



Faculty Senate

Steering Committee

Minutes for meeting of Thursday, February 30, 2025, 3:00 pm

Location: In person in the Charge on Chamber, Student Union Room 340

Recorded Link:

https://ucf.zoom.us/rec/share/d_YRSuApMNRN6WkdDZp6f5Lkdc2ooHQ6cLRsp7JPOrQ17n9JDqRyPEWza3j9vBkO.-IFg3b5QQjQyHNzt

Passcode: rYbec@1G

1. Call to Order 3:02
2. Roll Call via Qualtrics
3. Approval of Minutes of January 30, 2025-Minutes approved
4. Recognition of Guests

Tim Letzring, Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Excellence

Joel Cramer, Vice Provost for Faculty Excellence

Joe Harrington, Interim Associate Vice President for Research

Joe Adams, Senior Communications Director

5. Announcements

- **Senate Meeting & Resolutions:** Only one Faculty Senate meeting remains for discussing campus issues and resolutions. The deadline for Bylaw resolutions has passed. Non-Bylaw resolutions must be discussed today to be considered at the next meeting.
- **Provost Search Committee:** The committee has been announced, with Carolina Cruz Neira as co-chair, marking a rare instance of a rank-and-file faculty member in this role across SUS institutions. The committee includes two students and many faculty members, including the chair, who will provide updates at future Senate and Steering meetings.
- **Research Space Utilization:** As UCF's faculty grows, research space is a critical issue. With no new space available for several years, the administration is reviewing current space usage. Efforts are being made to ensure transparency by providing faculty with clear criteria for space reevaluation, their individual ratings, and comparisons with colleagues. Work is underway to help department chairs share this information more effectively. Updates will follow.
- **March 27 Steering Meeting:** This meeting will be held at the Rosen campus—please mark your calendars.



Faculty Senate

(Please see materials for full report)

6. Report of the Senate Chair

Chair King shared a slideshow covering two topics related to classrooms

- **Learning Space Manager:** The website <https://ucf.talem3.com/lsm/login/auth> provides images and details about technologies available in teaching rooms. Examples were shown, and the link will be shared for feedback at the full Senate meeting in two weeks.
- **Classroom Scheduling and Utilization:** A PowerPoint presentation was displayed to discuss classroom scheduling and space usage.

(Please see materials for full report)

Senators shared feedback and concerns. Discussion ensued.

7. Report of the Provost

Senior Vice Provost, Tim Letzring, provided the report on behalf of Provost Johnson

- **GEP Update:** The Board of Governors approved UCF's 2025-26 General Education Program (GEP) plan at their last meeting. Some courses were removed from the GEP list, while others were added. The Vice Provost addressed questions about GEP course changes and encouraged faculty to contact Dr. Letzring for inquiries about adding courses.
- **Provost Update:** In addition to the Chair's earlier remarks, a link to the Provost Search website was included in the email sent by the President yesterday. <https://www.ucf.edu/leadership/provost-search/>
- **Founder's Day:** Dr. Letzring encouraged faculty to attend the upcoming Founder's Day Celebration on April 2nd.

(Please see materials for full report)

8. Unfinished Business

9. New Business

a) Nominating Committee Update: Bill Self, Chair of Nominating committee

- The committee met on February 19 to review the elections process and bylaws.
- Faculty will receive an email to submit officer nominations.
- The committee will contact nominees to confirm their willingness to serve and prepare for voting at the first meeting of the new Senate.

b) UCF Faculty Senate Leadership Statement Regarding Civil Discourse and Free Expression



Faculty Senate

- Amendment A motion to approve the UCF Faculty Senate Leadership Statement Regarding Civil Discourse and Free Expression was seconded and opened for discussion.
- An amendment was proposed to add the following sentences to the end of the statement:

“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. It is equally important not to stifle the dissemination of any ideas, even if other members of our community may find those ideas abhorrent.”

- Vote on the amendment passed.
 - Vote on the amended statement passed. The approved statement reads:
 - *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 continuously 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. 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. It is equally important not to stifle the dissemination of any ideas, even if other members of our community may find those ideas abhorrent.”*
- c) Resolution 2024-2025-10 Centralization of Emergency Planning, approved by FCTL Advisory Committee
Motion to steer this resolution to the full senate was voted on and approved.
- d) Resolution 2024-2025-11 Evaluating on Faculty Instruction; approved by the ad hoc Teaching Evaluation committee
Motion to steer this resolution to the full senate was discussed, voted on and approved.
- e) Resolution 2024-2025-12 Approval of a revised Student Perception of Instruction Form; approved by the ad hoc Teaching Evaluation committee
Motion to steer this resolution to the full senate was discussed, voted on and approved.
- f) Update on Resolution 2024-2025-7 Faculty Senate Bylaw Amendment Resolution: Establishing the Committee on Committees as an autonomous Faculty Senate operational committee
This resolution was discussed, but no motions were made at this meeting.
- g) Agenda for March 13th Faculty Senate meeting



Faculty Senate

Chair King provided an update on the agenda for the March 13 Faculty Senate meeting, which will include:

- 10 Years of Senate Service Recognition
- Nominating Committee Update
- Review of All Active Resolutions
- No Campus Climate Report due to time constraints.

10. Committee Reports – Liaisons will be giving committee reports.

- a) B&A Committee: Aimee DeNeyolles, Steering Liaison for B&A Committee
- b) IT Committee: Jim Gallo, Steering Liaison for IT Committee
- c) Personnel Committee: Michael Proctor, Steering Liaison for Personnel Committee
- d) Research Council: Linda Walters, Chair of Research Council
- e) Graduate Council: Reid Oetjen, Chair of Graduate Program Review and Awards Committee, Steering Liaison for Graduate Council
- f) Undergraduate Council: Tina Chiarelli, Chair of UCRC, Steering Liaison for Undergraduate Council

11. Other Business

Bylaws Committee Discussion

A motion to bring the Bylaws Committee topic to the floor was seconded and discussed.

- Discussion to rename the committee to Constitution and Bylaws Committee and constitute it with past chairs/vice chairs.
- Discussion to make it a standing committee instead of an ad hoc committee.
- Discussion on the possibility of having the parliamentarian serve as committee chair and for the committee to function in both the fall and spring semesters.

