Keith Koons, chair, called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. The roll was circulated for signatures.

MINUTES
Motion to approve the minutes of November 3, 2016 was made and seconded. The minutes were approved as recorded.

RECOGNITION OF GUESTS
Lucretia Cooney, Associate Director of Faculty Excellence
Sherry Andrews, Associate Provost and Associate General Counsel
Kristy McAllister, Coordinator, Academic Affairs Information and Publication Services
Stephen King, Associate Professor for the College of Medicine and chair of the Personnel Committee
Fernando Rivera, Associate Professor, Sociology and 2015-2016 Provost Faculty Fellow

ANNOUNCEMENTS
During the November meeting, Nina Orlovskaya commented on the dangers of walking in the D parking lot. We contacted Curt Sawyer regarding the issue. Kris Singh, Director of Parking & Transportation Services and John Weaver, Associate Director of Construction Services surveyed the lot and current construction. They responded indicating that Parking Services began exiting the busses via the College of Optics and Photonics to the south of garage C. This alleviated them cutting through the parking lot with the exception of two small buses for park and ride. The main issue is vehicles cutting through the parking lot now that the south lanes have been configured into a roadway. We don't see much relief until construction ends. Several comments made how you are always walking in the road since there are no crosswalks for pedestrians.

On behalf of Naim Kapucu, the Director of the School of Public Administration, Claire Knox distributed the School of Public Administration's 2015-2016 annual FOCUS publication celebrating 40 anniversary of the school.

OLD BUSINESS
None.

REPORT OF THE PROVOST
The report of the provost was delayed until after the resolutions were discussed due to a prior commitment.

Data Breach
Starting January 29, 2017, employees will start receiving notifications that the one-year ProtectMyID coverage provided by the insurance carrier will be expiring. The lifetime support will continue to assist in handling ID theft. In the last consultation, UFF asked

the administration to consider extending coverage. We are halfway through the negotiation process and have determined a price point of $15.00 for a year of extended coverage, versus $15.00 per month.

Provost College Visits
I have enjoyed the half day college visits as part of institutionalizing the Collective Impact – Strategic Plan. It's been a good opportunity to meet the people, facilities, and learn about the programs at each college. My two favorite activities have been meeting the students and faculty hired within the last year and a half. Upcoming visits include:
- College of Health and Public Affairs – January 18
- Burnett Honors College – January 27
- College of Engineering and Computer Science – February 9
- College of Education and Human Performance – March 20
- College of Medicine – April 3
- College of Optics and Photonics – April 17
- College of Nursing – April 20

We intent to repeat visits annually for the next five years.

Collective Impact – Strategic Plan
A new award, the Marchioli Collective Impact Award was emailed to the UCF community recently. There is a $1,000 award for innovation; and a $2,500, $1,000, and $500 award for ideation. See the website http://www.ucf.edu/strategic-planning/ for details.

Diversity and Inclusion Commitment
Tuesday, Dr. Hitt sent an email renewing his commitment to diversity and inclusion. The statement was initiated by UFF resulting in the joint statement Tuesday. As part of my provost comments at the Senate meeting, I will try to differentiate the boundaries between divergent views and discriminatory views; boundaries between free speech and hate speech; boundaries between academic freedom; and our ability as individuals to speak as an individual.

Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) Program
Dr. Hitt and approximately five hundred other presidents signed a letter directed to the incoming U.S. Presidential administration to support and encourage the administration to extend DACA. Some institutions have gone further by declaring their campus a sanctuary for undocumented students. UCF can't act illegally by violating a Florida Statute, but is committed to about 140 undocumented students that have registered with DACA.

UCF Ranking
For the first time in UCF history, the university is ranked in the top 100 institutions in the National Science Foundation's Research and Development Expenditures ranking list. UCF is ranked 99.

Information Request
The Provost solicited examples or questions of situations of free speech, versus threats, versus religious gray areas to use as test cases on principles.

