

MEMORANDUM

Date: January 18, 2018
TO: All Faculty Senate Members
FROM: William Self
Chair, Faculty Senate
SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Meeting on January 25, 2018

Meeting Date: Thursday, January 25, 2018
Meeting Time: 4:00 - 6:00 p.m.
Meeting Location: Student Union Key West, Room 218

AGENDA

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Approval of Minutes of *December 7, 2017***
4. **Announcements and Recognition of Guests**
5. **Report of the Provost**
6. **Old Business**
None.
7. **New Business**
 - Amendments/vote on resolutions.
 - Resolution 2017-2018-5 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Governance in Academic Units
 - Resolution 2017-2018-7 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, University Promotion and Tenure Committee and Procedures
 - Resolution 2017-2018-9 Faculty Participation on University Committees
 - Resolution 2017-2018-11 Guidelines for Centers and Institutes at the University of Central Florida
 - Advance Notice of Resolution 2017-2018-10 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Faculty Staff & Benefits Committee Membership brought forward by the Steering Committee for the February 22 Senate meeting, allowing 30-days to review prior to discussion.
 - Legislative Update – *Greg Schuckman*

8. Committee Reports

- Budget and Administrative Committee – *Kimi Sugaya*
- Information Technology Committee – *Reid Oetjen*
- Parking, Transportation and Safety Committee – *Ahmad Elshennawy*
- Personnel Committee – *Stephen King*
- Graduate Council – *Jim Moharam*
- Undergraduate Council – *Nina Orlovskaya*

9. Other Business

10. Adjournment

Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes of
December 7, 2017

William Self, chair, called the meeting to order at 4:31 p.m. The roll was circulated for signatures.

MINUTES

A motion to approve the minutes of November 16, 2017 was made and seconded. The minutes were approved as recorded.

RECOGNITION OF GUESTS

Lucretia Cooney, Associate Director, Faculty Excellence
Jana Jasinski, Interim Vice Provost for Faculty Excellence
Katie Wyche, Assistant Director of Marketing and Communications, Faculty Excellence
Karla Amaro, IT Business Analyst, Faculty Excellence

ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

REPORT OF THE PROVOST

None.

NEW BUSINESS

This meeting was scheduled for the sole purpose of discussing Resolution 2017-2018-7 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, University Promotion and Tenure Committee and Procedures. The resolution will be up for possible amendment and vote at the January meeting. The resolution is open for discussion.

Dr. Scott provided an overview and answered questions raised at the November meeting. The resolution was developed after thorough discussion, research, and consideration of various alternatives by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Personnel Committee. We started by considering the most important role of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Research on how other universities handle promotion and tenure varied around the country. The committee examined UCF cases over the past four years. We also did a comparison between university recommendations and the provost's decisions over the past four years. There were only fifteen cases that were different. Fourteen were promotion to full professor, of which twelve had negative recommendations by the committee and positive outcomes by the provost. This suggests that the solution proposed would have little to no chance of changing this. Ohio State, Michigan State, Minnesota, Washington, Texas, Syracuse, and other universities don't have a review by a university committee. Some of these universities review cases referred to a committee by the provost, which is part of our proposal. Regarding the position of

the United Faculty of Florida (UFF) Chapter leadership, the contract only requires notification for an opportunity to discuss changes to proposed criteria, not to process or procedure. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee as an advisory committee, makes recommendations to the provost and the provost makes the final decision. Faculty Excellence would modify the UCF Regulation, which is open to review by the university community, including UFF. The option presented preserves the primary role of the committee, which is to sort through the mixed or split votes. This option also has the biggest impact on committee workload and the least chance of having committee members insert bias into the process.

Comment: A colleague in my department suggested instead of bypassing the committee, give the committee the ability to waive the right to review unanimous cases. That way, the change isn't a permanent change to what might be a temporary problem. Specifically, line 34:

“... Tenure Committee ~~will~~ may bypass the committee and be forwarded directly from the Dean's review to the Provost until such time it is no longer necessary.

The language on line 43 for “assigned” would also need to be changed.

Comment: There are many cases where committees have to review extensive information by sampling. They assign people to review certain files and flag any files that the whole committee needs to review. That could be one way of handling the workload without changing the bylaws or Regulation. The university level committee exists because a couple of colleges only have one department or have a small number of departments and want someone else to review the files, and in general to raise the standard across the university. There could be instances where a person bypasses the committee with unanimous votes, however, later issues arise that wouldn't be raised at the college level, but should have been caught at the university level. I question if the change is necessary since the committee can set their own rules.

