



Faculty Senate

Steering Committee

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

Zoom Link to access recording:

- 1) Quorum reached and meeting called to order at 3:01 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 *March 9, 2023*
 - a) Minutes are approved as written
- 4) Recognition of Guests
 - a) Joe Adams, Senior Communications Director, Faculty Excellence
 - b) Lucretia Cooney, Director, Faculty Excellence
 - c) Michael D. Johnson, Provost, Office of the Provost
 - d) Karol Lucken, Chair, Personnel Committee
 - e) Jana Jasinski, Vice Provost, Faculty Excellence
 - f) Amanda Major, Instructional Designer, Center for Distributed Learning
 - g) William Self, Professor, College of Medicine
- 5) [00:02] Announcements and Report of the Chair – *Stephen King*
 - a) Chair King talked about Advisory Council of Faculty Senates (ACFS) meetings with legislators in Tallahassee, Ad Hoc Government Relations Committee update, Post-Tenure Faculty Review legislation, upcoming UCF events and Board of Governors (BOG) emergency amendment. See Attachment B for full report.
- 6) [00:10] Report of the Provost – *Provost Michael D. Johnson*
 - a) Provost Johnson spoke about the Florida State legislative session, Founders' Day, faculty summer appointments, and upcoming UCF events. Please see Attachment C for full report and Zoom recording for questions from senators.
- 7) Unfinished Business - none
- 8) [00:18] New Business
 - a) Report of the Nominating Committee – *Joseph Harrington*
 - i) Please see attachment D for full report.
 - b) Discussion of Nomination Procedures
 - i) Please see attachment E for full report and Zoom recording for discussion. Chair King relinquished the chair to Vice Chair Watson to moderate the discussion. Motion to assign the review and possible revision of nomination procedures to the Ad Hoc Bylaws Committee, second, vote taken, motion passed.
 - c) UCF Faculty Senate Statement Regarding Civil Discourse and Free Expression



Faculty Senate

- i) Motion made to accept statement, second, discussion; amendment proposed to capitalize “c” in committee, second, vote taken by general acclamation, motion passed; amendment to move “via resolution” after “The Faculty Senate”, second, vote taken, motion passed.
 - ii) See attachment F for statement and Zoom recording for discussion.
 - d) Board of Governors (BOG) Post-Tenure Faculty Review Regulation
 - i) Open discussion regarding BOG Post-Tenure Faculty Review Regulation passage and how incorporate the changes into university processes. Please see Zoom recording for full discussion. See attachment G for full regulation.
- 9) [01:40] Committee Reports
- a) Budget and Administrative Committee – *Keri Watson*
 - b) Information Technology Committee – *Glenn Martin*
 - c) Personnel Committee – *Mason Cash*
 - d) Research Council – *Linda Walters*
 - e) Graduate Council – *Reid Oetjen*
 - f) Undergraduate Council – *Tina Chiarelli*
 - g) For the full reports, see attachment H.
- 10)[00:00] Other Business - none
- 11)Meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Reviewed and submitted for approval by

Kristine J. Shrauger

4/7/2023

Kristine Shrauger
Faculty Senate Secretary

Date

Faculty Senate Steering Committee Meeting Attendance
April 6, 2023

First Name:	Last Name:	College/Unit:	College/Unit: - Other	Meeting Role:
Mason	Cash	CAH		Steering
Keri	Watson	CAH		Steering
Jim	Gallo	CBA		Steering
Reid	Oetjen	CCIE		Steering
Jeff	Kauffman	CECS		Steering
Mike	Proctor	CECS		Steering
Glenn	Martin	CGS		Steering
Asli	Yalim	CHPS		Steering
Tina	Chiarelli	COM		Steering
Stephen	King	COM		Steering
	D'Amato-			
Leslee	Kubiet	CON		Steering
michelle	dusseau	COS		Steering
Joseph	Harrington	COS		Steering
Linda	Walters	COS		Steering
Axel	Schulzgen	CREOL		Steering
Kelly	Semrad	RCHM		Steering
Missy	Murphey	UL		Steering
Michael	Johnson	Other	Office of the Provost	Guest
Karol	M Lucken	Other	CCIE	Guest
Bill	Self	Other	COM	Guest
Joe	Adams	Other	Office of the Provost	Guest
Lucretia	Cooney	Other	Faculty Excellence	Guest
Jana	Jasinski	Other	Faculty Excellence	Guest

Faculty Senate Chair Report
Steering Committee Meeting
April 6, 2023

This is our last steering meeting of the current 2022-2023 cycle, and we have several weighty topics to discuss and possibly take action upon.