NEW BUSINESS
Resolution 2016-2017-12 Availability of Lactation Rooms for UCF Women
Linda Walters introduced the resolution on behalf of the Personnel Committee. The lack of rooms has been an issue on campus for decades. We have steadily been pushing for more rooms. We are now up to seven rooms, with five being on the main campus. We are not near the Federal recommendations for the number of lactation rooms based upon our faculty and staff. The goal of the resolution is to increase the number of rooms in new buildings or retrofit existing buildings. We were notified by Facilities and Safety that they are now starting to look into the issue.

Question: What makes getting the rooms difficult?
Answer: The rooms require a sink, making retro-fitting difficult. Space is at a premium on campus and it's difficult to give up any space.

Question: What about modular pods?
Answer: That's a possibility, but someone has to pay for the pods and decide it's a good idea.

All of the existing rooms are in one corner of the main campus. Nursing women are not supposed to walk more than five minutes to a lactation room. From admissions, it's a fourteen minute walk one-way to the Global UCF building.

Question: Off campus rooms?
Answer: Rosen had a room, but it was redesigned for other use. The College of Medicine has one room, and so does the College of Nursing off campus.

Question: How much of the campus is not covered?
Answer: About three fourths of the campus is not covered.

Question: Are there any downsides outside of cost?
Answer: No.

Motion and second to place the resolution on the Senate agenda for January 26, 2017.
Vote: All in favor; motion passes.

Resolution 2016-2017-13 Fair and equal enactment of the UCF Employment of Relatives
Policy
Stephen King introduced the resolution. This resolution addresses inconsistency in
current UCF Policy 3-008.2 Employment of Relatives. The majority of the policy
provides guidelines in identifying what would be a potential conflict of interest and what
mitigating steps you would take if hiring a relative at all levels. Dr. King read section
B.h.:

> *"in those instances when a research project requires unique skills or attributes of*
> *an individual that is not available in another candidate besides that of the*
> *employee's relative, a plan to mitigate and monitor the conflict of interest must be*
> *submitted to the Research Conflict of Interest Committee for review and approval.*
> *Under no circumstances will a principal investigator be permitted to directly or*
> *indirectly supervise his or her relative."*

The main issue is that the principal investigator as supervisor is the only instance singled
out as not being allowed. In all other cases (e.g., a chair and a dean) a supervisor can be
relatives and have a mitigation policy. The resolution asks for the last sentence to be
removed to allow for the same concerns and same process to handle relatives working on
a research project.

Comment: An example would be a spousal hire with two people that work in the same
field that might already share a grant. This is fairly common.

Question: Have you investigated Federal requirements?
Answer: The Federal requirement is that you must have a policy.

Comment: Can understand why the policy exists. Most cases of spousal direct chain of
command interactions are very visible. A research grant is not as visible to others in the
university community and probably a more sensitive area.

Comment: In response to the previous comment, yes, except it is ruled out in totality with
no exceptions.

Question: The provost commented that it's hard to get resolutions that he can't support
that might otherwise be supportable if we engaged other people earlier. Have you
consulted with Cynthia Young and Rhonda Bishop?
Answer: Contacted Rhonda Bishop twice with no response. Did not contact Cynthia
Young since the policy is through Rhonda Bishop's office. Provost offered to take back
questions to Rhonda Bishop. Dr. King indicated that the question was regarding the
rationale behind the language.

Question for Provost: This policy came out of the blue late last year. We already had a policy on conflict of interest. This policy seems severely worded. What was going on that prompted the policy to be developed so quickly?
Answer: Can't answer that. I can say I'm more worried about wide scale abuse that was concentrated about that time and had been going on for a long time. It could have been a reaction or response to that. The provost will make sure Rhonda Bishop gets back in touch with Dr. King.

Motion to place the resolution on the Senate agenda for January 26, 2017. Since the resolution comes from the Personnel committee, no second is required. Vote: All in favor; motion passes.

