



# Faculty Senate

## Steering Committee

Agenda for meeting of Thursday, April 6, 2023, 3:00 pm

Location: Charge on Chamber, Student Union Room 340

For those unable to make the in person meeting due to travel, location or health issues, there is a Zoom option:

<https://ucf.zoom.us/j/98516844120?pwd=ay9zbjBrRVVyeHV2TVRwdFFtOHBKQT09>

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call via Qualtrics: [https://ucf.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV\\_0JHM1hSE63TAlq](https://ucf.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_0JHM1hSE63TAlq)
3. Approval of Minutes of *March 9, 2023*
4. Recognition of Guests
5. Announcements and Report of the Chair
6. Report of the Provost
7. Unfinished Business
8. New Business
  - a) Report of the Nominating Committee – *Nominating Committee*
  - b) Discussion of Nomination Procedures
  - c) UCF Faculty Senate Statement Regarding Civil Discourse and Free Expression
  - d) BOG Post-Tenure Faculty Review Regulation
9. Committee Reports
10. Other Business
11. Adjournment

# Report of the Nominating Committee

Joseph Harrington, Chair, Faculty Senate Nominating Committee

30 March 2023

The Nominating Committee consisted of:

Joseph Harrington, Chair

Linda Walters

Reid Oetjen

The Committee met informally in person following appointment at the March Steering Committee meeting and again following the March Senate meeting. We held an ongoing email discussion. In these meetings, we discussed potential candidates and the procedures and timeline for the nominating process. We decided unanimously to forward all confirmed nominations, up to the four allowed by the Bylaws, and to seek multiple candidates for each office, if possible.

The committee decided to nominate multiple individuals, several emailed nominations were received by the Chair, and Nominating Committee members also nominated faculty on their own behalf. Once the eligible Senators were known and relevant changes to the Faculty Senate website were posted (including the new definition of faculty from the constitutional amendment approved at the last Senate meeting), we solicited nominations via a Qualtrics form in an email sent to all regular faculty by the Senate Office on March 24, with a deadline of noon today, March 30, per the Bylaws.

We received over 20 nominations, the vast majority of which were without confirmation by the candidate. We confirmed nominee eligibility and followed up with each eligible nominee. As of noon today, all but two nominees have responded. The nominees willing to serve at this point are:

For Chair:

Stephen King

Kelly Semrad

For Vice Chair:

Keri Watson

For Secretary:

Kristine Shrauger

We have received biographical and candidate statements from two nominees, and will submit the latest version from each candidate to the Senate Office by April 13, in time for inclusion in the April 20 meeting materials.

We have informed candidates that communication with voting senators is up to them and that the Senate Office will provide a list of email addresses upon request.

We will ask at Steering whether the Steering Committee wishes us to hold any pre-election events, such as Zoom meetings with each candidate. Candidates can always set these up on their own, too.

We will continue to seek confirmation of any additional nominations we receive, to collect candidate materials, and to forward the names and materials to the Senate Office as we receive them, through the last deadline given by the Senate Office (currently noon April 19 for an afternoon mailing 24 hours before the election meeting). Although we do not anticipate it, if any election exceeds four candidates, we will meet to reduce the number to four, as specified in the Bylaws. Candidates can always be nominated or self-nominate from the floor.

# Discussion of Nominating Committee Procedures and Bylaws

Joseph Harrington, Chair, Faculty Senate Nominating Committee

This year's Nominating Committee encountered a number of ambiguities and one outright contradiction in the Bylaws concerning how to proceed with our tasks. I am raising this discussion to see whether we would like to amend the Bylaws and/or establish a procedural document as a guideline for future elections. Any changes would be included in next year's Senate agenda, informed by this discussion. Points for consideration:

There is a conflict in the Bylaws, which specifies that the list of eligible Senators be available by April 1, but that the nominating process should conclude by the end of the 11<sup>th</sup> week of the Spring semester, which was March 31 this year.

The Bylaws are not specific on whether the Nominating Committee has the authority to remove a nominee from the list they forward to Steering because they believe, in their judgment, that the person would be a poor candidate, even if there are fewer than four nominees. This is the task of some Nominating committees, but usually for small, self-perpetuating or externally appointed boards like our own Board of Trustees, and not for large electing bodies like ours. The Bylaws should be clear, one way or the other.

The Bylaws refer to Steering receiving the "recommendation" of the Nominating Committee, which implies that Steering could reject those recommendations. Robert's Rules recommends against this, to prevent those in authority from maintaining their positions by choosing the candidates.

It is not clear whether the Nominating Committee continues to accept nominations between the report to Steering and the election, or whether nominations are closed then and reopen at the election.

It is not clear whether the Nominating or Steering Committees should be involved in candidate communications or should hold candidate events like Zoom meetings before the election.

It is not clear whether candidate materials should be reported to Steering, or only names.

The candidate materials in the Bylaws only refer to a biographical sketch, but a candidate statement is common.

Please have a look at the quotations from the Constitution and Bylaws, consider these points, and be prepared to discuss them at the meeting.

*Sections of the Bylaws and Roberts relating to the Nominations committee and officer elections.*  
**Constitution:** Only designates titles of officers, no other information is present.

**Relevant section of the Bylaws:**

**Section 3.A. Officers:** Chair: f. To oversee the Office of the Faculty Senate  
Past Chair: b. To serve as chair of the Nominations Committee

**Section 3. B. Election of Officers**

As the first order of business at the first meeting of the new Senate in April, the Senate shall elect from its voting membership by majority vote a chair, vice chair and secretary to perform the duties and functions as described in Section A. Each of the officers has a one-year term, beginning immediately following the annual election.

No later than April 1, the Office of the Faculty Senate shall make public a list of all Faculty Senate members for the coming year and issue a call to the general faculty for nominations for Faculty Senate officers from this list. In the eleventh week of the spring semester, the Nominating Committee shall select up to four willing candidates for each office from among the candidates nominated by the faculty. In addition, the Nominating Committee may add additional nominees for each office not previously put forward by the faculty.

At least one week prior to the first meeting of the new Faculty Senate, the Office of the Faculty Senate shall distribute the names and biographical statements of nominees to all members of the Faculty Senate. Additional nominations for each office shall also be accepted from the floor of the Faculty Senate.

**Section 6: Senate Operational committees A.2. Duties and Resp. of the Steering Committee.**  
d. To monitor Senate elections and maintain election records.