Comment: The idea of sampling wouldn't require a bylaw change, but would require a change in the UCF Regulation, which requires committee members to review all files.

Dr. Self would like to determine if any colleges had all applicants with unanimous votes for 8 years in a row. What fraction of the colleges would the university review?

Question: Do we still need a university committee? The university has a wide range of disciplines. The departments and colleges should decide on their faculty. I'm also concerned about the fairness if one group gets a bypass.

Response: The Personnel Committee discussed whether the university needs the committee or not, but felt this was not the time to debate the question.

Comment: I haven't seen any evidence that any unanimous votes from the department and college resulted in the university committee denying promotion or tenure.

Response: I think there are some cases.

Comment: With the varied professions, if I were on the committee, I would defer to the expert from the appropriate college. In unanimous cases, I would not question the validity of the college and not question the college's decision.

Response: You need objectivity of the committee, especially for small units. Different biases can filter up through the department to the college level. The university committee weeds out the politics.

Response: The proposal gives the committee more time to review the mixed or split votes and those cases that interpreted the criteria differently.

Question: Does this resolution preclude an applicant from asking for a review for a unanimous vote?

Answer: The Personnel Committee discussed the option, but could not identify how losing the ability would hurt the candidate.

Question: What about allowing the committee to request a file is reviewed?

Answer: The committee discussed this too, but this would result in members reviewing all the files.

Comment: Many organizations handle large workloads with a reasonable number of people. There may be instances where a department and college don't want the extra review because the faculty member is valuable even though they might not meet the standards for research or service. If the college only has one department, the university committee is the only oversight for review.

Comment: Faculty candidates going through this process should know what the process looks like from the beginning. It has to be transparent.

Question: Do any senators with experience on the University Promotion and Tenure committee have any comments or opinions?

Comment: The workload wasn't an issue two years ago with only 42 applicants. Last year there were 79 applicants, and 63 this year. The number of applicants will raise dramatically by 2020.

Comment: We could review all the unanimous applicants, just not at the same level of detail as the mixed or split votes. If the cursory review raises a flag, then it can be reviewed by the whole committee.

Comment: I support streamlining the process. If we support faculty governance, we must have faith in our colleagues within the department that know the criteria the best, to make the right decision.

Comment: I had a conversation with the previous chair of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, and he fully supports the resolution.

Comment: This is a permanent solution for a temporary problem that emphasizes the number of applicants. The influx of applications is a temporary influx.

Response: It can be changed in the future.

Response: This isn't a temporary problem. The College of Medicine plans to grow massive numbers of faculty and departments with Medical City. The workload for the committee will only increase in the long term.

Comment: We can think of this as a clarification of the role of the committee. The primary role of the committee is to help the provost sort through the mixed or split votes. This would be a permanent solution to a permanent charge.

Question: Does the provost have any thoughts or opinions on this subject?

Answer: This is a faculty committee issue. I spend less time reviewing the unanimous applicants versus the mixed or split votes, where I read every page. I think this is more about taking the time to review what needs to be reviewed. We've hired over 520 new faculty in the past three years and are hiring 120 this year. We have an 8-year pipeline ahead of us and the number of faculty will continue to grow.

No other discussion. Dr. Self reminded the senators to bring enough copies of an amendment to the January meeting or email the Faculty Senate office.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

None.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

	2016-17		2015-16		2014-15		2013-14	
	# of Applications	All Unanimously Approved?*	# of Applications	All Unanimously Approved?*	# of Applications	All Unanimously Approved?*	# of Applications	All Unanimously Approved?*
Arts and Humanities	10	No	8	YES	5	No	8	No
Business Administration	5	No	1	No	0	No	1	No
Education & Human Performance	4	No	4	No	7	No	4	YES
Engineering & Computer Science	12	No	7	No	2	No	4	No
Health & Public Affairs	6	No	3	No	2	No	4	No
Medicine	7	No	6	No	6	No	6	No
Nursing	3	No	1	YES - ONLY 1	0	N/A	0	N/A
Optics & Photonics	3	No	0	N/A	0	N/A	2	No
Rosen	6	No	1	YES - ONLY 1	0	N/A	0	No
Sciences	13	No	10	No	9	No	7	No
Centers & Institutes	10	No	0	N/A	1	YES - ONLY 1	0	N/A