12. Adjournment- Meeting adjourned at 4:45

Daniel Seigler

Daniel Seigler

Secretary, Faculty Senate

3/07/2025

Date

AGENDA ITEM:

UCF Faculty Senate Leadership Statement Regarding Civil Discourse and Free Expression

Excerpts 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.

Proposed UCF Faculty Senate Leadership 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 continuously 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

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.

Civil Discourse Final Report

2022



CIVIL DISCOURSE INITIATIVES **in the** **STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM**

INTRODUCTION

As members of many different societal groups and communities, people thrive on the personal interactions that occur every minute of every day. These ongoing interactions provide the foundation for learning, discovery, and growth in a university setting. More specifically, open-minded, tolerant, and respectful discourse among campus community members is critical to enabling students to learn and pursue their educational goals, faculty to effectively teach, and staff to pursue fulfilling work.

To promote civil discourse in the State University System, the Board of Governors, the presidents of Florida's twelve public universities, adopted a "Statement of Free Expression" in 2019. The Board's statement directly aligns with the well-established "Chicago Principles" that originated at the University of Chicago in 2014 to articulate the university's overarching commitment to free, robust, and uninhibited debate. Universities have widely adopted the Chicago Principles throughout the U.S.

The Board's Statement of Free Expression was endorsed by the twelve state universities as a vehicle to establish, maintain, and support a full and open discourse and the robust exchange of ideas and perspectives on all university campuses (See Appendix A). The statement reinforces that a critical purpose of a higher education institution is "to provide a learning environment where divergent ideas, opinions, and philosophies, new and old, can be rigorously debated and critically evaluated."

Board of Governors Chair Syd Kitson established the Board's Civil Discourse Initiative during his January 2021 "State of the System" address. Chair Kitson expressed concern regarding the steady decline in respectful discourse among those with differing viewpoints. He stated that the university setting could provide a foundation for understanding, learning, and growth in this area. Chair Kitson tasked Governor Tim Cerio to lead the initiative through the Strategic Planning Committee. Governor Cerio has stated that "Civil discourse, conducted civilly without fear of reprisal, is critical to free speech and ensuring academic and intellectual freedom – not just on our university campuses, but throughout our country."

The 2018 Legislature established the Campus Free Expression Act in section 1004.097, Florida Statutes. This statute provides direction and relevance to the Board's initiative as it codifies an individual's right to engage in free-speech activities at public higher education institutions. It also prohibits a public institution from shielding students, faculty, or staff from expressive activities while authorizing a public institution to create and enforce reasonable restrictions under specified conditions.

CIVIL DISCOURSE: BEST PRACTICES

The State University System

The state universities provided information on activities and initiatives promoting and supporting civil discourse in their campus communities. Best practices gleaned from a review of their submissions were highlighted within the following four categories.

1. Workshops & Professional Development: Presentations, lectures, workshops, or training designed to provide opportunities for faculty, staff, students, and campus partners to learn how to engage in and facilitate dialogue respectfully.
2. Speakers, Dialogue & Debate: Events or programs that provide opportunities for faculty, staff, and students to engage in, observe, or facilitate conversations and encourage civil discourse.
3. Outreach (on and off-campus): Programs, workshops, and or campaigns with external partners help cultivate a campus culture of civil discourse.
4. Research and Academic Affairs: Research-based initiatives, web tools, and courses designed to provide opportunities for students, faculty, and staff to engage in and learn about issues related to civil discourse in a formal setting.

Additionally, the committee researched established national programs addressing civil discourse and interviewed prominent authorities in this area. Interviews were conducted with Dr. Robert George, McCormick Professor of Jurisprudence & Director, James Madison Program at Princeton University; Dr. Lynn Pasquerella, President of the Association of American Colleges and Universities; Dr. Diana Hess, Dean, University of Wisconsin School of Education; Ms. Liz Joyner, Founder & C.E.O., the Village Square; Dr. Bill Mattox, Director, James Madison Institute's Marshall Center for Educational Options; Dr. Tim Chapin, Dean, FSU College of Social Sciences and Public Policy, and Dr. Jonathan Haidt, founder of the Heterodox Academy.

National Models

A review of the national postsecondary system and institutional civil discourse programs identified a number of highly regarded initiatives and strategies that promote and support civil discourse. Examples include the following.

- The Center for Peace and Conflict Resolution, Brigham Young University: The Center's primary focus is conflict resolution. Through mediation, arbitration, training workshops, research, conferences, academic courses, and consultations, the Center assists both the university and the community in building skills and promoting understanding of peace, negotiation, communication, and conflict resolution.
- Heterodox Academy: Heterodox Academy is a nonpartisan international collaborative of professors, administrators, and students committed to enhancing the quality of research and education by promoting open inquiry, viewpoint diversity, and constructive disagreement in institutions of higher learning. The

Heterodox Academy was founded in 2015 by scholar Jonathan Haidt. He was prompted by his views on the negative impact that the lack of ideological diversity has had on the quality of research within the Academy.

The Academy collaboratively engages with universities throughout the U.S. to promote rigorous, open, and responsible interactions across lines of difference as essential to separating good ideas from bad and making good ideas better. Heterodox scholars view the university as a place of collaborative truth-seeking, where diverse scholars and students approach problems and questions from different points of view in pursuit of knowledge, discovery, and growth.

- The Institute for Civic Discourse and Democracy, Kansas State University: The Institute pursues theories and practice in civic discourse that are identified to advance improvements in all campus and community interactions. The Institute supports public conversation to elevate specific qualities of civic discourse, including inclusiveness, equality, reciprocity, reflection, reason-giving, and shared decision-making. The Institute offers certificates and degrees through the university's communication studies department; and offers workshops, facilitator training, and research opportunities through the Kansas Civic Life Project.
- The James Madison Program in American Ideals and Institutions: The James Madison Program is a scholarly institute within the Department of Politics at Princeton University and is dedicated to exploring enduring questions of American constitutional law and Western political thought. The James Madison Program was founded in 2000 by Dr. Robert George, McCormick Professor of Jurisprudence at Princeton University, and follows the University of Chicago's principles on freedom of expression.