First I want to give an update on actions of faculty related to legislation out of Tallahassee.

On March 26th and 27th Joe Harrington, myself, and Sara Michael Luna (a senator from CCIE) went to Tallahassee to join up with the ACFS Advisory Council of Faculty Senates. The ACFS contains the chair and past chair of the 12 SUS institutions, so these are highly motivated and involved faculty with a variety of specialties. It's a great group of experienced faculty to share ideas with.

On Monday March 27th we went to the offices of 5-6 legislators as well as seeing the BOG Chancellor.

Here are a few take-aways from our interactions:

- 1) Although hard to find the legislators themselves, their staff were easy to work with and share ideas with
- 2) There was an incredible **lack of knowledge** about how various accrediting bodies for degree programs have significant DEI components as part of the accreditation standards. There was also a lack of understanding that there is no "plan B" for program accreditation, meaning that we cannot find a second accreditor if Florida Lawyers are not accredited by the Bar, or if the LCME does not accredit our MD students.
- 3) Similarly, there was a **lack of knowledge** of how many grants, especially those from NSF, have broader impact sections that are many times fulfilled with specific DEI initiatives.
- 4) The details of a super prominent researchers looking to leave USF, and bring 25 of her researchers with her if she moves, captured attention.
- 5) The legislators and staff REALLY want one-page summaries of positions, and we did not have those ready to go
- 6) The ACFS needs help to have language ready for amendments to propose to legislators
- 7) When I shared that UCF had created a Government relations committee to help on this topic, the other senate chairs were eager to do the same and share ideas and results with each other. I think only 1-2 other SUS universities had a similar committee prior to UCF making our own.

UCF Government Relations committee

I also want to fill you in on our UCF Government Relations committee.

Bill Self, past senate chair and past BOG member is chairing the committee, additional members include myself,

Sara Michael Luna from School of Education in CCIE,

Lynn Casmier-Paz from the English Department in CAH,

Aubrey Jewett, from the School of Politics, Security and International Affairs in COS.

and Janet Owen, UCF VP of Government and Community Relations

All members have expertise in various aspects of current legislature and/or policy development in Florida. We have met twice already, and are formulating short term and long term goals and strategies,

with short term meaning what to do this legislative session and immediately after,

and long-term including how to be better prepared for the next session and into the future, including education of senators, the general faculty, and beyond. This committee will be working through the summer as the legislative session continues.

Post tenure faculty review: The new regulation was approved without any changes at the March 29th BOG meeting. One note: Deanna Michael, the lone faculty member on the BOG, and Nimna Gabadage the FSU student member, voted against the regulation and all other BOG members voted for it.

Since the PTFR regulation is now in effect: Time is **not on our side**, as we roll this out for the coming academic year... so we need to provide what feedback we can right away.

Therefore, at the end of our agenda today, we have an open discussion with the provost where I hope we can focus on aspects of the new process where we can provide useful ideas and feedback.

In my role as faculty senate chair, I met with Jana and the provost last week and we discussed a range of things about the new regulation ranging from: determining exactly how many faculty need to go up for review,

to how will the 20% of the pool of faculty be assigned in each year,

to faculty volunteering to be part of initial cohort,

to knowing whether PeopleSoft systems will be used for process management and sharing the dossier

to the required timing of all steps so that provost can also act for normal P&T dossiers,

to requirements and guidelines for the dossier,
to the potential use of department and college committees,
to many more little, yet soon to be critical, details.

In other words there is a LOT to consider and very little time to accomplish everything

I'll just point out a few of the parties working on this:

personnel committee their survey finish yesterday, and I expect their data to be shared with Faculty excellence very soon about feedback for documents to include in the dossier.

faculty excellence and the provost are moving on all aspects of the process, with a lot of fact finding occurring right now,

BOT soon will be in the position to approve a new UCF regulation,

Union: without any direct knowledge, I will make a guess that some aspects of the new regulation may have to be agreed upon in some way with the Union

So yes, it's a chaotic scramble right now with a large number of moving parts.

