

Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes of
September 22, 2016

Keith Koons, chair, called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. The roll was circulated for signatures.

MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of August 25, 2016 was made and seconded. The minutes were approved as recorded.

RECOGNITION OF GUESTS

Greg Schuckman, Assistant Vice President of University Relations and Director of Federal Relations

Kristy McAllister, Academic Affairs Information and Publication Services

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Office of Faculty Excellence has an opportunity for faculty to help brainstorm ideas for an electronic system that will be used for faculty reporting, such as faculty annual reports, as well as used by administrators for accessing aggregate data (reports on faculty productivity related to publications, honors and awards, and more).

The system will either be developed in-house or licensed through a third-party vendor. The first step in the process is to brainstorm what that system would be and what it would look like (i.e., the business processes it would support and functionality for multiple users including faculty and administrators). Three brainstorming meetings, facilitated by the Office of Faculty Excellence, will provide opportunities for faculty to brainstorm and sketch out ideas for the system. Faculty who plan to attend are asked to please come prepared to discuss what would be valuable for this system (e.g., reporting, scheduled activities, ad hoc functions) from your perspective as a faculty, administrator, or other. To best accommodate schedules, three sessions are scheduled. A RSVP is not necessary.

- Friday, September 30 from 1:30-2:30 p.m., Classroom Building 1, room 205
- Tuesday, October 11 from 12:00-1:00 p.m., Classroom Building 1, room 205
- Wednesday, October 12 from 10:00-11:00 a.m., Classroom Building 1, room 205

Question: Have you done any benchmarking or researched what other universities are doing?

Answer: Yes, there are outside vendors that other universities use, whereas other institutions develop their own product.

We will send out a follow-up email to all senators with the information.

Dr. Koons informed the senators about the Advisory Council of Faculty Senates (ACFS) which is represented by faculty members from all the State University System institutions. The elected chair of ACFS has a seat on the Board of Governors. The ACFS is holding a meeting tomorrow at New College in Sarasota. Drs. Koons, Oetjen, and Self are attending representing UCF.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

REPORT OF THE PROVOST

Dr. Elizabeth Dooley attended on behalf of the provost. No report at this time, but will answer any questions.

NEW BUSINESS

Federal Research Opportunities

Dr. Koons introduced Greg Schuckman, Assistant Vice President for University Relations and Director of Federal Relations. Indicated that the Federal fiscal year starts October 1. Since there is no an approved budget yet, congress will have to pass a continuing resolution to fund the government through December 9. This means all agencies will see a half percent reduction in funding based on the budget this fiscal year until a new budget is approved. The agencies will likely process request for proposals (RFP) slower and more conservatively.

Prior to 2012, earmarks in the budget directed specific funding toward an institution or project. Between 2001 and 2010, UCF benefited from over \$67 million in earmarks. UCF is unique in that we sent out a request for proposals internally for faculty to submit ideas through a white paper process, followed by proposals to a committee. The committee is co-chaired by Greg Schuckman, Liz Klonoff, and other members including administrators, board of trustees, and an external stakeholder. The committee invites and listens to faculty presentations. After the presentations, the committee makes recommendations on priorities to Dr. Hitt. This process is a great way to achieve more funding and recognition. This process was postponed in 2012 when congress put a ban on earmarking. Soft earmarking still occurs, but instead of being directed to a specific institution, increased funding is requested to an agency for a specific purpose.

Regardless of what happens in the presidential election, UCF would like to be prepared with a list of federal priorities, so the internal process will proceed. Mr. Schuckman is on campus through Wednesday meeting with several colleges and institutes. White papers are due October 10. The committee will determine which white papers will be invited to submit proposals by November 23. November 29, the committee will hold an all-day session to here presentations.

Question: In the past, certain agencies made it clear that if you received an earmark you would not receive any other federal funds. Is there anything else you can do for us besides getting earmarks?

Answer: There are two agencies we do nothing with; the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the National Institutes of Health (NIH). These agencies want nothing to do with earmarks. The Department of Defense is friendly to earmarking.

Question: For the internal federal priorities list, do we submit white papers through our dean or directly to you?

Answer: Proposals go through the dean. All the paperwork and information is available on the Office of Research website at

http://www.research.ucf.edu/FY2018_UCF_FederalPrioritiesInformation_FullProposalFormat.pdf.

Approval of TIP, RIA, and SoTL Documents

Dr. Koons pointed out that last year the Steering Ad Hoc Committee on Awards submitted recommended changes to the award documents to the provost. These recommendations are under consideration by administration through the bargaining process with UFF. Since bargaining is still underway, the only change to the procedures to be approved are the dates.

Motion and second to approve the TIP, RIA, and SoTL documents. Open for discussion. A senator pointed out that the College of Medicine documents are included even though the College of Medicine is not included in bargaining. What is going to happen with these documents? Since these are the same documents, administration probably did not want to change at this time.