Resolution 2016-2017-14 Guidelines for Academic Structure at the University of Central Florida
William Self introduced the resolution. Last year, the provost asked the Provost Fellows to review UCF policies regarding academic structure. UCF has not developed any guidelines regarding academic structure. We reviewed what other institutions have developed and requested a report from the Education Advisory Board (EAB) in regards to interdisciplinary research. The guidelines are rooted in tenure track faculty that teach, research, and serve. The language in the guidelines leaves room for variation. The guidelines are brought forward as a resolution to communicate and give faculty an opportunity to review. In addition a 2004-2005-5
(http://facultysenate.ucf.edu/resolutions/2004-2005/index.asp#res5) resolution encouraged administration to consult with the Faculty Senate when creating colleges, schools, or other degree granting units.

Question: How does this impact center faculty without a unit?
Answer: This wasn't developed with a targeted program or unit in mind. This is more of a forward looking document.

Question: Will the Faculty Clusters be like nanoscience?
Answer: Didn't address Faculty Clusters specifically. The document defines the opportunity for growth and possible placement.

Comment: A handful of faculty in nanoscience have tenure in the center and not an academic unit. This presents issues in the tenure and promotion process. The decision has been handled through the research office, where the head of research has acted as the dean. This also presents a problem when apportioning the Faculty Senate since senators represent an academic unit. When faculty are outside of an academic unit they don't have Senate representation.

Provost Comment: This brings up a similar question with the new budget distribution model. This was prompted when I was working through promotion and tenure documents. I started wondering what the consistency is among Nanoscience, the Institute for Simulation and Training (IST), and what was previously known as CREOL. What is the evolutionary path from a grouping of interested people to a grouping of people that

may have a research center? Because of history we have pieces of inconsistency. Going forward, there is value in having descriptions of what consistency would look like. What does it mean to evolve to an academic unit? The intent is to provide an opportunity for groups of faculty with guidelines and a foundation for what defines a school, department or academic unit.

Question: Is dual tenure in the guidelines?
Answer: Dual tenure was in the EAB document, not in the guidelines.

Question: The guidelines are written as if you starting with nothing, but we have entities that might want to be redefined in some way. It would be good to recognize that you don't necessarily have to go through a probationary period. For example, my group has been granting degrees in Planetary Science since 2009. We are one of the top groups in the country and bigger than many departments. A probationary period doesn't seem necessary.
Answer: I think the document indicates "should", so it's not an absolute. We can look to make sure it's flexible.

Question: What is the process for amendments to the guidelines?
Answer: The way the resolution is written, we didn't intend to allow amendments, but we are making notes to handle feedback. We would prefer an informal process for feedback and changes to the guidelines.

Comment: The word "draft" on the guidelines is problematic for the Senate. If you are asking for the Senate to vote on something, it shouldn't be a draft.

Motion and second to revise and submit the final edited resolution to the Senate on January 17, 2017. Remove the word draft from line 16 and 20. Vote: All in favor; motion passes.

Resolution 2016-2017-15 Cumulative Progress Evaluation (CPE) Requirement for Promotion to Full Professor
William Self introduced the resolution. The resolution is a result of the COACHE process based on negative feedback regarding the promotion process from associate to full professor. We held a forum at the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning (FCTL) conference on the issue. Unlike the promotion process from assistant professor, this is a curriculum vitae (CV) and a one-page statement of accomplishments to receive feedback. This would only be required one time prior to applying for promotion. This is only a requirement for those associate professors after 2014. We are trying to institutionalize this going forward. However, this is a bargained issue. Cynthia Young suggested the resolution be modified to "recommended". Not sure recommending the process would have an impact, but at the same time it could take two years to get through the bargaining process.

Question: Is this meant to be completed at the department level?
Answer: Yes, through the chair.