**Section 6 A.5.b. Nominating Committee.**

This committee consists of the Senate past chair, who shall serve as chair of the committee, and two other Steering Committee members. If the immediate past chair is not available, the Steering Committee must elect a faculty member to serve in this role. Prior to the first meeting of the new Senate, the Nominating Committee recommends to the Steering Committee a list of up to four willing candidates for each of the Senate offices. (For nomination procedures, see *Bylaws*, Section III.B.)

**Section 4: Meetings of the senate K. Conduct of Senate Business** 1. In the conduct of its business, the Senate shall be guided by the customary rules of parliamentary procedure, insofar as these are not modified by the provisions of this *Constitution* or its bylaws. In cases of dispute recourse shall be to *Robert's Rules of Order* (latest edition).

**From Roberts Rules(12<sup>th</sup>): Committee reports 51:55** The report of the nominating committee consists of a written list of candidates for office, just as in the case of the membership committee's report. No vote on the nominating committee's report is taken, however; the procedure is as described in **46** (*Note: 46 is Nominations and Elections*)

**Content of Bylaws 56:68**

- 1) *Each society decides for itself the meaning of its bylaws.* When the meaning is clear, however, the society, even by unanimous vote, cannot change that meaning except by amending its bylaws. An ambiguity must exist before there is any occasion for interpretation.

**AGENDA ITEM:**

UCF Faculty Senate Statement Regarding Civil Discourse and Free Expression

***From the BOG Civil Discourse Final Report-2022*****University Leadership**

State university boards of trustees have the powers and duties necessary for each university's operation, management, and accountability. University civil discourse policies, programs, and initiatives should be viewed as strategic priorities by each board of trustees. The Board of Governors also believes that university faculty senates and student governments have a vital role and should participate early and often in the development, implementation, evaluation, and support of civil discourse programs and initiatives.

**Recommendation III. The Board of Governors recommends that the leadership of each university board of trustees, faculty senate, and student government annually review and endorse the Board's Statement of Free Expression and commit to the principles of civil discourse.**

***FAU Faculty Senate statement:***

The Florida Atlantic University Faculty Senate has reviewed the University's policies, statements, and practices on civil discourse and freedom of expression. We find that our existing practices on our campuses generally conform with the State University System Board of Governors Statement of Free Expression. We remain committed to civil discourse, and the free exchange and discussion of ideas.

*Kimberly Dunn, Ph.D.*

*President, FAU Faculty Senate*

***Proposed UCF Faculty Senate Statement***

The University of Central Florida Faculty Senate Steering committee has examined and reviewed civil discourse and freedom of expression within the Faculty Senate. We find that the Faculty Senate has shown support for both civil discourse and freedom of expression as outlined in the University System Board of Governors Statement of Free Expression. The Faculty Senate has endorsed freedom of expression and civil discourse via resolution, and our support for both civil discourse and free expression will continue.

*Stephen J. King, Ph.D.*

*Chair, UCF Faculty Senate*

## **Appendix A: State University System of Florida Statement of Free Expression**

The State University System of Florida and its twelve public postsecondary institutions adopt this Statement on Free Expression to support and encourage full and open discourse and the robust exchange of ideas and perspectives on our respective campuses. The principles of freedom of speech and freedom of expression in the United States and Florida Constitutions, in addition to being legal rights, are an integral part of our three-part university mission to deliver a high quality academic experience for our students, engage in meaningful and productive research, and provide valuable public service for the benefit of our local communities and the state. The purpose of this Statement is to affirm our dedication to these principles and to seek our campus communities' commitment to maintaining our campuses as places where the open exchange of knowledge and ideas furthers our mission.

A fundamental purpose of an institution of higher education is to provide a learning environment where divergent ideas, opinions and philosophies, new and old, can be rigorously debated and critically evaluated. Through this process, often referred to as the marketplace of ideas, individuals are free to express any ideas and opinions they wish, even if others may disagree with them or find those ideas and opinions to be offensive or otherwise antithetical to their own world view. The very process of debating divergent ideas and challenging others' opinions develops the intellectual skills necessary to respectfully argue through civil discourse. Development of such skills leads to personal and scholarly growth and is an essential component of the academic and research missions of each of our institutions.

It is equally important not to stifle the dissemination of any ideas, even if other members of our community may find those ideas abhorrent. Individuals wishing to express ideas with which others may disagree must be free to do so, without fear of being bullied, threatened or silenced. This does not mean that such ideas should go unchallenged, as that is part of the learning process. And though we believe all members of our campus communities have a role to play in promoting civility and mutual respect in that type of discourse, we must not let concerns over civility or respect be used as a reason to silence expression. We should empower and enable one another to speak and listen, rather than interfere with or silence the open expression of ideas.

Each member of our campus communities must also recognize that institutions may restrict expression that is unlawful, such as true threats or defamation. Because universities and colleges are first and foremost places where people go to engage in scholarly endeavors, it is necessary to the efficient and effective operations of each institution for there to be reasonable limitations on the time, place, and manner in which these rights are exercised. Each institution has adopted regulations that align with Florida's Campus Free Expression Act, section 1004.097, Florida Statutes, and with the United States and Florida Constitutions and the legal opinions interpreting those provisions. These limitations are narrowly drawn and content-neutral and serve to ensure that all members of our campus communities have an equal ability to express their ideas and opinions, while preserving campus order and security.

## **Appendix B:**

### **Resolution 2017-2018-6 Endorsement of University of Chicago Statement on Freedom of Expression**

**Whereas**, the University of Central Florida firmly supports academic freedom and free speech on campus; and

**Whereas**, multiple events on university campuses across the country over the past several years, but especially 2017, have raised questions about status of free speech on American university campuses; and

**Whereas**, the free speech policy statement produced by the Committee for Freedom of Expression at the University of Chicago has become a model for university affirmations of free speech and academic freedom across the country since its publication in 2015; and

**Whereas**, the Chicago Statement has been adopted or endorsed by a growing number of faculty bodies and institution across the United States; therefore

**Be it Resolved** that the Faculty Senate endorses the following statement on freedom of expression, adapted from the University of Chicago statement:

Because the University of Central Florida is committed to free and open inquiry in all matters, it guarantees all members of the University community the broadest possible latitude to speak, write, listen, challenge, and learn. Except insofar as limitations on that freedom are necessary to the functioning of the University, the University of Central Florida fully respects and supports the freedom of all members of the University community to discuss any problem that presents itself.