The James Madison Program promotes teaching and scholarship in constitutional law and political thought and provides a forum for free expression and robust civil dialogue and debate. The Program hosts visiting postdoctoral and undergraduate fellows and offers various activities, courses, summer programs, and other related activities promoting free expression.

RECOMMENDATIONS

All 12 universities in the State University System have voiced a commitment to civil discourse and have provided numerous examples of programs and policies to establish, maintain, and support civil discourse throughout their living, learning, and working environment.

In recent years, there have been incidents of unacceptable behaviors and violations of codes of conduct and personnel policies relating to civil discourse by administrators, faculty, and students in the system. When such incidents occur, universities must respond to grievances with rapid response, thorough review, and adjudication according to their established policies. This process is most valuable when the conflict is resolved,

the impacted individuals are redressed, and all involved can learn and grow from the experience.

Moreover, programming restricting participation based on race or ethnicity, and in violation of existing university policies, has occurred with more frequency on Florida campuses. Although perhaps well-intentioned, often the effect of these programs is to further divide and disenfranchise, rather than promote understanding through civil discourse.

The Board of Governors as Advocate

The Board of Governors, responsible for the management and operation of the State University System, is unequivocal in its support of civil discourse throughout its 12 campus communities. The Board believes that each campus community member has a unique and critical role in the adherence to civil discourse and the ongoing support of the establishment, maintenance, and evaluation of civil discourse initiatives.

The Board of Governors' "Statement of Free Expression" remains an integral part of the Board's three-pronged mission for state universities: to deliver a high-quality academic experience for students, to engage in meaningful and productive research, and to provide a valuable public service for the benefit of local communities, metropolitan regions, and the state.

- I. **The Board of Governors expects that the leadership at each university will operationalize the Board's commitment to open-minded and tolerant civil discourse by promoting, supporting, and regularly evaluating adherence to the principles set forth in the Board's Statement of Free Expression and cultivating a culture of civil discourse in all campus interactions, including academic, administrative, extracurricular, and social dealings.**

University Planning

In its 2025 Strategic Plan, the Board of Governors sets forth its mission for the State University System and further states that the state universities will "*support students' development of the knowledge, skills, and aptitudes needed for success in the global society and marketplace.*" The Board strongly believes that the state universities are well-positioned to provide the foundation for civil discourse learning, understanding, and growth for all campus community members.

Each university's Accountability Plan is an annual report of specific accountability measures and strategic plans.

- II. **The Board of Governors recommends that each university's Accountability Plan and Strategic Plan include a specific endorsement of the Board's Statement of Free Expression, as well as a clear expectation for open-minded and tolerant civil discourse throughout the campus community. The Board of Governors will include similar statements and principles in its Strategic Plan for the State University System.**

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.

- 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.**
- IV. **The Board of Governors recommends that each board of trustees conducts a thorough review of current student orientation programs, student codes of conduct, and employee policies and procedures to ensure consistency with the Board of Governors Statement of Free Expression, the principles of free speech and civil discourse, and compliance with section 1004.097, Florida Statutes.**

The University President

The university president has primary responsibility for establishing the campus culture and setting the day-to-day living, learning, and working environment for all university community members. The president directs and monitors these efforts and is ultimately accountable for the civil discourse climate in the campus community.

Board of Governors Regulation 1.001, University Board of Trustees Powers and Duties, states that the annual evaluation for university presidents addresses "responsiveness to the Board of Governors' strategic goals and priorities."

- V. **Beginning in the 2022 presidential evaluation and contract renewal cycle, as a part of a president's evaluation, the Chair of the Board of Governors will consult with the board of trustees chair to review the university's campus free speech climate, including adherence to the principles set forth in the Board's Statement of Free Expression, the occurrence and the resolution of any issues related to the university's compliance with substantiated violations of section 1004.097, Florida Statutes, and the implementation of best practices promoting civil discourse.**

Academic, Student, and Administrative Affairs

Board of Governors Regulation 1.001, University Boards of Trustees Powers & Duties, directs each board of trustees to adopt regulations or policies for a student code of conduct and establish a personnel program for all university employees. These policies are required to include standards for performance and conduct as well as disciplinary actions, complaints, appeals, and grievance procedures.

A university's personnel policies, orientation programs, and student code of conduct are critical to setting the tone for a climate of open-mindedness and tolerance for civil discourse. More specifically, all university campus areas, including classrooms, lecture halls, offices, and extracurricular, residential, and social locales, offer opportunities for learning, tolerance, and growth. Academic deans and directors, student affairs administrators, faculty, and students share responsibility for establishing and reinforcing tolerant, open-minded, and respectful discourse on a university campus.

- VI. **The Board of Governors recommends that university academic, student affairs, and administrative leaders review student orientation programming, student codes of conduct, and employee personnel policies and procedures to ensure that they contain clear and unambiguous support for the Board's Statement of Free Expression, and the principles of free speech and civil discourse, and that they are in compliance with section 1004.097, Florida Statutes.**

Best Practices for Civil Discourse

- VII. **The Board of Governors recommends implementing the following best practices based on its review of university programs and initiatives that effectively promote and support civil discourse.**

- **Instill the importance of civil discourse, academic freedom, and free speech from day one**, utilizing student and employee orientation sessions, public assemblies, and official university documents and communications.
- **Schedule and host ongoing, campus-wide forums, dialogues, and debates** on various issues and perspectives to promote open discussion, understanding, and learning opportunities.
- **Foster intellectual diversity** by encouraging university leadership to: (1) promote viewpoint diversity and open-minded discussion and debate, and (2) highlight and enforce policies that prohibit programming that excludes participation based on race or ethnicity.
- **Avoid disinvitations** by developing clear, viewpoint-neutral policies and procedures governing the invitation and accommodation of campus speakers.
- **Provide targeted educational and professional development opportunities** for university administrative employees to reinforce free expression and open-minded debate norms.
- **Encourage faculty to establish and maintain a learning environment in their classrooms and offices that supports open dialogue and the free expression of all viewpoints and create processes to evaluate the strength of such environments.**

Appendix A

State University System of Florida

Statement of Free Expression

April 15, 2019

The State University System of Florida and its twelve public postsecondary institutions adopt this Statement on Free Expression to support and encourage a 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 worldview. 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 each of our institutions' academic and research missions.