*Through college level

1 **Resolution 2017-2018-5 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Governance**
2 **in Academic Units**

3 **Whereas**, the *Faculty Senate Constitution* contains Article VII. Governance in Academic Units, specifying that
4 each academic unit of the university shall provide for non-administrative faculty representation in its
5 governance; and

6 **Whereas**, the *Bylaws* do not provide details regarding governance in Academic Units; therefore

7 **BE IT RESOLVED** that the *Bylaws* of the *Faculty Constitution* be amended as follows to include a new Section
8 IX. Governance in Academic Units with the Constitution Article VII automatically updated to reflect, as set
9 forth in Senate Bylaws, Section IX:

10 **SECTION IX.**
11 **Governance in Academic Units**

12 A. Operation and Bylaws

13 Each academic unit, and departments and schools whose leader holds an administrative
14 appointment, must operate according to written bylaws approved by a majority of the unit's general
15 faculty. The unit's general faculty is defined in Faculty Senate Bylaws *Section I. Definition of Faculty*
16 and typically includes the leader of the unit. The unit's bylaws will be approved by the unit faculty,
17 the unit leader, and appropriate Dean (or equivalent). The Dean will have the Office of Faculty
18 Excellence review the bylaws to ensure compliance with university policy. When fully approved, the
19 bylaws will be posted electronically by the Office of Faculty Excellence in a manner accessible and
20 easily navigable by all unit faculty. The unit bylaws will be reapproved and revised (as needed) every
21 five years or whenever requested by a majority of the unit faculty.

22 B. The unit bylaws shall at least include the following topics:

- 23 a. Frequency of Meetings - Meetings of Department/School faculty will be regularly called by
24 and presided over by the leader. Their frequency will depend on the needs and usages of
25 the units. At least one meeting per semester shall be held. Chairs and directors in colleges
26 with multiple units should meet at least monthly with the college dean.
- 27 b. Meeting Rules - Unit meetings should run according to the latest edition of *Robert's Rules of*
28 *Order*, or other rules as specified in the unit's bylaws (note the quorum and recusal rules
29 therein).
- 30 c. Faculty-called Meetings - The faculty in a Department/School shall be entitled to call a
31 special meeting with a specific agenda upon presentation to the appropriate leader of such
32 a request of one-third of the Department/School faculty. The special faculty meeting shall
33 occur within five business days of the presented request if reasonably possible.
- 34 d. Membership and Voting - All general faculty should attend and participate in unit meetings.
35 The unit bylaws must designate voting rights.
- 36 e. Records - Proposed meeting agendas must be provided to the faculty by the leader in
37 advance of the meetings. Minutes must be circulated to the members before the next
38 meeting and offered for approval at the next meeting. Agendas and approved minutes must
39 be posted electronically in a manner accessible and easily navigable by all unit faculty. A
40 shared drive or unit intranet is the preferred means for information sharing.

- 41 f. Except for records deemed confidential under law or university policy, leaders must not
42 keep unit records confidential from unit faculty. As requested by unit faculty, records must
43 be posted electronically in a manner accessible to all unit faculty.
- 44 g. Unit policies and bylaws; unit budgets; formal plans; unit meeting agendas, minutes, and
45 exhibits; unit committee records (including membership, agendas, minutes, and exhibits); as
46 determined by a majority of the faculty of each unit, must be posted online in a manner
47 accessible and easily navigable by all unit faculty.
- 48 h. Upon the request of unit faculty, other public data relevant to unit members should be
49 posted electronically in a manner accessible and easily navigable by all unit faculty.
- 50 C. Steering Committee
- 51 Each unit is strongly encouraged to have a steering or executive committee of senior faculty to
52 advise the unit leadership.

Approved by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee on October 5, 2017.