Of course, the ideas of different members of the University of Central Florida community will often and quite naturally conflict. But it is not the proper role of the University to attempt to shield individuals from ideas and opinions they find unwelcome, disagreeable, or even deeply offensive. Although the University greatly values civility, and although all members of the University community share in the responsibility for maintaining a climate of mutual respect, concerns about civility and mutual respect can never be used as a justification for closing off discussion of ideas, however offensive or disagreeable those ideas may be to some members of our community.

The freedom to debate and discuss the merits of competing ideas does not, of course, mean that individuals may say whatever they wish, wherever they wish. The University of Central Florida may restrict expression that violates the law, that falsely defames a specific individual, that constitutes a genuine threat or harassment, that unjustifiably invades substantial privacy or confidentiality interests, or that is otherwise directly incompatible



with the functioning of the University. In addition, the University may reasonably regulate the time, place, and manner of expression to ensure that it does not disrupt the ordinary activities of the University. But these are narrow exceptions to the general principle of freedom of expression, and it is vitally important that these exceptions never be used in a manner that is inconsistent with the University's commitment to a completely free and open discussion of ideas.

The University of Central Florida's fundamental commitment is to the principle that debate or deliberation may not be suppressed because the ideas put forth are thought by some or even by most members of the University community to be offensive, unwise, immoral, or wrong-headed. It is for the individual members of the University community, not for the University as an institution, to make those judgments for themselves, and to act on those judgments not by seeking to suppress speech, but by openly and vigorously contesting the ideas that they oppose. Indeed, fostering the ability of members of the University community to engage in such debate and deliberation in an effective and responsible manner is an essential part of the University's educational mission.

As a corollary to the University of Central Florida's commitment to protect and promote free expression, members of the University community must also act in conformity with the principle of free expression. Although members of the University community are free to criticize and contest the views expressed on campus, and to criticize and contest speakers who are invited to express their views on campus, they may not obstruct or otherwise interfere with the freedom of others to express views they reject or even loathe. To this end, the University has a solemn responsibility not only to promote a lively and fearless freedom of debate and deliberation, but also to protect that freedom when others attempt to restrict it.

*Approved by the Faculty Senate on October 19, 2017.*

### **10.003 Post-Tenure Faculty Review.**

(1) Each board of trustees shall adopt policies requiring each tenured state university faculty member to undergo a comprehensive post-tenure review to accomplish the following.

- (a) Ensure high standards of quality and productivity among the tenured faculty in the State University System.
- (b) Determine whether a faculty member is meeting the responsibilities and expectations associated with assigned duties in research, teaching, and service, including compliance with state laws, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies.
- (c) Recognize and honor exceptional achievement and provide an incentive for retention as appropriate.
- (d) Refocus academic and professional efforts and take appropriate employment action when appropriate.

(2) Timing and Eligibility

(a) Each tenured faculty member shall have a comprehensive post-tenure review of five years of performance in the fifth year following the last promotion or the last comprehensive review, whichever is later. For faculty hired with tenure, the hire date shall constitute the date of the last promotion.

1. In the first year following the effective date of this regulation, 20% of tenured faculty will be evaluated, in addition to faculty in the fifth year under (2)(a).

2. In each of the second, third, fourth, and fifth years following the effective date of this regulation, 20% of tenured faculty who have not received a comprehensive review will be evaluated in addition to faculty who are in the fifth year under (2)(a).

3. Beginning with the sixth year following the effective date of this regulation, the process outlined in (2)(a) shall be followed.

(b) Tenured faculty in administrative roles, such as department chairs or directors, shall be evaluated annually by the appropriate college dean based on criteria established by the university. Such evaluations shall include a review of performance based on all assigned duties and responsibilities and professional conduct. Such evaluations shall also include the following, if applicable: performance of academic responsibilities to the university and its students; non-compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies; and substantiated student complaints.

(c) Policies and regulations adopted by the boards of trustees may include exceptions to the timing of the comprehensive post-tenure review for extenuating, unforeseen circumstances. Exceptions granted to tenured faculty members shall be disclosed in the chief academic officer's report to the university's president and board of trustees on the outcomes of the comprehensive post-tenure review outlined in Section (6) below.

(3) Review Requirements

- (a) The comprehensive post-tenure review shall include consideration of the following.
  - 1. The level of accomplishment and productivity relative to the faculty member's assigned duties in research, teaching, and service, including extension, clinical, and administrative assignments. The university shall specify the guiding documents. Such documents shall include quantifiable university, college, and department criteria for tenure, promotion, and merit as appropriate.
  - 2. The faculty member's history of professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities to the university and its students.
  - 3. The faculty member's non-compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies.
  - 4. Unapproved absences from teaching assigned courses.
  - 5. Substantiated student complaints.
  - 6. Other relevant measures of faculty conduct as appropriate.
- (b) The review shall not consider or otherwise discriminate based on the faculty members' political or ideological viewpoints.

(4) Process Requirements

- (a) The faculty member shall complete a university-designated dossier highlighting accomplishments and demonstrating performance relative to assigned duties and submit the dossier to the appropriate department chair.
- (b) The faculty member's department chair shall review the completed dossier, the faculty member's personnel file, and other records related to professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance.
- (c) The faculty member's department chair shall add to the dossier the following.
  - 1. Additional records related to professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance concerns.
  - 2. A letter assessing the level of achievement and certification that the letter includes, if applicable, any concerns regarding professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance during the period under review.
- (d) The faculty member's department chair shall forward the dossier, including all records and the chair's letter, to the appropriate college dean for review.
- (e) The dean of the college shall review all materials provided by the faculty member's department chair.
- (f) The dean of the college shall add to the dossier a brief letter assessing the level of achievement during the period under review. The letter shall include any concerns regarding professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance. The letter shall also include the dean's recommended performance rating using the following scale.

1. Exceeds expectations: a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond the average performance of faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit.
  2. Meets expectations: expected level of accomplishment compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit.
  3. Does not meet expectations: performance falls below the normal range of annual variation in performance compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit but is capable of improvement.
  4. Unsatisfactory: failure to meet expectations that reflect disregard or failure to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or performance involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in applicable university regulations and policies.
- (g) The dean of the college shall forward the dossier to the chief academic officer for review.
- (h) The chief academic officer shall review the dossier provided by the dean of the college.
- (i) With guidance and oversight from the university president, the chief academic officer will rate the faculty member's professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance during the review period. The chief academic officer may accept, reject, or modify the dean's recommended rating. The chief academic officer may request assistance from a university advisory committee in formulating an assessment. Each faculty member reviewed will receive one of the following performance ratings, as defined in (4)(f) above.
1. Exceeds expectations
  2. Meets expectations
  3. Does not meet expectations
  4. Unsatisfactory
- (j) The chief academic officer shall notify the faculty member, the faculty member's department chair, and the appropriate college dean of the outcome.