Question: Are there more issues at the departmental level versus at the college and university level?
Answer: In some cases the feedback from the departmental level will not be the same as the college or university level.

Question: What about the timing?
Answer: There is a schedule for the cumulative progress evaluation (CPE). Whatever the results of the CV review, you don't have to put the results in the promotion binder.

Question: Would this hinder counter offers by requiring the process prior to applying for promotion?
Answer: If it goes through as a bargained issued as "must" be completed, then yes they would have to wait until the process is complete. If the language is changed to "recommended", then no it wouldn't hinder.

Comment: Don't see the value in completing this process if the feedback is not completed at least every other year. Feedback should be timely and regular.

Comment: The reduced version of the CPE process is not stated in the resolution. Maybe add a sentence in the Be it Resolved. The determination of whether the process should be required or recommended should be addressed on the Senate floor. Also, the timing is specified as 2016, which has already passed. The resolution should probably state 2017 or later.

Question: Have you thought of using a different name?
Answer: It's a bargaining question.

Motion and second to table the resolution to add details and bring back to Steering. Vote: All in favor, motion passes.

Proceeded to the report of the Provost.

Appointment of selection committee for the University Excellence in Professional Service Award
Requested three Steering members to volunteer to review and select the University Excellence in Professional Service Award. The chair of the Senate is the chair of the selection committee. Michelle Kelley, Claire Knox, and Nina Orlovskaya volunteered for the committee.

TIP, RIA, SoTL Approval Process
Every Fall semester the Steering Committee approves date changes to the documents. Sherry Andrews provided a brief overview of the history. The State of Florida originally funded the awards programs. When the State phased out funding, UCF was the only university to continue the programs. Additionally, bargaining was conducted at the State level. Prior to having a local bargaining contract, the Senate handled criteria and

procedures. Since the awards are a term and condition of employment, UFF has the right to bargain the awards. This past year, UFF wanted to bargain the criteria. At this point, the Senate doesn't have a role in the programs.

Question: TIP, RIA, and SoTL are bargained for in-unit faculty, what about out-of-unit? Answer: The College of Medicine criteria and procedures are voted on by the unit, but nothing prevents the Senate from getting involved.

Question: Does the Senate have a role for out-of-unit? Answer: It's undefined. Suggested that the Senate wait to see if the out-of-unit faculty want the Senate involved. Committee members asked William Self to check with out-of-unit faculty to see what they prefer and report back to Steering.

Provost Response to Resolution 2016-2017-10 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Restore Section V.I. Resolutions
The Provost approved the resolution with an addendum that removes the Board of Trustees as the final appeal of a Senate action. Steering can either accept the addendum or reject the addendum and start over.

Question: The objection is based on the chair of the Senate being a member of the Board of Trustees. If two thirds of the Senate disagrees with the president, what is wrong with taking it to the board?
Answer: If you disagree, you can make the view of the Senate known at the microphone during public comment at any Board of Trustees meeting. The Board of Trustees delegated executive powers to the president.

Question: So why strike the language?
Answer: Because this is taking a resolution to the board and asking for a vote to be overturned. That is very different then expressing a view during public comment.

Comment: This issue is very disturbing and troubling. It doesn't make sense that we have to vote on correcting a clerical error. If it wasn't for a clerical error, the language would still be in the Bylaws and the president or provost would not have the opportunity to remove.

Provost Question: Can you clarify the history of the language and how it was removed?
Answer: Dr. Koons reiterated that the Faculty Constitution used to be a single document and required a Faculty Assembly for any change. In 2010, the Faculty Constitution was divided into two documents, the Faculty Constitution and Bylaws. The Constitution retained the core structure and high standard required for changes. The Bylaws represented all committee details that are more easily changed and automatically updated due to title changes, etc. Splitting the Faculty Constitution was a laborious process, and unfortunately this language was accidently left out.