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 unlawful expression, 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 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.



STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA





Board of Governors
State University System of Florida

325 West Gaines Street, Suite 1614

Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Phone: (850) 245-0466

www.flbog.edu

Resolution 2024-2025-10 Centralization of Emergency Planning

Whereas, the UCF faculty have expressed concerns about the generic nature of emergency planning materials present in every classroom; and

Whereas, emergency planning materials customized for every classroom (including such information as a custom evacuation route for that exact classroom, the location of the nearest AED, etc.) do not presently exist, nor does it appear to be the purview of any identified office at UCF to create them; and

Whereas, the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning Advisory Committee was assigned Faculty Senate topic 2024-2025-8 which stated: *In the event of an emergency, classroom instructors and students need to have location-specific safety information available. How can we incorporate that information into all course syllabi for in person classes? Examples of safety information that could be included are an active shooter plan for the individual classroom and the location of the nearest AED;* and

Whereas, the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning Advisory Committee discovered a classroom tracking software called Talum, which is operated by the Office of Instructional Resources, who handles classroom technology but not emergency planning, rendering Talum an incorrect choice for housing faculty-facing safety information; therefore

Be It Resolved, that the Faculty Senate hereby calls upon the University to assign a specific central office associated with public safety to provide custom safety information for each classroom.

Resolution 2024-2025-11

Evaluating Faculty Instruction

Whereas, despite UCF Regulation 3.010 indicating that Student Perceptions of Instruction (SPIs) should not be the only source of evaluating teaching, SPIs remain one of the primary and most convenient methods of evaluating faculty instruction for purposes of annual evaluation, tenure and promotion, and teaching awards at UCF; and

Whereas, empirical research has shown that SPIs are biased against women, with women being judged more harshly than their male counterparts (Boring, 2017; Centra & Gaubatz, 2000; Kogan, Schoenfeld-Tacher, & Hellyer, 2010; Laube, Massoni et al., 2007; Mitchell & Martin, 2018). Empirical research has equally shown that SPIs are biased against ethnic and minority groups, resulting in African American professors being rated, on average, as 21% more mean spirited and 24% harder as compared to Caucasian faculty ratings (Harlow, 2003); and

Whereas, a recommendation of the 2020 report of the UCF SPI Task Force states: “As one of the largest and most innovative universities in the U.S., a designated Hispanic-Serving and Minority Serving institution that is committed to access, inclusion, and diversity, UCF should discontinue the use of SPIs, which perpetuate race- and gender-based biases, in the process of Faculty Performance evaluations” (p.6). The rationale for this recommendation was based in part on an argument that appeared in an issue of Inside Higher Ed, which stated: “Relying on biased instruments to evaluate faculty members is institutional discrimination.” (Owen, 2019); and

Whereas, empirical research, including a recent meta-analysis (Uttl, White & Gonzalez, 2017), has shown that SPIs are a poor measure of teaching effectiveness, primarily measuring perceptions of students who are not experts in pedagogy, and are influenced by non-teaching based factors like time of day, subject, and class size (Boring, Ottoboni, 2016; Stark & Freishtat, 2014; Flaherty, 2020; Lederman, 2020; Stroebe, 2020); and

Whereas, empirical research has shown that students rate teaching methods that have been proven effective [such as active learning] as less effective than passive learning strategies (Deslauriers, McCarty et al., 2019); and

Whereas, UCF research has shown that less than 60% of students complete SPIs, despite continuous reminders and subsequent barriers to enrollment and other university activities for those failing to complete them (Dziuban, Moskal, Self, & Hubertz, 2022); and

Whereas, UCF research has shown that 66.1% of students from 2017 to 2021 straight lined their SPI responses (Dziuban, Moskal, Self, & Hubertz, 2022); and

Whereas, empirical research has shown that “up to a third of students use instructor ratings to get revenge on instructors they do not like, even to the extent of submitting false information” (Clayson & Haley, 2011; as cited in UCF SPI Task Force Report, 2020:7).

Whereas, empirical research has shown that student grade satisfaction, receiving expected grades, perceived and actual grading leniency, and/or “consumer satisfaction” are important

drivers of [positive] faculty evaluations (Johnson, 2002; Eiszler, 2002; Felton et al., 2008; Braga, et al., 2014; Stroebe, 2020); and

Whereas, empirical research has shown that SPIs, especially when used in high-stake personnel decisions, encourage grade inflation (Johnson, 2006; Hu, 2005), ultimately affecting the credibility of institutions and creating dubious impressions of student learning and teaching effectiveness; and

Whereas, at UCF, from 2018 to 2023, in lower-level undergraduate courses, 46.8 percent [range of 42.3 – 49] of grades were A’s (A /A-) and 26.2 percent [range of 25.3 – 28.2] were B’s (B+/B/B-). From 2018 to 2023, in upper-level undergraduate courses, 47.2 percent [range of 44 – 48.9] of grades were A’s and 26.1 percent [range of 25.7 – 27.9] were B’s (Source:IKM); and

Whereas, at UCF, from 2018 to 2023, the average percentage of A’s received in upper-level undergraduate courses was at or exceeded 55 percent [range of 55 – 65] in 6 of 10 colleges. In the remaining 4 colleges, which are responsible for 62% of all grades at UCF, the most commonly reported percentage of A’s for upper-level undergraduate courses was 45 percent [range of 31 – 46] and 26 and 36 percent for B’s (Data Source: IKM; College of Medicine and Graduate Studies, and Honor’s College, where 80 percent of grades are “S,” are not included in these figures).