(5) Outcomes

- (a) University regulations and policies regarding outcomes of the comprehensive post-tenure review process shall include recognition and compensation considerations and consequences for underperformance.
- (b) For each faculty member who receives a final performance rating of "exceeds expectations" or "meets expectations," the appropriate college dean, in consultation with the faculty member's department chair, shall recommend to the chief academic officer appropriate recognition and/or compensation in accordance with the faculty member's performance and university regulations and policies. The chief academic officer shall make the final determination regarding recognition and/or compensation.
- (c) For each faculty member who receives a final performance rating of "does not meet expectations," the appropriate college dean, in consultation with

the faculty member's department chair, shall propose a performance improvement plan to the chief academic officer.

1. The plan must include a deadline for the faculty member to achieve the requirements of the performance improvement plan. The deadline may not extend more than 12 months past the date the faculty member receives the improvement plan.
  2. The chief academic officer shall make final decisions regarding the requirements of each performance improvement plan.
  3. Each faculty member who fails to meet the requirements of a performance improvement plan by the established deadline shall receive a notice of termination from the chief academic officer.
- (d) Each faculty member who receives a final performance rating of "unsatisfactory" shall receive a notice of termination from the chief academic officer.
- (e) Final decisions regarding post-tenure review may be appealed under university regulations or collective bargaining agreements, as applicable to the employee. The arbitrator shall review a decision solely for the purpose of determining whether it violates a university regulation or the applicable collective bargaining agreement and may not consider claims based on equity or substitute the arbitrator's judgment for that of the university.

(6) Monitoring and Reporting

- (a) The chief academic officer shall report annually to the university president and board of trustees on the outcomes of the comprehensive post-tenure review process consistent with section 1012.91, Florida Statutes.
1. Beginning January 1, 2024, and continuing every three years thereafter, each university must conduct an audit of the comprehensive post-tenure review process for the prior fiscal year and submit a final report to the university's board of trustees by July 1. The audit shall be performed by the university's chief audit executive or by an independent, third-party auditor ("auditor"), as determined by the chair of the university's board of trustees. The auditor must provide the university board of trustees with a report that includes the following.
    - a. The number of tenured faculty in each of the four performance rating categories as defined in (4)(f).
    - b. The university's response in cases of each category.
    - c. Findings of non-compliance with applicable state laws, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies.
  2. Each university board of trustees shall consider the audit report at the next regularly scheduled board of trustees meeting after the report's publication date.
    - a. The chief academic officer or the auditor must present the audit report to the board of trustees. The board of trustees shall not adopt the report as a consent agenda item.

- b. If the audit report shows that a university is in compliance with applicable state laws, Board of Governors' regulations, or university regulations and policies, a copy of the adopted audit report shall be provided to the Board of Governors consistent with Regulation 1.001(6)(g).
- c. If the auditor finds that a university is out of compliance with applicable state laws, Board of Governors' regulations, or university regulations and policies, the auditor must present the report to the Board of Governors at its next regularly scheduled meeting.

(7) Following the effective date of this regulation, universities shall not enter into any collective bargaining agreement that conflicts with this regulation.

(8) Nothing in this regulation is intended to prevent a state university from instituting additional evaluation processes, criteria, or standards so long as they meet or exceed the requirements outlined in section 1001.706(6)(b), Florida Statutes, and this regulation.

Authority: Section 7(d), Art. IX, Fla. Const., Section 1001.706(6)(b), Florida Statutes; New 03-29-23.



# Faculty Senate

## Steering Committee

Minutes for meeting of Thursday, March 9, 2023, 3:00 pm

Zoom Link to access recording:

[https://ucf.zoom.us/rec/share/PkEIAAnXLEgyN6Ek8vPHuO7vRGZv58SJocuTAIRiQvidp3\\_eKZ\\_yE83AWZ3WjMD9s.0bD4L1GkrpFeMkAY](https://ucf.zoom.us/rec/share/PkEIAAnXLEgyN6Ek8vPHuO7vRGZv58SJocuTAIRiQvidp3_eKZ_yE83AWZ3WjMD9s.0bD4L1GkrpFeMkAY)

Passcode: sw+325E.

- 1) Quorum reached and meeting called to order at 3:00 p.m.
- 2) Roll Call via Qualtrics – Faculty Senate Chair Stephen King, Vice Chair Keri Watson, Secretary Kristine Shrauger, and Past Chair Joseph Harrington were present. (See *meeting materials Attachment A for list of participants*)
- 3) Approval of Minutes of *February 2, 2023*
  - a) Request to update Resolution 2022-2023-11 with amendment made from last meeting. Amended minutes approved.
- 4) Recognition of Guests
  - a) Lucretia Cooney, Director, Faculty Excellence
  - b) Timothy Letzring, Senior Associate Provost, Office of the Provost
  - c) Jana Jasinski, Vice Provost, Faculty Excellence
  - d) William Self, Professor, College of Medicine
- 5) [00:05] Announcements and Report of the Chair – *Stephen King*
  - a) Chair King talked about college senator and committee chairs meetings with senate leadership, shared governance, Board of Governors regulations and Florida State legislation. See Attachment B for full report.
- 6) [00:12] Report of the Provost – *Senior Associate Provost Timothy Letzring*
  - a) Provost Letzring spoke about Florida State legislation and upcoming university events. Please see Attachment C for full report and Zoom recording for questions from senators.
- 7) Unfinished Business - none
- 8) [00:25] New Business
  - a) Appointment of Nominating Committee (Past Senate Chair plus two Steering members)
    - i) Joe Harrington (Chair), Linda Walters and Reid Oetjen agreed to serve.
  - b) Topic Assignment: Diversity Representation within Code of Conduct Training
    - i) Motion made to assign topic to Ad Hoc Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee, discussion, vote taken, motion passed.
  - c) Discussion: Recording of Steering Committee and Faculty Senate Meetings
    - i) Overview of how the recording of meetings started, discussion, motion made to assign topic to Personnel Committee, second, discussion, vote taken,



# Faculty Senate

motion failed. After more discussion, the Steering Committee members decided to continue recording Steering and Senate meetings.