1 **Resolution 2017-2018-7 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, University Promotion and**
2 **Tenure Committee and Procedures**

3
4 **Whereas**, the university has, in recent years, markedly increased the number of tenure-line faculty
5 hired, resulting in an increase from 43 to 79 applications reviewed by the University Promotion and
6 Tenure committee between 2015-2016 and 2016-2017; and

7
8 **Whereas**, Faculty Excellence projects the University Promotion and Tenure committee’s caseload to
9 steadily increase to over 120 applications by 2020-2021; and

10
11 **Whereas**, the University Promotion and Tenure Committee estimates the maximum number of
12 applications to review to be around 50 for a reasonable caseload; and

13
14 **Whereas**, one of the primary roles of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee is to advise the
15 Provost about applications that have received conflicting evaluations and votes at earlier steps of the
16 review process; and

17
18 **Whereas**, applications forwarded to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee having received
19 unanimous positive votes at all previous levels comprise a substantial percentage of the University and
20 Promotion Committee’s caseload (38 out of 79 in 2016-2017) and would not need this committee’s
21 evaluation of conflicting evaluations; and

22
23 **Whereas**, all applications between 2013-2017 that received unanimous positive votes at all levels
24 before the University Promotion and Tenure Committee review were approved by the Provost and UCF
25 BOT; and

26
27 **Whereas**, bypassing the University Promotion and Tenure Committee for all applications that have
28 received unanimous positive votes at all previous levels—that is, forwarding such cases directly from
29 the Dean’s review to the Provost—would enable the University committee to maintain a reasonable
30 workload and focus on applications that most need its evaluation; therefore

31
32 **Be it resolved** that, beginning in the 2018-2019 promotion and tenure cycle, all tenure-line promotion
33 and tenure cases that receive unanimously positive votes at all levels before the University Promotion
34 and Tenure Committee will bypass this committee and be forwarded directly from the Dean’s review
35 to the Provost. The Provost may still ask the University Promotion and Tenure Committee to review
36 any such tenure-line cases if he/she needs the committee’s advisement about them; and

37
38 **Be it further resolved** that the *Bylaws* of the *Faculty Constitution* be amended as follows:

39
40 Section VIII. Joint Committees and Councils

41 **University Promotion and Tenure Committee**

42 1. Duties and Responsibilities.

- 43 a. To review and evaluate all **assigned** applications for promotion and tenure and make
44 recommendations to the provost and executive vice president.

Approved by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee on November 2, 2017.

1 **Resolution 2017-2018-10 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Faculty**
2 **Staff & Benefits Committee Membership**

3
4 **Whereas**, the Faculty & Staff Benefits Committee makes recommendations on policies and programs
5 and other benefits and services provided faculty and staff; and
6

7 **Whereas**, the current membership includes a faculty member from each academic unit, seven USPS staff
8 members, and one retired faculty member and one retired staff member of the UCF Retirement
9 Association; and
10

11 **Whereas**, the Faculty & Staff Benefits Committee recommends modifying the committee membership
12 to include an A&P employee to enable their input to discussion and decisions; therefore
13

14 **BE IT RESOLVED** that the Bylaws of the Faculty Constitution be amended as follows:
15

16 Faculty and Staff Benefits Committee

17 2. Membership

18 The committee shall consist of one faculty member from each academic unit, selected by the
19 Committee on Committees, seven staff members selected by the USPS Staff Council, one A&P
20 employee selected by the Associate Vice President & Chief Human Resources Officer, and two
21 members from the Retiree's Association (one retired faculty and one retired staff) nominated by
22 the president of the UCF Retirement Association. ~~The A~~ benefits coordinator representative
23 from the Office of Human Resources and the Associate Vice President & Chief Human Resources
24 Officer (or designee) director of Human Resources shall serve as ex officio members. The chair is
25 appointed annually by the Associate Vice President & Chief Human Resources Officer ~~director of~~
26 Human Resources from the faculty members of the committee. Terms of service shall be two
27 years, staggered.

Approved by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee on January 11, 2018.

1 **Resolution 2017-2018-11 Guidelines for Centers and Institutes at the**
2 **University of Central Florida**

3
4 **Whereas**, in 2016-2017 the Faculty Senate passed resolution 2016-2017-14
5 Guidelines for Academic Structure at the University of Central Florida; and

6
7 **Whereas**, these guidelines emphasized the need for tenure to be granted in
8 Departments and Schools within the academic unit structure at UCF (Colleges); and

9
10 **Whereas**, faculty traditionally have tenure homes in academic departments or
11 similar units; therefore

12
13 **BE IT RESOLVED** that the Faculty Senate supports tenure being granted only within
14 established Departments or Schools that fall within an academic college (including
15 Graduate Studies and Undergraduate Studies) at UCF, in line with the previous
16 resolutions of the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate urges the administration to
17 work with faculty who are tenured or tenure-earning in a research center or
18 institute to find a tenure home within an academic unit (Department or School
19 within a College); and

20
21 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Faculty Senate supports the following
22 guidelines for centers and institutes at UCF, and that these guidelines be appended
23 to the original guidelines for academic structure at the University of Central Florida.
24 In addition these guidelines are supplementary to the definitions of centers and
25 institute in [BOG Reg 10.015](#) and [UCF Reg 2.035](#).