Whereas, research by scholars from Brigham Young, Purdue, and Stanford University (Denning, Eide, Mumford, Patterson & Warnick, 2023) found that the “no direct cost to the university” practice of grade inflation [not changing enrollment patterns, better performance on standardized tests, student-to-faculty ratios or instructional expenditures] is most responsible for increased graduation rates (“The Grade Inflation Conversation We’re Not Having,” April 13, 2023 issue of Chronicle of Higher Education); and

Whereas, the Faculty Senate ad hoc committee on Teaching Evaluations was charged to: “*Examine teaching evaluation practices from other higher ed institutions that do not rely on student perceptions of instruction including Colorado-Boulder, Southern California, Oregon, Kansas along with current research and present a resolution to the faculty senate regarding mechanisms to measure effective teaching that do not rely on documented biased measures of student perception.*” These four universities have made substantial changes to the evaluation of faculty teaching, which includes elimination of SPIs as a sole source of evaluating teaching in favor of more balanced frameworks (UCF SPI Task Force, 2020:8-9)

Be it Resolved that UCF limit use of SPIs in faculty annual evaluations, promotion and tenure decisions, and awards, to no more than 25% of the total teaching evaluation. For the remaining 75%, UCF unit/department heads, deans, and other university personnel shall utilize and prioritize other measures of teaching quality and commitment in assessing faculty instruction. Examples of alternative measures include, but are not limited to:

I. Materials created by the faculty member (primary documents)

- a. Syllabi
- b. Lesson plans
- c. Exams

- d. Assignment prompts
- e. Presentation materials
- f. Use of evidence-based practices in classroom
- g. Creation of new courses for department curriculum
- h. Students supervised on independent studies/theses/dissertations

II. Materials created by the faculty member (reflective documents)

- a. Statement of teaching philosophy
- b. Narrative of teaching practices (specific examples of how theory is put into practice)
- c. Annual reflection statement (teaching innovations and continuous improvement in the classroom this year)
- d. Statement of teaching responsibilities
- e. Statement of professional development attended

III. Materials created by others

- a. Peer observation feedback (by department peer or Chair)
- b. Peer observation feedback (by UCF faculty member outside department)
- c. Peer observation feedback (by FCTL)
- d. Peer observation feedback (same discipline, different instruction, via recording)
- e. Annual letter of participation in various events from FCTL
- f. Teaching awards received
- g. FCTL video capture of instructor teaching a class
- h. quality course designations from IDL

IV. Evidence of student learning

- a. Before-and-after results (test or writing samples, especially comparing early semester to end)
- b. Passing rates of students (especially compared to department average)
- c. Graded student essays, with explanation on grading results
- d. Student publications on course-related work
- e. Statements/videos from previous students in the course
- f. Publications and presentations with students

References

- Boring, A. (2017). Gender biases in student evaluations of teaching. *Journal of Public Economics*, 145, 27-41.
- Boring, A., & Ottoboni, K. (2016). Student evaluations of teaching (mostly) do not measure teaching effectiveness. *ScienceOpen research*.
- Braga, M., Paccagnella, M., & Pellizzari, M. (2014). Evaluating students' evaluations of professors. *Economics of Education review*, 41, 71-88.
- Centra, J. A., & Gaubatz, N. B. (2000). Is There Gender Bias in Student Evaluations of Teaching? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71(1), 17. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2649280?origin=crossref>
- Clayson, D. E., & Haley, D. A. (2011). Are students telling us the truth? A critical look at the student evaluation of teaching. *Marketing Education Review*, 21(2), 101-112.
- Denning, J. T., Eide, E. R., Mumford, K. J., Patterson, R. W., & Warnick, M. (2023, Apr 13). The grade inflation conversation we're not having. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/the-grade-inflation-conversation-were-not-having>.
- Deslauriers, L., McCarty, L. S., Miller, K., Callaghan, K., & Kestin, G. (2019). Measuring actual learning versus feeling of learning in response to being actively engaged in the classroom. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116, 19251-19257.
- Dziuban, C., Moskal, P., Self, J., & Hubertz, M. (2022, May 11). *Updates on the Student Perception of Instruction Process at UCF: Can We Improve It?* FCTL Summer Conference. FCTL, Summer 2022.
- Eiszler, C. F. (2002). College students' evaluations of teaching and grade inflation. *Research in Higher Education*, 43, 483-501.
- Felton, J., Koper, P. T., Mitchell, J., & Stinson, M. (2008). Attractiveness, easiness and other issues: Student evaluations of professors on ratemyprofessors.com. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(1), 45-61.
- Flaherty, C. (2020, Feb 27). *Study: Student evaluations of teaching are deeply flawed*. Inside Higher Ed. <https://www.insidehighered.com>
- Harlow, R. (2003). "Race Doesn't Matter, but...": The Effect of Race on Professors' Experiences and Emotion Management in the Undergraduate College Classroom. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 66(4), 348. <http://doi.org/10.2307/1519834>
- Hu, S. (2005). *Beyond grade inflation: Grading problems in higher education*. Wiley Periodicals.
- Johnson, V.E. (2006). [Review of the book *Beyond Grade Inflation: Grading Problems in Higher Education*]. *The Review of Higher Education* 30(1), 76-77. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2006.0051>.

- Kogan, L. R., Schoenfeld-Tacher, R., & Hellyer, P. W. (2010). Student evaluations of teaching: perceptions of faculty based on gender, position, and rank. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 15(6), 623–636. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2010.491911>
- Laube, H., Massoni, K., Sprague, J., & Ferber, A. (2007). The impact of gender on the evaluation of teaching: What we know and what we can do. *National Women's Studies Association Journal*, 19(3), 87-104.
- Lederman, D. (2020, Apr 8). Evaluating teaching during the pandemic. Inside Higher Ed. *Inside Higher Ed*. <https://www.insidehighered.com>
- Mitchell, K. M., & Martin, J. (2018). Gender bias in student evaluations. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 51(3), 648-652.
- Owen, A. (2019, Jun 23). The next lawsuits to hit higher education. *Inside Higher Ed*. <https://www.insidehighered.com>
- Stark, P. & Freishtat, R. (2014). An evaluation of course evaluations. *ScienceOpen Research* (doi: 10.14293/S2199-1006.1.SOR-EDU.AOFRQA.v1)
- Stroebe, W. (2020). Student evaluations of teaching encourages poor teaching and contributes to grade inflation: A theoretical and empirical analysis. *Basic and applied social psychology*, 42(4), 276-294.