- d) Resolution 2022-2023-13 UCF Faculty Senate Supports Accessibility and Inclusion for All
  - i) Overview of resolution, motion made to send resolution to full senate, discussion, vote taken, motion passed.
- e) Resolution 2022-2023-14 Administrative Support for New Digital Accessibility Policy Requirements
  - i) Overview of resolution, motion made to send resolution to full senate, discussion, vote taken, motion passed.
- f) Resolution 2022-2023-15 Faculty Involvement in the Hiring of T/TE/Research Faculty
  - i) Overview of resolution, motion made to send resolution to full senate, discussion, vote taken, motion passed.
- g) Motion to consider Resolution 2022-2023-12 as an emergency as described in the Faculty Bylaws Section X.A.4
  - i) Overview of motion, motion made to consider resolution as an emergency, second, discussion. Motion made to call the question, second, vote taken on motion to call the question, motion to call the question failed. Discussion continued on original resolution, vote taken, motion passed.
  - ii) Resolution 2022-2023-12 Bylaw Amendment to Create a Faculty Senate Student Success Council
    - (1) Motion made to approve sending resolution to full senate, second, several amendments were proposed: 1. Amendment made to add on line 26 “and other relevant committees, units and individuals” after Undergraduate Studies, vote taken on amendment, motion passed. 2. Motion made to add on line 53 “a representative from the College of Graduate Studies (appointed by the dean of the College of Graduate Studies), vote taken, motion passed. 3. Motion made to add on line 53 “a representative from UCF Global (appointed by Associate Vice Provost for Academic Affairs) after location of previous amendment, second, vote taken, motion passed. 4. Motion to add “and the College of Graduate Studies” on Line 26 after College of Undergraduate Studies, vote taken, motion passed. 5. Motion to change on line 49 from “one student (nominated by the president of the Student Government Association)” to “at least four students including at least one graduate student and one undergraduate student”, amendment made to add “and one international student” to this amendment, second, vote taken, motion passed, vote taken on previous motion, motion passed.
    - iii) Motion made to extend meeting time by 15 minutes, second, vote taken, motion passed.
    - iv) Vote taken to send resolution with amendments to full senate, motion passed.
- h) Motion made to skip Committee Reports agenda item, second, vote taken, motion passed.
- i) Senate Agenda for March 23, 2023
  - i) Resolution 2022-2023-8 Instructional Designers
  - ii) Resolution 2022-2023-10 Parking, Transportation and Safety Committee





# Faculty Senate

- iii) Resolution 2022-2023-11 Student Success Constitutional Amendment
- iv) Other Resolutions Approved by Steering Committee
  
- 9) [00:00] Committee Reports
  - a) Budget and Administrative Committee – *Keri Watson*
  - b) Information Technology Committee – *Glenn Martin*
  - c) Personnel Committee – *Mason Cash*
  - d) Research Council – *Stephen King for Linda Walters*
  - e) Graduate Council – *Reid Oetjen*
  - f) Undergraduate Council – *Tina Chiarelli*
  - g) For the full reports, see attachment D.
  
- 10)[01:03] Other Business
  - a) Motion to create an Ad Hoc Government Relations Committee, second, overview and discussion. Motion made to have people volunteer as well as be appointed by the chair, second, discussion, vote taken, motion passed. Vote taken on original motion, motion passed.
  
- 11) Meeting adjourned at 5:13 p.m.

Reviewed and submitted for approval by

*Kristine J. Shrauger*

*3/10/2023*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kristine Shrauger  
Faculty Senate Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Faculty Senate Steering Committee Meeting Attendance  
March 9, 2023

First Name:	Last Name:	College/Unit	College/Unit: - Other	Meeting Role:	Meeting Role: - Guest
Mason	Cash	CAH		Steering	
Kristina	Tollefson	CAH		Steering	
Keri	Watson	CAH		Steering	
Jim	Gallo	CBA		Steering	
Reid	Oetjen	CCIE		Steering	
Jeff	Kauffman	CECS		Steering	
Michael	Proctor	CECS		Steering	
Glenn	Martin	CGS		Steering	
Asli	Yalim	CHPS		Steering	
Stephen	King	COM		Steering	
	D'Amato-				
Leslee	Kubiet	CON		Steering	
Michelle	Dusseau	COS		Steering	
Joseph	Harrington	COS		Steering	
Linda	Walters	COS		Steering	
Kelly	Semrad	RCHM		Steering	
Missy	Murphey	UL		Steering	
Kristine	Shrauger	UL		Steering	
Karol	Lucken	CCIE		Guest	Chair FS Personnel Cmte Senator but guest at steering
Bill	Self	COM		Guest	
Lucretia	Cooney	Other	Faculty Excellence	Guest	Director
Jana	Jasinski	Other	Faculty Excellence	Guest	Vice Provost
Timothy	Letzring	Other	Academic Affairs	Guest	Vice Provost

Report of the Chair  
Faculty Senate Steering Committee Meeting  
March 9, 2023

For my report of the Chair, I will start by giving an update on several initiatives we have been working on in the senate office.

**First:** We have now concluded in person group meetings with operational and curricular chairs. We had three meetings, one with our operational chairs (That's Research, IT, Personnel, and B&A), one with graduate council chairs, and the last with our undergrad council chairs. These meetings let the chairs work with each other and the current senate leadership to share ideas with each other, examine common problems, and to explore ways to improve their committee operations. There was a general consensus that these meetings were extremely beneficial, and would be looked forward to in the future, specifically right after we do topic assignment in the fall.

**Second,** we have also finished individual zoom meetings with the senators from each academic unit. These were also productive meetings, where a host of topics, concerns, and ideas were shared. Workday, new legislation, and communication with unit and college administrators were common topics across units. I also want to say thanks to the many 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year senators, that took this opportunity in these smaller sized meetings to raise concerns and speak out, when they were not ready to speak at the full senate meetings. I hope all of you will feel encouraged **to continue to raise your voice**, and to make sure we are hearing the voices of ALL our senators at our meetings.

**Third** an update on shared governance at UCF; I am a strong proponent of faculty working with the administration in the shared governance of our university to address the problems we are facing. I have three areas I want to bring to your attention about shared governance.

**First,** at the University level, I hope everyone saw my email from a few weeks ago that highlighted the change to the procedures for how new policies are developed and adopted at UCF. After multiple discussions I have had with President Cartwright and with Rhonda Bishop, Vice President and chair of the University Policies and Procedures Committee, I am pleased to say that future University policies under development will come to the Faculty Senate for review **BEFORE** they progress to the University Policy Committee. This will give faculty a much earlier and therefore stronger voice in how we share the responsibility with the administration for developing campus wide policies.

