Keith Koons, chair, called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. The roll was circulated for signatures.   Recognized Robert Folger, CBA and Bari Hoffman-Ruddy, COHPA on conference call. Quorum was established.

While waiting on Provost Whittaker, Dr. Koons communicated the purpose of the emergency meeting was to discuss the May 27, 2015 letter from the Provost regarding Faculty Senate Resolution 2007-2008-5 Appointment and Evaluation of School Directors and Department Chairs (Revised). Dr. Koons informed the attendees that he responded to the Provost expressing concern and asking for clarification on four main points:
1. Authority. The Faculty Senate is an advisory body to the president and provost of the university. Resolutions passed by the Senate are delivered to the provost, who has the authority and responsibility to approve or veto them. However, any authority for the provost to nullify a resolution from a previous year which has been approved by a previous provost and incorporated into official UCF policy is not stated in the Constitution.
2. Intent. Senate Resolution 2007-2008-5 provides an important voice for faculty in the appointment and reappointment of chairs and directors – their immediate supervisors. By taking out that opportunity for faculty input, the concept and benefits of shared faculty governance are diminished.
3. Rationale. The letter dated May 27, 2015 stated a conflict with Article 4 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Article 4 speaks about management rights of the Board of Trustees. How is this a conflict with faculty input on chairs and directors?
4. Current enforcement of policies. The letter stated a conflict with current hiring practices. By approving 2007-2008-5, Provost Hickey took the step of adopting the elements of the resolution as official UCF policy. It seems that current hiring practices should follow approved policy, not the other way around.

Dr. Koons welcomed Provost Whittaker and informed him of what transpired in the meeting thus far.

MINUTES
Motion to approve the minutes of April 9, 2015 was made and seconded. The minutes were approved as recorded.

RECOGNITION OF GUESTS
Stephen Kuebler, Faculty Senator, COS, Chemistry
Joseph Harrington, Faculty Senator, COS, Physics
Elsie Olan, Faculty Senator, CEDHP, School of Teaching, Learning and Leadership
Bob Jones, Faculty Senator, CAH, School of Visual Arts and Design
Lucretia Cooney, Faculty Excellence
Sherry Andrews, Associate General Counsel, General Counsel's Office
Diane Chase, Vice Provost, Academic Program Quality
Manoj Chopra, Interim Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies

OLD BUSINESS
There is no old business.

NEW BUSINESS
Dr. Koons turned the floor over to Provost Whittaker. The Provost first clarified principles of faculty voice and selection of a chair. The hiring authority has the ultimate responsibility and accountability for choosing the best person for the position. The most important stakeholder group is the faculty. Faculty have to provide their voice to the hiring manager in order for the hiring manager to make a reasonable choice. The point of discussion are the words "vote" and "public vote." What are the best ways for faculty voice to be expressed to a hiring manager? In dean searches, he prefers to receive the summarized input from committees so individual input is protected since all records are open to public record.

The Provost requested the Steering Committee reconsider the resolution and consider what the best mechanism is for allowing faculty input, and to what point the input is recorded. Faculty do vote on the tenure for external candidates. He suggested a discussion on the nature of the word "vote."

The Provost agreed to limit the conversation to Directors and Chairs since the level of faculty input for a Dean is different than the current issue. Discussion continued on the following points:

- Voting process in the resolution is not a binding vote; advisory in nature. Why is the vote problematic? The resolution does not specify the vote to be anonymous, instead allows departments to formulate procedures; allowing potential for variability. Having the hired candidate know faculty were not in favor of hiring. Discussion continued on a candidate or hired chair knowing the vote; whether the vote is anonymous; internal versus external; pros and cons.

- The terminology used in a vote (e.g., outstanding, acceptable, unacceptable), and how hiring managers interpret.

- Resolution compels all departments to vote. He prefers we not require every department to vote.

- Faculty allowed to vote; different in reappointment and search process.

- Resolution was implemented in Faculty Handbook. According to Sherry Andrews, Associate General Counsel, the Faculty Handbook is not University policy. Policy would have to be formulated and go through the University Policy or Regulation Development procedure.

- Once a Faculty Senate Resolution is passed and accepted by administration, follow-up and implementation is up to administration not the Faculty Senate. The specific procedures should be handled by each college and the Provost. Resolution 2010-2011-5 Revision to Policy Concerning Appointment and Evaluation of Chairs and Directors asked for clarity; also not implemented.

- Confusion surrounding search votes, hiring votes with tenure for external candidates, and internal hiring votes.

- Lack of procedures and inconsistent college communication of appointment of directors and chairs (how selected, why recommended not selected, etc.). Annual evaluation of chairs not happening consistently. Lack of faculty recourse.

- Currently, feedback in some form is given, but the resolution is not implemented in colleges. Should be same feedback as the 5-year or annual review or same procedure as tenure.

- Resolution allows colleges to determine at what point the faculty vote is reviewed (e.g., to the search committee, to the dean after the search committee recommends, etc.). The Provost prefers the input go through the search committee.

- The Provost is uncomfortable with the word "vote," "recorded vote," or defining which faculty provide feedback. Is more comfortable with text feedback or even compelling feedback.

A suggestion was made to the Provost that he can take the current resolution and direct the deans to develop procedures that he would support.

Motion made to send this issue to the Personnel Committee to include anonymous feedback, guidelines not clear enough and not practiced. Motion seconded.

Discussion continued regarding the previous bullet points and whether the issue should be sent to the Personnel Committee. An approved resolution in the past can't be changed, a new resolution would need to be formulated. Would be helpful to know the intent of the resolution (search or hiring).

Clarify motion: draft multiple resolutions including: hiring, reappointment, 5-year review, and annual review.

Senate needs to work with Administration so the Senate is notified when a resolution is implemented into policy, regulation, or procedures. The university community also needs to know of changes.

The Provost requested a revised resolution that articulates principles, keeps the request simple and flexible, and includes a mechanism where violations are handled. He was asked to compel the deans to come up with policies.

Question: Is there anywhere where the status of Faculty Senate resolutions is defined as permanent and binding? It seems like the only way a resolution can't be revoked is if it's in official UCF policy. Dr. Koons expressed the expectation is after a resolution is approved by the senate and the provost, action is taken by administration to implement the policy, procedure or confirm acceptance, if just a statement. The Provost agreed with the expectation and indicated that this resolution is too ambiguous to accept or deny. He indicated that what is missing is his feedback to the Senate once accepted on how administration will proceed.

Motion and second was made to send the topic to the Personnel committee. Motion repeated for conference callers. Vote: four opposed, motion passes. Topic will be sent to the Personnel committee at the start of the 2015-2016 senate session.

Clarification: The Provost was asked if he discussed the issue with the chair or other senate leadership prior to sending the memo. He indicated no, and that he should have.

Suggestion made to appoint a Parliamentarian in charge of clarifying procedures. Dr. Koons indicated it is up to the chair to appoint a Parliamentarian and asked everyone to let him know if they were interested.

OTHER BUSINESS
No other business.

ADJOURNMENT
Motion to adjourn made and seconded. The committee adjourned at 10:32 a.m.