Resolution 2024-2025-12
Approval of a Revised Student Perception of Instruction Form

Whereas, the UCF faculty have expressed ongoing concerns about the quality and usage of the current Student Perception of Instruction form; and

Whereas, several Faculty Senate committees, administrators, the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning, and a designated Faculty Senate ad hoc committee have developed constructive recommendations to revise the Student Perception of Instruction form; and

Whereas, these recommendations stressed moving away from questions that asked students to rate topics they had no expertise in, questions that were out of the instructor's control, and questions that inappropriately conflated the course/instruction with the instructor; and

Whereas, the Faculty Senate ad hoc committee on Teaching Evaluations was charged to: “present a resolution with *a revised set of objective SPI questions for use in 5-year reviews*,” which stemmed from Faculty Senate resolution 2023-2024-8 Evaluating Faculty Instruction and Faculty Senate resolution 2023-2024-6 Approval of a Revised Student Perception of Instruction Form; and

Whereas, the ad hoc Faculty Senate committee on Teaching Evaluations has considered the available reports, debated various options, and approved a Revised Student Perception of Instruction form; therefore

Be It Resolved, that the Faculty Senate hereby accepts and approves the proposed revisions to the Student Perception of Instruction form and transmits that Revised Student Perception of Instruction form to the Provost for incorporation into future evaluations,

Be It Further Resolved, that the presentation of SPI results will be revised to include departmental average comparisons that match the size (small, medium, or large) of the course in question,

Be It Further Resolved, that the presentation of SPI results will not include university average comparisons.

Replacement Likert Scale Questions

1. The course expectations were clear.
2. The course was well organized.
3. Graded work was aligned with course content.
4. The instructor made clear efforts to engage students.
5. The instructor was helpful in responding to questions.
6. I received sufficient feedback on my performance in the class.
7. The instructor was available for assistance.
8. The instructor enhanced my understanding of the material.
9. The instructor positively impacted how I learn.

Scale: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree

Nonstudent facing averages.

Overall Effectiveness of the course and content (Automated Average Score) 1-3

Overall Effectiveness of the instructor and instruction (Automated Average Score) 4-9

Replacement Open Ended Questions

Describe to the instructor the most effective elements of the course.

Explain to the instructor your suggestions for improving the course.

1 **Resolution 2024-2025- 7**
2 **Faculty Senate Bylaw Amendment Resolution:**
3 Establishing the Committee on Committees as an
4 autonomous Faculty Senate operational committee
5

6 **Whereas**, the Committee on Committees is currently a subcommittee of the Steering
7 Committee, requiring its members to also serve on the Steering Committee; and

8 **Whereas**, the duties and responsibilities of the Steering Committee and the Committee on
9 Committees are unrelated, and the skills, experience, and characteristics that make
10 senators effective in one committee may not align with those needed in the other; and

11 **Whereas**, separating the Steering Committee and the Committee on Committees would
12 enable a broader range of senators to engage with the Faculty Senate's inner operations
13 and leadership, thereby doubling opportunities for senators from each academic unit to
14 gain valuable experience; therefore

15 **Be It Resolved**, that the Committee on Committees shall become an autonomous
16 operational committee of the Faculty Senate, with its members selected from among the
17 senators of each academic unit; and

18 **Be It Further Resolved**, that the Faculty Senate Bylaws be amended to remove any
19 reference to the Committee on Committees as a subcommittee of the Steering Committee
20 and to establish the Committee on Committees as an independent operational committee
21 with the following description:

22 ***Committee on Committees.***

23 ***1 Duties and Responsibilities***

24 *a To solicit committee preferences from senators for membership on the operational,*
25 *curricular and joint committees and councils of the Senate, and to review and recommend*
26 *committee membership.*

27 *b To determine the interest of their academic unit faculty (by survey or other*
28 *appropriate means) in serving on the various operational, curricular and joint committees*
29 *and to obtain names from department chairs, deans, and others of faculty members whom*
30 *they believe have the requisite interest and experience to serve on specific committees.*

31 *c To provide the Office of the Faculty Senate with a list of nominees for all Senate*
32 *operational, curricular and joint committees and councils. The Committee on Committees*
33 *shall take into consideration minority and female representation, and to the extent possible,*
34 *take into consideration approximate proportionate representation of the academic units to*
35 *serve on operational, curricular, and joint committees.*

36 *d To provide the Chair of the Committee on Committees and the Office of the Faculty*
37 *Senate with faculty nominees for additional service opportunities that are requested of the*
38 *Faculty Senate from across the university.*

39 2. Membership:

40 *Members of the Committee on Committees are elected at the first Senate meeting of the year*
41 *to a one-year term. The senators from each academic unit shall elect one representative to*
42 *the Committee on Committees from amongst the unit's Senators. A senator may serve as*
43 *their unit's representative on both the Steering Committee and the Committee on*
44 *Committees. Should a vacancy occur on the Committee on Committees, the senators from*
45 *the academic unit in which the vacancy occurs shall designate a replacement. This*
46 *committee will be chaired by the Senate vice chair.*

a. Committee on Committees.

1. Duties and Responsibilities: The committee responsibilities are:

- i. To solicit committee preferences from senators for membership on the committees of the Senate, **and to** review and recommend committee membership, ~~and to appoint a Senate liaison to provide monthly committee reports to the Senate.~~
- ii. ~~To consult with the faculty and deans of their academic units to identify nominees for university joint committees and councils and to review and recommend committee membership.~~
 - a. ~~The identification of faculty for service on joint university committees and councils is the result of collaboration between the college Committee on Committees representative and a representative of the college dean. The Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate will notify both parties when a vacancy occurs, who will come to an agreement on the new appointee.~~
 - b. ~~Based upon the criteria for the committee position, both parties may solicit nominations from the college's faculty or administrators. If the dean's representative and the college Committee on Committees representative cannot agree on the new appointee, both the nominations will be reviewed by the full Committee on Committees, which will make the final determination.~~
 - c. ~~Once the new appointee has agreed to serve, the Committee on Committees representative shall inform the Office of the Faculty Senate of the appointment.~~
- iii. To determine the interest of **their academic unit** faculty (by survey or other appropriate means) in serving on the various Senate **operational, curricular** and joint committees and to obtain names from department chairs, deans, and others of faculty members whom they believe have the requisite interest and experience to serve on specific committees.
- iv. To provide **the Office of the Faculty Senate** ~~Steering Committee of the Faculty Senate~~ with a list of nominees for all Senate operational ~~and~~ curricular committees ~~and the responsible university administrator with nominations for~~ **and** joint committees and councils. The Committee on Committees shall take into consideration minority and female representation, and to the extent possible, take into consideration approximate proportionate representation of the academic units to serve on Senate **operational, curricular**, and joint committees.
- v. To provide the Chair of the Committee on Committees and the Office of the Faculty Senate with faculty nominees for additional service opportunities that are requested of the Faculty Senate from across the university