**Second,** at the level of our collaborative faculty senate joint committees, we have the opportunity today to approve a Resolution to send Bylaws for a Faculty Senate Student Success Council to the full senate for consideration. With a new VP dedicated to working in this area of the University, I think it is critical to make sure our faculty voice is an integral part of how the university plans to improve our student success rates. I know that VP Dosal wants faculty input on a broad array of what student success means... including:

Aligning the curriculum of our Direct Connect partners, to promote major readiness for incoming transfer students,

Finding ways to provide additional High Impact Practices to ALL of our students. and a whole host of other ways faculty can work with the administration to help our students graduate and also be ready for life after graduation.

**The third** aspect of shared governance I want to talk about is something that came through loud and clear in our recent meetings with senators. This is academic unit level shared governance between our faculty and their chairs, directors and deans. I want to thank Kevin Coffee, at the recent meeting I had with faculty from CECS, for asking me if I was aware that not a single department in the College of Engineering and Computer Science had approved unit bylaws. I was unaware of this, although I immediately understood the implications of the lack of unit bylaws. Shared governance at its most basic level is faculty working with their chairs and directors to address their problems together. This requires ROBUST communication between both groups, and the ability to bring up any topic for meaningful discussion.

Several years ago, the senate approved resolution 2017-2018-5 entitled Governance in Academic Units, that outlined the requirement and essential features of academic unit Bylaws. This was approved by the current provost at the time, and today Faculty Excellence helps track which units have completed the Bylaw approval process.

Unit Bylaws require multiple topics to be included, but today I want to focus in on the requirement that each unit has a dedicated number of faculty meetings where the chairs and faculty discuss all aspects of their unit. Furthermore, the unit Bylaws **MUST provide** a mechanism for the faculty to request a **SPECIAL faculty meeting**, and to place SPECIFIC and critical topics on the agenda for discussion, whether it is the unit budget, faculty hiring, workday and SET issues, or anything else.

After the meeting with CECS senators I determined that 29 units at UCF have unit level Bylaws...and that 38 units **do NOT** have Bylaws approved and filed with faculty excellence. I have already informed the provost that the senate will be pushing to have all academic units complete the approval process, and that we WILL need support from the Provost to make sure chairs and deans move forward with the Bylaws. What's more: we may also need the Provost to make sure that the chairs and deans ABIDE by the Bylaws and work together with their faculty. For units that have not completed their unit Bylaws: Expect more on this topic in the coming weeks.

**Ok time for a topic shift to more ominous issues.** BOG Regulations and state legislation.

Two weeks ago, I shared information on the Post-Tenure Faculty Review BOG Regulation and how to provide comments on it. Comments are now closed at the BOG feedback site. I fully expect the BOG to approve the current draft Regulation at the BOG meeting on March 28<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup>. After that, the various Boards of Trustees across the state will need to write and approve individual University Regulations that conform to the BOG regulation. Sometime after that process is completed here at UCF, the

provost will have to put that regulation into effect by developing new procedures. I am sure we will be hearing more on the UCF version of this Regulation in the near future.

In previous meetings I described portions of what the governor was proposing for I will quote "Higher education reform". The legislative session began this week and there are a host of filed legislative Bills that will affect higher education in Florida if approved. I can't possibly go through them all and still have us end on time today, yet within the senate, we need to examine them, educate our faculty about them, and plan how to proceed in response to proposed and approved legislation and regulations. The senate does not currently have a mechanism to do this. Today, under other business, I will be making a motion to create an ad hoc committee that will focus upon state legislation and BOG regulations, including understanding the legislation and regulations, educating our faculty, and developing internal and external responses. This committee is essential in the current legislative environment and will report to the senate, to this steering committee, and to the faculty senate chair. We will talk more about this committee when we get to that portion of the agenda.

# **Report of Timothy Letzring, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee on Behalf of Provost Michael D. Johnson**

Thursday, March 9, 2023

- Letzring said the Legislature opened on Tuesday with proposals on higher education still taking shape. He said more will be known as the legislative session unfolds.
- Meanwhile, he echoed what the provost has urged the faculty to do: to please continue to teach and conduct research well, in the professional manner you always have.
- He reminded the committee about two key upcoming events:
  - **UCF Celebrates the Arts 2023**, April 2 through 15 at the Dr. Phillips Center for Performing Arts; showcasing UCF's talented students, faculty and alumni; Google the name for more about tickets, show times
  - **UCF Founders' Day**, Wednesday, April 5, 3 p.m., Student Union Pegasus Ballroom; come celebrate the very best of our faculty
- Letzring fielded questions at the end.

1 Resolution 2022-2023-12

2 Bylaw Amendment to Create a Faculty Senate Student Success Council

3 **Whereas**, a core mission of UCF is to teach students by providing high-quality  
4 education that prepares them for the real-world experiences that will unfold over the rest  
5 of their lives; and

6 **Whereas**, UCF has recently enhanced its focus upon student success by hiring a senior  
7 vice president for Student Success and by reorganizing several departments and areas  
8 to coordinate efforts within the Division of Student Success and Well-Being; and

9 **Whereas**, student success encompasses a broad array of departments, programs,  
10 initiatives, and policies that require administration, faculty, and staff working together in  
11 a cohesive manner to help our students complete their studies; and

12 **Whereas**, the faculty at UCF have a critical role in guiding and enhancing the success  
13 of our students as they take classes and progress through degree programs; and

14 **Whereas**, there currently is no faculty level committee on campus that focusses upon  
15 student success, or that works with the administration to develop, evaluate and utilize  
16 policies and procedures that enhance student success across UCF; therefore

17 **Be It Resolved** that the Faculty Bylaws be amended to create a Faculty Senate Student  
18 Success Council with the membership and the duties and responsibilities described  
19 below:

20 a. Duties and Responsibilities

- 21 i. To promote the development and implementation of programs, policies,  
22 and practices that help students succeed in their academic pursuits and  
23 personal wellbeing.
- 24 ii. To advise and assist the University Student Success Steering Committee,  
25 the senior vice president for Student Success, the vice provost and dean  
26 of the College of Undergraduate Studies, the dean of the College of  
27 Graduate Studies, and other relevant committees, units, and individuals in  
28 developing student success initiatives and recommending actions to meet  
29 student success goals.
- 30 iii. To review and monitor the performance and progress of state  
31 performance- based funding, preeminence, and other strategic student  
32 success metrics that are important for UCF and its students.
- 33 iv. To support and collaborate with the Faculty Center for Teaching and  
34 Learning and the Center for Distributed Learning to create professional  
35 development for faculty to facilitate student success.
- 36 v. To serve as an advisory and recommending body for academic units and  
37 the Faculty Senate on strategies and procedures that relate to student  
38 success.