A quick announcement: The inaugural Digital Learning Day is next Friday April 14th.

Last I want to share a Board of Governors emergency amendment to Regulation 3.0075 concerning the State University System Prohibited Technologies List. Various emails are going across campus today on this topic. The following applications that can no longer be used on university devices:

- Kaspersky
- VKontakte
- Tencent QQ
- TikTok
- WeChat
- Any subsidiary or affiliate of an entity listed above

A process to request an exemption is being developed, and I don't know more at this time.

I'll end there for today, and call upon Provost Johnson to give the report of the provost.

UCF Faculty Senate Steering Update from Provost Michael D. Johnson

Thursday, April 6, 2023

- Provost Johnson thanked this year's Steering Committee members for their engagement and service.

Tallahassee and Higher Ed

- The provost said the state's annual legislative session is at the halfway point.
- Proposed budget funding allocations are firming up with upcoming budget sessions to happen to hash out details between the House and Senate.
- Details on the bigger higher education bills (HB 999 and companion SB 266) are evolving and expected to play out in weeks ahead.
- The university is determining next steps following the Board of Governors' approval of a regulation on post-tenure review process mandated by a new state law.

Workday and summer supplemental appointments

- Summer supplemental appointments for all nine-month faculty will be completed within Workday for the first time. Details just went out to faculty.

Other items

- The John C. Hitt Celebration of Life Ceremony will be Monday, May 15, at 2 p.m., in the Student Union's Pegasus Ballroom.
- UCF Celebrates the Arts 2023 continues through April 15; get your tickets to enjoy the best of our talented, students, faculty and alumni in action.
- End of the semester stretch run is here; looking forward to commencement ceremonies on Friday and Saturday, May 5 and 6.

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 11th 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(12th): 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.

Statement of Free Expression and Civil Discourse
Faculty Senate Steering Committee
April 6, 2023

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, via resolution, has endorsed freedom of expression and civil discourse, and our support for both civil discourse and free expression will continue.

Stephen J. King, Ph.D.
Chair, UCF Faculty Senate

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

Faculty Senate Steering Committee
Committee Reports
April 6, 2023

Budget and Administrative Committee

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

Information Technology Committee

Chair – Glenn Martin; Vice Chair – Joseph Harrington
April 4, 2023
Committee met for about forty minutes. Got an update on policy feedback system, Linux support, and EndNote (site license is being renewed; some stopgap licenses available). Discussion of other IT updates occurring (moving students from knights mail to ucf.edu system).

Personnel Committee

Chair – Karol Lucken; Vice Chair – Gulnora Hundley
March 22, 2023
The committee discussed the Status of Faculty Involvement in Hiring Resolution (that was presented to Senate on March 23). They also discussed the possibility of Post-Tenure Review, and what Dossier Materials ought to be included. As a result, they voted to create a survey to be sent to all faculty (that was sent to faculty on March 23). They also briefly discussed the COACHE Survey Results.

Research Council

Chair – Linda Walters; Vice Chair – David Luna
[Date of meeting/meetings – summary]

Graduate Council

Chair – Stacy Barber; Vice Chair – Valeriya Shapoval
No Update

Undergraduate Council

Chair – Jeffrey Kauffman; Vice Chair – Tina Chiarelli
Undergraduate Course Review Committee (UCRC) – March 7, 2023: The UCRC held its monthly meeting. During that time, 22 Consent Agenda items and 14 Action Agenda items were approved.
Undergraduate Policy and Curriculum Committee (UPCC) – March 12, 2023: The UPCC held its monthly meeting. During that time, the committee approved 16 certificate/minor/program revisions, 1 minor suspension, and 2 minor/program additions. They also heard from Brandon Greenaway (SGA Chief of Staff and President-Elect) on the problem of student cheating and



Faculty Senate

John Sacher (Interim Assistant Dean, College of Undergraduate Studies) on the possibility of eliminating the C-/D+/D- grades at UCF.

Ad Hoc Committee on Civil Discourse

Chair – Stephen King

[Date of meeting/meetings – summary]

Ad Hoc Committee on Student Success

Chair – Tina Chiarelli

Proposed bylaws have been revised and were further discussed and approved at the March meeting of the Steering Committee and later approved in Senate.