2 Membership: Members of the Committee on Committees are elected at the first Senate meeting of the year to a one-year term. The senators from each academic unit shall elect **one representative** ~~their representatives~~ to the Committee on Committees from amongst the unit's **Senators Steering Committee members**. **A senator may serve as their unit's representative on both the Steering Committee and the Committee on Committees.** Should a vacancy occur on the Committee on Committees, the senators from the academic unit in which the vacancy occurs shall designate a replacement. This committee will be chaired by the Senate vice chair.

A. Steering Committee

1. Composition.
2. Duties and Responsibilities
3. Meetings
4. Quorum
5. Subcommittees of the Steering Committee

a. Committee on Committees.

The senators from each academic unit shall elect their representatives to the Committee on Committees from amongst the unit's Steering Committee members. Members of the Committee on Committees are elected at the first Senate meeting of the year to a one-year term. Should a vacancy occur on the Committee on Committees, the senators from the academic unit in which the vacancy occurs shall designate a replacement. This committee will be chaired by the Senate vice chair. The committee responsibilities are:

i. To solicit committee preferences from senators for membership on the committees of the Senate, review and recommend committee membership, and to appoint a Senate liaison to provide monthly committee reports to the Senate.

ii. To consult with the faculty and deans of their academic units to identify nominees for university joint committees and councils and to review and recommend committee membership.

a. The identification of faculty for service on joint university committees and councils is the result of collaboration between the college Committee on Committees representative and a representative of the college dean. The Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate will notify both parties when a vacancy occurs, who will come to an agreement on the new appointee.

b. Based upon the criteria for the committee position, both parties may solicit nominations from the college's faculty or administrators. If the dean's representative and the college Committee on Committees representative cannot agree on the new appointee, both the nominations will be reviewed by the full Committee on Committees, which will make the final determination.

e. Once the new appointee has agreed to serve, the Committee on Committees representative shall inform the Office of the Faculty Senate of the appointment.

iii. To provide the Steering Committee of the Faculty Senate with a list of nominees for all Senate operational and curricular committees and the responsible university administrator with nominations for joint

~~committees and councils. The Committee on Committees shall take into consideration minority and female representation, and to the extent possible, take into consideration approximate proportionate representation of the academic units to serve on Senate and joint committees.~~

~~iv. To determine the interest of faculty (by survey or other appropriate means) in serving on the various Senate and joint committees and to obtain names from department chairs, deans, and others of faculty members whom they believe have the requisite interest and experience to serve on specific committees.~~

b. Nominating Committee.

The Nominating Committee shall be formed at the Steering Committee meeting prior to the March Senate meeting at the latest. 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. The chair of the Nominating Committee shall preside over the election of Faculty Senate officers. For nomination procedures, see Bylaws, Section III.B.

EXCERPT FROM THE CONSTITUTION ARTICLE IV:

Committees and Councils

A. Purpose and Classification

“Service on university committees and councils is the primary means of direct participation in university governance by faculty. There are three classes of committees and councils staffed by the Faculty Senate: Senate operational committees, Senate curricular committees and councils, and joint committees and councils. The creation, restructuring, or dissolution of Senate and joint committees and councils is proposed on the Senate floor and is recommended to the president of the university by a majority vote of the Senate. The purviews, structures and procedures of Senate operational committees, Senate curricular committees and councils and joint committees and councils are more fully set forth in the Senate bylaws. Ad hoc Senate committees may be established by the Senate or by the Steering Committee.”

EXCERPTS FROM THE CONSTITUTION ARTICLE VII:

Amendments

A. Amendments to the constitution shall be considered by the Faculty Senate upon recommendation of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee or upon receipt of a proposal signed by five percent of the General Faculty. The text of a proposed amendment must be communicated to the General Faculty, made available electronically to the members of the Faculty Senate, and be included on the agenda and discussed at two successive meetings of the Senate. The proposed amendment is subject to amendment and may be voted upon at the second Senate meeting. A two-thirds vote of the voting members present is required for adoption.

B. Upon adoption by the Faculty Senate, an amendment shall be transmitted to the provost and vice president for Academic Affairs and the president of the university for action. Within twenty days the president shall either approve the amendment or refer the amendment back to the Faculty Senate for reconsideration. Such a referral shall include the reasons for the action. If the latter action is taken, the Faculty Senate may, by a two-thirds vote of the voting members present, approve the original or a revised amendment. The approved amendment will be sent to the president for further consideration. An amendment shall become effective at such time as it receives the president's approval.

C. If there is a change in the designation of an office, the title of an official, the name of a committee, or the references to the bylaws, the constitution will be automatically adjusted to reflect the change. Such changes will be reported to the Faculty Senate.

D. This constitution may be amended by the Board of Trustees in accordance with the Florida Board of Governor's Regulation Development Procedure for State University Boards of Trustees.

EXCERPTS FROM ROBERT'S RULES:

12: Amend

12:6 “An amendment must always be germane – that is, closely related to or having bearing on the subject of the motion to be amended. This means that no new subject can be introduced under pretext of being an amendment”

57: Amendment of Bylaws:

Amending a Proposed Amendment to the Bylaws

57:10 While amendments to a proposed bylaw amendment can be made in both the first and the second degrees (as applicable) and can be adopted by a majority vote without notice, they are subject to restrictions on the extent of the changes they propose.