- 39 vi. To support and collaborate with professional advising offices across UCF  
40 to help facilitate student success.  
41 vii. The chair of the Faculty Senate Student Success Council will serve as a  
42 member on the University Student Success Steering Committee.

43 b. Membership

44 The Faculty Senate Student Success Council shall consist of at least one faculty  
45 member from each academic unit (selected by the Committee on Committees),  
46 at least two of whom are current members of the Faculty Senate, the senior vice  
47 president for Student Success (ex officio), one associate or senior instructional  
48 designer from the Center for Distributed Learning, one representative from the  
49 Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning, four students, with at least one  
50 undergraduate student, one graduate student, and one international student  
51 (nominated by the president of the Student Government Association), one  
52 representative of the Student Success & Well-Being Leadership Council Team  
53 (selected by the senior vice president for student success), one representative  
54 from UCF Global (appointed by the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs), one  
55 representative from the College of Graduate Studies (appointed by the Dean of  
56 the College of Graduate Studies), and one representative from the College of  
57 Undergraduate Studies (selected by the vice provost and dean of the College of  
58 Undergraduate Studies). A representative from the professional advising office  
59 for each college or unit may serve as a non-voting committee member. The  
60 senior vice president for Student Success (or designee) shall identify additional  
61 ex officio members, making every effort to ensure that areas relating to student  
62 success are represented. The chair and vice chair shall be elected annually from  
63 its faculty membership. Terms of service shall be two years, staggered, except  
64 for the student member, who shall serve for one year.



Resolution 2022-2023-13

UCF Faculty Senate Supports Accessibility and Inclusion for All

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

**Whereas**, the University of Central Florida has made a commitment to both excellence and access, where our faculty and staff educate a diverse student body and prepare our students for the challenges of today and tomorrow; therefore

**Be It Resolved** that the University of Central Florida Faculty Senate supports UCF’s widespread initiatives to expand accessibility and inclusiveness for all persons, regardless of race, color, religion, sex, gender, sexual orientation, national origin, age, disability, marital status, veteran status, and political opinion or affiliation.

1 Resolution 2022-2023- 14

2 Administrative Support for New Digital Accessibility Policy Requirements

3 **Whereas**, the president of the University of Central Florida approved a Digital Accessibility policy, policy  
4 2-006, effective 6/20/2022; and

5 **Whereas**, policy 2-006 requires responsible parties at the University of Central Florida to adopt the Web  
6 Content Accessibility Guidelines version 2.0 AA as the guiding accessibility standard for all information  
7 and communication technology; and

8 **Whereas**, responsible parties shall strive to ensure that all electronic technology and resources used for  
9 communication, instruction, and the distribution of information is created and/or maintained in a  
10 digitally accessible manner including, but not limited to instructional systems, online instructional  
11 lessons, web-based services, software applications, electronic documents, computers, hardware  
12 systems, telecommunication products, video and multimedia products, mobile devices, and online  
13 events; and

14 **Whereas**, as of June 26, 2023, faculty and other parties responsible for creating and/or maintaining  
15 Learning Management System and university content that is created, redeveloped or undergoes  
16 substantial revisions as well as multimedia resources posted to university web pages and applications  
17 and/or used in university programs, courses, and activities shall strive to conform to WCAG 2.0AA; and

18 **Whereas**, by December 31, 2024, faculty and other responsible parties must review web pages and/or  
19 web content that has been created and published in the last seven years and ensure that it is digitally  
20 accessible in accordance with WCAG 2.0 AA; therefore

21 **Be It Resolved** that faculty and staff need financial support and resources from the university  
22 administration to ensure that all digital content meets the new policy requirements that web pages,  
23 web content in courses, videos with subtitles, and images are digitally accessible; and

24 **Be It Further Resolved** that the UCF administration creates a Center or Office for Digital Accessibility to  
25 focus efforts across campus to comply with the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines version 2.0.

**Resolution 2022-2023-15**  
**Faculty Involvement in the Hiring of T/TE/Research Faculty**

**Whereas**, shared governance has been recognized as a central feature of higher education since the 1966 *Statement on Government in Colleges and Universities* (SGCU) from the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. The SGCU stipulates the responsibilities and authority that should be conferred upon faculty and legitimates their involvement in institutional governance (Birnbaum, 2004 as cited in Jones, 2011). This includes the proviso that “*faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, granting of tenure, and dismissal;*” and

**Whereas**, this responsibility and authority stems from the recognized expertise of faculty that is cultivated through the publication and peer review of scientific manuscripts, preparation and acquisition of research grants, and national/international conference research presentations; and

**Whereas**, this responsibility and authority is consistent with and upholds the tenure system found in the vast majority of U.S. universities; and

**Whereas**, studies have consistently and overwhelmingly found that faculty across the U.S. believe in shared governance as an integral part of their institution’s values, identity, and culture (Tierney & Minor, 2003; see also Williams et al., 1987; Gore et al., 1987, Miller 2002); and

**Whereas**, campus values, identity, and culture shape and are shaped by faculty morale, and faculty morale and engagement is tied to shared governance and participation in the recruitment and retention of the best research talent; and

**Whereas**, Discovery & Exploration has been identified as a key element of UCF’s 5 Year Strategic Plan, which includes increasing the “focus on research by supporting basic, applied, clinical, and translational research activities and recruit and retain highly qualified faculty,” including the hiring of 300 faculty by 2027; and

**Whereas**, the Office of Institutional Equity (OIE) and Human Resources (HR) search, screening, and hiring guidelines do not specify certain important aspects of faculty involvement in faculty searches and hiring; and

**Whereas**, a substantial majority of unit bylaws defer to the OIE and HR search, screening, and hiring guidelines and/or do not specify certain important aspects of faculty involvement in faculty searches and hiring; and

**Whereas**, the current search and hiring process does not require transparency with faculty, making the process vulnerable to misinformation and/or arbitrary decision making (e.g., not collecting or sharing input from faculty, search committees refusing to provide search updates to relevant unit faculty, staff voting on faculty research cluster appointments), therefore