26
27 **Definitions of Centers and Institutes**

28
29 **Existing Definitions from [BOG Reg 10.015](#) (repeated in [UCF Reg 2.035](#))**

- 30 a) State of Florida Institute or Center: An entity with statewide mission, that
31 may include two or more State universities, established to coordinate inter-
32 institutional research, service, and teaching across the State University
33 System. State of Florida institutes and centers must be approved by the
34 Board of Governors. State of Florida institutes and centers' operational
35 budgets reside within the bases of their host institutions; additional budget
36 requests must be reviewed by the Council of Academic Vice Presidents
37 (CAVP), and only those with a positive recommendation are carried forward
38 to the Board of Governors for consideration.
- 39 b) University Institute or Center: An entity that is generally established by a
40 single university to coordinate institutional research, service, and/or
41 educational/training activities that enhance existing instruction, research,
42 and service at the university. The budget of a university institute or center
43 and any requests for additional funding are wholly within the purview of the
44 host university.
- 45 c) Exclusions: There are entities that use the term "Institute" or "Center" in
46 their titles, as well as some other service units, that are excluded from this
47 policy. Examples of these units include the Institute of Food and Agricultural

48 Sciences (IFAS); the University of Florida Health Sciences Center; the
49 University of South Florida Health Sciences Center; the Florida State
50 University Health Sciences Center; the Florida Mental Health Institute;
51 incorporated institutes and centers with university affiliations, such as the
52 Institute for Human and Machine Cognition and the H. Lee Moffitt Cancer
53 Center and Research Institute; and university advising, student health,
54 computing, and certain other centers. However, excluded entities such as
55 IFAS and the health sciences centers may have institutes or centers under
56 their purview that are covered by the policies referenced in this document.
57

58 *Note that exclusions listed include major university medical divisions and student*
59 *service units. The definitions also exclude faculty support units and auxiliary units.*
60

61 **Proposed Criteria and Definitional Language for Centers and Institutes**

62 UCF's centers and institutes are formally recognized university entities established
63 to enhance research and possibly educational and/or public service efforts to fulfill
64 the university's mission and goals. They generally meet the following criteria:

- 65 ✓ The unit coordinates and supports research and/or creative activities (and,
66 accordingly, fits the definition of an organized research unit), and can also
67 conduct instruction/training, public service, and/or other activities.
- 68 ✓ The unit has a distinct mission and activities that are closely tied to the
69 university's mission and goals.
- 70 ✓ The unit conducts continuing work in a well-defined area, and work that
71 would be more difficult to undertake if the unit did not exist.
- 72 ✓ The university has existing strengths aligned with the unit.
- 73 ✓ The unit's budget and operations are overseen by the university, and the unit
74 is typically supported, at least in part, by recurring external funding (e.g.,
75 from grants/contracts or legislative appropriations).
- 76 ✓ Faculty are not tenured in the unit unless it is also an academic unit such as a
77 college or school.

78
79 UCF uses the following definitions to generally distinguish between centers and
80 institutes:

- 81 • **Centers** are single or multidisciplinary units organized to support research
82 and, in some cases, other interdisciplinary activities around a specific topic
83 or issue. They are typically characterized by a narrower scope and less
84 autonomy than institutes, they are typically located within colleges/schools
85 or institutes, and they typically have recurring external funding. Some also
86 have dedicated administrative staff, commitments from faculty (FTE), and
87 evidence of long-term sustainability.
- 88 • **Institutes** are generally multidisciplinary units organized to support
89 research and, in some cases, other interdisciplinary activities around a
90 cluster of related topics or issues. Institutes are generally characterized by
91 more organizational stability, research program autonomy, and a broader
92 scope of focus than centers. They often have recurring external funding from
93 multiple sources, dedicated administrative staff, commitments from faculty
94 (FTE), and evidence of long-term sustainability.

95

96 **Types of UCF Centers and Institutes**

97 UCF acknowledges the following four types of centers and institutes, distinguished
98 in part by their levels of registration and oversight.