Question: Is this going to be a yearly problem if the approval happens before bargaining is complete?

Answer: If changes are approved through bargaining, the changes would go into effect the following year.

Discussion closed. Vote: all in favor, motion passes.

Discussion of Resolutions Brought Forward by Steering on August 11, 2016

Dr. Koons noted that the eleven resolutions presented impact the Bylaws of the Faculty Constitution. This meeting is devoted to discussion. The resolutions will be subject to amendments and voting at the October meeting. If you have a substantial amendment, please bring to the next meeting in printed form.

Question: Last year there was question regarding the process for the Constitutional change, can you clarify?

Answer: The Constitutional change is a more rigorous process. All the resolutions this year are only changes to the bylaws which is not as rigorous and is defined as needing two successive meetings of the Senate.

Dr. Koons introduced each resolution, allowing time for comments or discussion. Clarification requested on red versus black text. Red underlined text indicates new language where red strikethrough text indicates deletions of current language. Black text indicates existing language.

- Resolution 2016-2017-1 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Section VIII. Joint Committees and Councils – no discussion.
- Resolution 2016-2017-2 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Various Joint Committees and Councils – no discussion.
- Resolution 2016-2017-3 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, University Promotion and Tenure Committee – no discussion.
- Resolution 2016-2017-4 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Undergraduate Council and Committees – no discussion.
- Resolution 2016-2017-5 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Graduate Council and Committees. None of the committees currently have the associate deans as ex officio members. Don't really see the need in adding ten additional members. This change models the Undergraduate committees where the associate deans responsible for curricular items are included. Some members of the graduate council don't seem to think adding them is a good idea. Suggested senators talk to members of the graduate council to see what they think. Typically the associate dean attends when an item in their college is on the agenda. Different from the undergraduate committees where the associate deans present the information. Before a policy change is presented, the graduate studies executive committee discusses a change with the associate deans for feedback. Statement made that ex officio doesn't mean compulsory attendance and not counted as part of the quorum. Ex officio members are members of the committee and meant to serve as a resource. For the undergraduate committees, even if the associate deans don't have an item, they are still helpful in the whole process, but don't know if this would be true for the graduate level. Suggested everyone check around and touch base with their respective associate dean to find out more from those individuals that deal with curricular items to determine how or if this resolution needs to be modified.
- Resolution 2016-2017-6 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Parking Advisory and University Parking and Transportation Committees – no discussion.
- Resolution 2016-2017-7 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Information Technology Resource Advisory Committee – no discussion.
- Resolution 2016-2017-8 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Nominating Committee – no discussion.

- Resolution 2016-2017-9 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Governance in Academic Units. In reference to line 17 and 18; strongly opposed to monthly meetings, seems very micro-management. Comment that monthly is not required, but helps if you want to meet. The term faculty meeting doesn't appear in any UCF document. This defines a model for a department. Many departments operate fine and the intent was not to make a well run department meet. This doesn't seem necessary if you have senior faculty. Some units have no senior faculty. Line 27 regarding posting online. Does this mean website or email? Can be posted on an intranet, but accessible to the faculty. If email, new faculty do not have access. At what level is this for (dean, chairs, program directors, etc.)? All levels. Regarding line 17 and 18. Requirement seems excessive, would rather see "must meet on a regular basis each semester" and leave what regular means to the departments. B.1. is missing input to the agenda from faculty. Impromptu survey with a show of hands with how many currently have monthly meetings; majority raised their hands. Asked how many meet every two months; couple of hands raised. Asked how many every semester; just a couple of hands raised. Asked if anyone has not had a meeting within the last year; no hands raised. Comment made that it is a good practice to have minutes. Would like to see "faculty of a unit are entitled to request a meeting" to have a clear mandate of the right of the faculty. Would like to strike all reference to unit bylaws. Unit operates fine and don't want to develop bylaws. Bylaws are happening anyway, Faculty Excellence is requesting copies of bylaws. Seems the language is disconnected. Requires information posted online, but only suggests there should be a meeting.
- Resolution 2016-2017-10 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Restore Section IV.I. Resolutions – no discussion.
- Resolution 2016-2017-11 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Section IX. Amendments – no discussion.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Budget and Administrative Committee – Pradeep Bhardwaj

Meeting scheduled for October 5, nothing to report at this time.

Personnel Committee – Stephen King

Held first meeting. Discussed the five topics assigned by Steering. Formed subcommittees to work on two topics. Had the most discussion on the Nepotism policy. Referred to a 1977-1978-19 and 1991-1992-16 resolutions. Current UCF Policy has contradictory statements.

Parking Advisory Committee – Ahmad Elshennawy

Nothing to report at this time.

Undergraduate Council – Kelly Allred

Met on September 13. Discussed the potential need to update the academic rigor report, which is temporarily tabled. Also discussed the need to document and for timely communication regarding course and program changes. Next meeting October 11.

Graduate Council – Zixia Song

Each committee has met and conducting normal business.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.