44 **Be it Resolved** that the University of Central Florida OIE and HR delineate and expand its' search,  
45 screening, and hiring guidelines for new or appointed T/TE/Research (T/TE/R) faculty who will  
46 be required to conduct research and prepare and/or publish research-related [or discipline specific]  
47 deliverables, such as academic publications, as part of their annual assignment of duties in the  
48 following ways:  
49

- 50 • The hiring official shall notify all full-time faculty in the unit before commencing a search or  
51 an appointment for T/TE/R faculty.  
52
- 53 • The hiring official shall appoint members of the search committee who are T/TE/R faculty  
54 and/or faculty who will be responsible for the decision making on the tenure and/or  
55 promotion of that faculty member, unless unit bylaws expressly state that other faculty may  
56 serve on search committees for T/TE/R faculty positions.  
57
- 58 • Once qualifying applicants have been identified from the candidate pool during the round  
59 one credentials review (see OIE Search & Screening Guidelines, p.8), the search committee  
60 shall make available to unit T/TE/R faculty and/or faculty who will be responsible for the  
61 decision making on the tenure and/or promotion of that faculty member, meeting minutes and  
62 profiles of remaining applicants; this is consistent with the principles and laws informing the  
63 hiring guidelines developed by HR (*revised version September 2022*) that require the public  
64 be notified of and allowed to attend search committee meetings.  
65
- 66 • Faculty, as defined in the above paragraph, who have read candidate materials, shall be given  
67 a reasonable opportunity to provide voluntary feedback [that is aligned with search criteria]  
68 to the search committee in the second and potentially third round of the screening process  
69 (see OIE Search & Screening Guidelines, p.8), the results of which shall be made available to  
70 these faculty before proceeding to the next round.  
71
- 72 • Following the candidates' on-campus (or virtual) visits, all full-time unit faculty, support  
73 staff, students, or community members who have met with the candidate or attended their  
74 presentations may provide input on the pros and cons of each candidate to the search  
75 committee.  
76
- 77 • Following the candidates' on-campus (or virtual) visits, the search committee shall convene a  
78 joint meeting inviting unit T/TE/R faculty and/or faculty who will be responsible for  
79 deciding on the tenure and/or promotion of that faculty member, to participate in the drafting  
80 of a final report, with pros and cons of each visiting candidate, for the hiring official.  
81
- 82 • If a consensus view is expressed in the final report of the faculty, and the hiring official  
83 departs from that view, then the hiring official should provide the faculty with a written  
84 explanation for the departure.  
85

86  
87 **Be it Further Resolved** that a unit vote shall be taken for other forms of faculty hiring with the  
88 potential for tenure (e.g., academic partner hires, dual unit appointments, research cluster or  
89 administrator appointments etc.), and that unit voting privileges on any matter concerning the  
90 potential hiring shall only extend to T/TE/R faculty and/or faculty who are responsible for  
91 deciding on the tenure and/or promotion of faculty.



# Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate  
Committee Reports  
March 9, 2023

## **Budget and Administrative Committee**

Chair – Tina Buck; Vice Chair – Keri Watson  
No Update

## **Information Technology Committee**

Chair – Glenn Martin; Vice Chair – Joseph Harrington  
February 21, 2023

Committee met for about an hour. Got an update on policy feedback system (next step still pending), and Linux support (unfortunately, new hire at UCF resigned after three days). New business discussion on reviewing policy regarding deprovisioning of users, and changes coming to the UCF IT web site. Finally, a short discussion on status of text messages under Sunshine laws for terminated employees was held.

## **Personnel Committee**

Chair – Karol Lucken; Vice Chair – Gulnora Hundley  
February 15, 2023

The upcoming March meeting was rescheduled for the 22<sup>nd</sup> due to Spring Break. The Faculty Involvement in Hiring Resolution passed unanimously and will now be forwarded to Steering. The presentation [and ultimately the resolution] on alleged bias in the Code of Conduct Trainings for 2021 and 2022 met with opposition from committee members. A motion to dismiss and remove it as a topic for the Personnel Committee was unanimously approved. The issue/problem was deemed non-existent given the evidence and counter-evidence presented and also as being more appropriate for another Faculty Senate committee.

## **Research Council**

Chair – Linda Walters; Vice Chair – David Luna  
No update

## **Graduate Council**

Chair – Stacy Barber; Vice Chair – Valeriya Shapoval  
February 24, 2023

The Grad Council Program Review & Awards Committee met and selected recipients for the graduate student and faculty excellence awards on February 24th. The next meeting of the Grad Council Program Review & Awards Committee is scheduled for April 14th.

Graduate policy committee:

Graduate Policy Committee

Feb 22: Drafted, discussed, and approved a dissertation conflict of interest policy, now open for public comments. Comments received so far are supportive of the new policy.



# Faculty Senate

Feb 22: Modified the traveling scholar GPA policy to bring the minimum course grade to B (from B-), consistent with the UCF graduate grade policy. The policy was out for comments, and no comments were received.

Mar 8: Considering a proposal for students' intellectual property policy. In the discussion phase and we anticipate a vote during the next policy committee meeting on Mar 22.

Mar 8: introduced a draft for the graduate certificate program, addressing admission, award, requirements, and procedures. The draft's rationale was approved on Feb 22, and the discussion is to be made during the meeting on Mar 22.

Mar 8: discussed the university regulation of removing C-, D+, and D- from the grading catalog and its implications on graduate students. Awaiting more research on the impact on graduate students to determine whether objecting to the policy would be necessary.

The policy reads as a directive, and the implementation is left to the instructor on record (may or may not enforce it).

## **Undergraduate Council**

Chair – Jeffrey Kauffman; Vice Chair – Tina Chiarelli

March 2023

Undergraduate Course Review Committee (UCRC) - On Tuesday, 7 February, the UCRC held its monthly meeting. During that time, 44 Consent Agenda items and 10 Action Agenda items were approved.

Undergraduate Policy and Curriculum Committee (UPCC) - On Tuesday, 14 February, the UPCC held its monthly meeting. During that time the committee approved 18 program/minor/certificate revisions, 2 program/certificate suspensions, and 4 program/certificate additions. We continued the ongoing discussion on student cheating with leadership from Digital Learning (Tom Cavanagh and Patsy Moskal) and Information Technology (Matt Hall).

## **Ad Hoc Committee on Civil Discourse**

Chair – Stephen King

No update

## **Ad Hoc Committee on Student Success**

Chair – Tina Chiarelli

March 2023

Proposed bylaws have been revised and will be up for further discussion in Steering.