Provost Question: How do you know it was accidently omitted and not intentionally taken out?
Answer: It's nowhere in the minutes or committee notes.

Question: Has Dr. Hitt expressed an opinion on this issue?
Answer: Yes, but I don't think he has a strong opinion either way. It's probably more important to discuss with the Trustees, and I have not discussed this with Trustee Marchena. Dr. Koons noted that this process has never been used.

Question: Can we ask the Provost to reconsider?
Answer: The provost would like some time to think about the issue of undermining the authority of the president and to discuss it with Dr. Hitt and Trustee Marchena. Dr. Koons asked the provost to informally let him know if he is willing to reconsider the original resolution.

Provost Response to Resolution 2016-2017-9 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Governance in Academic Units
The provost denied the resolution as drafted with an addendum that will be completed shortly. There were three areas in the resolution that caused issues including: continuity by having the dean and Faculty Excellence review the bylaws, and all records being open just needs some modification so it's within the law. Steering member pointed out the exclusion of records deemed confidential under law or university policy is in the resolution. Steering will wait for the official response.

Student Perception of Instruction (SPoI) Response Rate
A question has been raised regarding the response rate and blank responses. A handout was provided from Lisa Wayte in Computer Services and Telecommunications (CS&T) with data regarding the response rate from 2012 through 2016. Although blank responses are not counted in the overall student responses, we do have data on the number of blank responses. Based on the data, we need to determine if any other action needed.

The issue is particularly important for small classes. When in paper form, the students conscientiously filled them out and the response rate was high. Once the form went online, the pop-up prevented students from registering or accessing MYUCF until the SPoI was completed, resulting in blank responses or not genuine responses to quickly get by. Students are unable to pull the form back up to complete once they submit it blank. In talking with others, this seems to be a wide-spread issue. It was noted that any class with five or less students is not counted or collected. We would like to see a change to ensure the students aren't motivated to ignore the form or not authentically complete the forms. Discussion continued. Maybe small classes can be summed over the course of time. For those that teach graduate level courses, students can graduate and never complete the form, leaving no feedback.

Dr. Koons asked if an Ad Hoc committee should be formed or the issue sent to an existing committee. Committee member suggested we gather national data and review further UCF historical data before proceeding. Dr. Koons noted that he will be taking the response rates to the state level at an upcoming Advisory Council for Faculty Senates meeting January 27 and hopes to see data from other universities.

Suggestions regarding information to gather:
- Alternative ways of accessing effectiveness other than SPoI.
- How to improve collection of data and increasing response rate.
- Obtain a breakdown of response rate by mode of instruction.
- How long does it take for a student to complete?
- When are the students completing the forms?
- What is the difference between providing a block of time to complete and others that had to complete on their own time.

This issue doesn't fall within the duties of an existing committee. There appears to be sufficient cause to look deeper into the issue. Motion and second to form a Steering Ad Hoc Student Perception of Instruction (SPoI) Response Rate Committee. Vote: All in favor; motion passes. Joseph Harrington volunteered to chair the committee. Additional committee members include Scott Warfield and Kevin Murphy.

LIAISON COMMITTEE REPORTS
Budget and Administrative – Nina Orlovskaya
Committee met yesterday. Committee was briefed on the process to provide support to colleges and departments.

Parking Advisory Committee – Bari Hoffman-Ruddy
Committee met November 28. The committee continues to discuss options to reduce parking fees. The committee is currently reviewing golf cart and bicycle friendly improvements. Next meeting is scheduled for January 23.

Personnel Committee – Linda Walters
No update outside of resolutions brought forward.

Graduate Council – Jim Moharam
All committees continue to meet and complete normal business.

Undergraduate Council – Kelly Allred
Committees continue to meet and complete normal business. Will be meeting to revise Undergraduate processes.

OTHER BUSINESS
None.

ADJOURNMENT
Motion to adjourn made and seconded. The committee adjourned at 6:10 p.m.