57:11 If the bylaws require previous notice for their amendment (as they should), or if they do not but notice has been given and a majority of the entire membership is not present, no amendment to a bylaw amendment is in order that increases the modification of the article or provision to be amended (see 35:2(6)). This restriction prevents members from proposing a slight change and then taking advantage of absent members by moving a greater one as an amendment to the amendment. Thus, if the bylaws place the annual dues of members at \$10 and an amendment is pending to strike out 10 and insert 25, an amendment to change the 25 to any number between 10 and 25 would be in order, but an amendment to change the number to less than 10 or greater than 25 would not be in order, even with unanimous consent. Had notice been given that it was proposed to increase the dues to more than \$25 or to reduce them below \$10, members who opposed such a change might have attended the meeting to vote against the amendment.

57:12 The same principle applies to an amendment in the nature of a substitute for sections or articles (short of a revision), as already indicated above; the proposed substitute is open to amendments that diminish the amount of change, but not to amendments that increase it or that introduce new changes. Thus, if an amendment is pending to substitute a new rule for one that prescribes the initiation fee and the annual dues, and the substitute proposes to alter the initiation fee but does not propose any change in the annual dues, then an amendment which recommends changing the annual dues would not be in order.

councils, and joint committees and councils. The creation, restructuring, or dissolution of Senate and joint committees and councils is proposed on the Senate floor and is recommended to the president of the university by a majority vote of the Senate. The purviews, structures and procedures of Senate operational committees, Senate curricular committees and councils and joint committees and councils are more fully set forth in the Senate bylaws. Ad hoc Senate committees may be established by the Senate or by the Steering Committee.

B. Committee Governance

Rules and policies of the Senate govern the operation of its committees. Senate committees may adopt temporary rules and policies necessary to the operation of committees. These temporary rules must be consonant with the constitution and the bylaws and are reported to the Office of the Faculty Senate as they are adopted. Such changes are subject to subsequent approval by the Senate.

C. Eligibility for Membership on Committees and Councils

Faculty on one-year, non-renewable contracts and visiting faculty, regardless of their rank or duration of appointment, are not eligible to serve on committees or councils. A committee member designated as an *ex officio* member is a contributing member who takes part in all discussions and serves as a resource person but is non-voting and cannot serve as the chair of the committee unless specified otherwise.

D. Types of Committees and Councils

1. Senate Operational Committees.

Senate Operational Committees serve to expedite the efficient functioning of the Senate and its affairs and to address matters relating to faculty interests and functions. Committees and membership selection shall be made in accordance with the bylaws.

a. Steering Committee.

The Steering Committee of the Faculty Senate serves as the “executive committee” of the Faculty Senate. It advises the chair of the Senate and assists the chair in determining the agenda for Senate meetings.

i. **Committee on Committees.**

A subcommittee of the Steering Committee serves as the Committee on Committees. This committee will be chaired by the Senate vice chair. The membership and responsibilities of the Committee on Committees is as specified in the bylaws.

ii. Nominating Committee.

A subcommittee of the Steering Committee serves as the Nominating Committee. This committee will be chaired by the past chair of the Senate. The membership and responsibilities of the Nominating Committee is as specified in the bylaws.

b. Budget and Administrative Committee.

The Budget and Administrative Committee evaluates and recommends policies and procedures concerning university budget with special emphasis on the academic budget.

c. Information Technology Committee.

The Information Technology Committee evaluates and recommends policy and procedures concerning information technology and resources.

d. Personnel Committee.

The Personnel Committee studies and recommends academic personnel policy and standards, including university-wide promotion and tenure criteria.

e. Research Council.

The Research Council recommends policies with respect to research activities, facilities, personnel, and patents to the vice president for Research.

2. Senate Curricular Committees and Councils.

Senate Curricular Committees govern college and university curricular and academic policies and procedures in cooperation with the College of Undergraduate Studies and/or the College of Graduate Studies. Committees and membership selection shall be made in accordance with the bylaws.

The Senate Curricular Committees and Councils are:

a. Undergraduate Council.

The Undergraduate Council reports to the Senate on undergraduate policy and curricular matters. The committees of the Undergraduate Council are:

i. Undergraduate Policy and Curriculum Committee

ii. Undergraduate Course Review Committee

b. Graduate Council.

The Graduate Council reports to the Senate on graduate policy and curricular matters. The committees of the Graduate Council are:

i. Graduate Policy Committee

ii. Graduate Appeals Committee

iii. Graduate Curriculum Committee

iv. Graduate Program Review and Awards Committee

3. Joint Committees and Councils.

Faculty involvement is important for the disposition of certain key university issues with academic and administrative implications. In the spirit of shared governance, these issues are dealt with by joint committees. These committees are established and dissolved by the president and the Senate. The faculty are represented by members nominated by the Committee on Committees. Composition of the joint committees and councils varies and is specified in the Senate bylaws. Joint committees, councils, or task forces shall report to the Senate and to the president or the responsible administrators designated in the bylaws. At any time, the president or Senate may evaluate the effectiveness of joint committees in conjunction with the Steering Committee. Through the mechanism established in Article IV of this *Constitution*, such committees may be mutually restructured. The committee responsibilities and membership are defined in the *Bylaws*, Section VIII.

The Joint Committees and Councils are:

a. Academic Calendar Committee.

The Academic Calendar Committee recommends to the provost and vice president for Academic Affairs regarding the academic calendar.

b. Admissions and Standards Committee.

The Admissions and Standards Committee considers appeals of admissions and readmissions of undergraduate students. Additionally, the committee considers appeals of decisions concerning administrative record changes made by the College of Undergraduate Studies for undergraduate students and the College of Graduate Studies for graduate students.

c. Commencements, Convocations, and Recognition Committee.

The Commencement, Convocations, and Recognitions Committee makes recommendations to the president and the provost and vice president for Academic Affairs regarding commencements, convocations, awards, honorary degrees, emeritus status, and other forms of recognition.

d. Faculty and Staff Benefits Committee.

The Faculty and Staff Benefits Committee recommends to the vice president for Administration and Finance on policies and programs that revise the benefits provided faculty and staff.

e. Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning Advisory Committee.

The Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning Advisory Committee makes recommendations to the Center director on professional improvement and instructional research activities that will enhance teaching and learning excellence and improve assessment and evaluation in all learning environments.

f. Faculty Senate Campus Safety and Security Committee.

The Faculty Senate Campus Safety and Security Committee evaluates and recommends policies concerning campus safety and security that will foster a