99

100 ***Type 1: State of Florida Centers and Institutes***

101 These centers and institutes meet the definition and requirements listed in “a” from
102 BOG Regulation 10.015 (see above). In some instances they are established as a
103 result of legislative intent. If hosted by UCF, they must be approved by the Office of
104 Research and Commercialization (ORC), the UCF provost, the UCF president, the
105 UCF BOT, and the BOG. They must be registered with the BOG, and are overseen at
106 UCF by ORC. They must submit annual reports to the BOG and to ORC and the UCF
107 provost (or designee), and they must undergo cyclical review at least every five
108 years.

109

110 ***Type 2: State University System (SUS) Centers and Institutes***

111 These centers and institutes meet the definition and requirements listed in “b” from
112 BOG Regulation 10.015 (see above). They must be approved by ORC, the UCF
113 provost, and the UCF president. They must be registered with the BOG, and are
114 overseen at UCF by ORC. They must submit annual reports to the BOG and to ORC
115 and the UCF provost (or designee), and they must undergo cyclical review at least
116 every seven years. These units generally have a primary research, development or
117 capacity building, and/or commercialization mission; some may additionally have a
118 service delivery mission. They are generally supported by legislative line-item
119 appropriations and/or other recurring external funding.

120

121 ***Type 3: UCF Recognized Centers and Institutes***

122 These units are recognized by UCF as centers and institutes and meet UCF’s criteria
123 (see above), but they do not meet the BOG definition and therefore are not
124 registered with or report to the BOG; accordingly they do not submit annual BOG
125 reports or undergo BOG-required cyclical review.

126

127 They must be approved by ORC. They must submit annual reports to UCF
128 accounting for their mission and location; ORC determines with their home colleges
129 (and other units, if applicable) the appropriate lines of reporting and oversight.
130 Their range of primary missions includes research and/or creative activity, public
131 service/outreach, and dual research and public service.

132

133 ***Type 4: Exclusions***

134 Because they do not meet BOG and UCF definitions and criteria, UCF views these
135 units as centers or institutes in name only. Accordingly, they do not require state or
136 university-level registration or oversight. However, any unit not already using and
137 wishing to use the term “center” or “institute” in their names must seek and receive
138 approval from Academic Affairs to do so. They are overseen by and report to their
139 UCF home unit (e.g., college, school, and/or department).

140

141 Examples of excluded centers and institutes include service units that primarily
 142 provide services to the UCF community, research support units for UCF faculty,
 143 units that provide student awards and exchanges, public service units without a
 144 significant research element, auxiliary units, and buildings or facilities. Existing
 145 excluded centers and institutes, and units wishing to use the term “center” or
 146 “institute” in their names are strongly encouraged to consider whether the unit
 147 meet’s UCF’s definitions and criteria (see above) and whether one of the following
 148 designations would be more suitable:

- 149 • **Research groups, collaboratives or alliances** are generally groups of
 150 investigators aligned around a shared topic or set of topics, but are less
 151 formally and tightly connected than clusters.
- 152 • **Initiatives** are generally units organized to complete limited-term projects
 153 or efforts with specific foci and objectives. They typically do not have
 154 separate administrative structures but can involve members of multiple
 155 units and distinct resources, budgets, and lines of funding. (*e.g., UCF Literacy
 156 Initiative*)
- 157 • **Offices** are generally permanent units organized to oversee and administer a
 158 specific set of ongoing duties and/or services. They can range from
 159 university-level administrative or support units to units that support colleges
 160 or departments.
- 161 • **Consortia** are generally partnerships among institutions (higher ed, public,
 162 private) that cooperate and/or combine resources around a shared problem
 163 or issue. (*e.g., Florida Consortium of Metropolitan Research Universities*)
- 164 • **Programs**
- 165 • **Laboratories**

167 The following table summarizes UCF’s types of centers and institutes and their
 168 corresponding registration, approval, oversight, and reporting requirements:

<i>Level</i>	<i>Registered with BOG?</i>	<i>Approval/Disbandment</i>	<i>Oversight</i>	<i>Reporting</i>
State of Florida	Yes	ORC/Provost/President/CAVP/BOT/BOG	ORC/Provost (Designee)	BOG, Annual & 5
SUS	Yes	ORC/Provost/President (Notify BOG)	ORC/Provost (Designee)	BOG, Annual & 7
UCF Recognized	No	ORC	ORC/College	Annual (Internal)
Exempt	No	AA	Internal Unit	Internal Unit

Approved by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee on January 11, 2018.