

**Faculty Senate Meeting**  
Minutes of  
**January 25, 2018**

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

**MINUTES**

A motion to approve the minutes of December 7, 2017 was made and seconded. The minutes were approved as recorded.

**RECOGNITION OF GUESTS**

Kristy McAllister, Coordinator, Academic Affairs Information and Publication Services  
Lucretia Cooney, Associate Director, Faculty Excellence

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Dr. Self welcomed David Nickerson as an interim senator for Xin Yan, Kent Butler as an interim senator for Nicole Damico, and Jim Beckman as an interim senator for Timothy Ravich. The three interim senators are serving during the Spring semester.

Resolution 2017-2018-2 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Undergraduate Policy and Curriculum and Undergraduate Course Review Committees; Resolution 2017-2018-3 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Undergraduate Common Program Oversight Committee; and Resolution 2017-2018-4 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Admissions and Standards Committee have been approved by the provost. The Faculty Senate website and the Bylaws have been updated.

We are working with administration to potentially change the coordination and management of the travel awards fund to support the University Travel Awards Committee. There are discussions about this being moved to Faculty Excellence next year. Regardless of this change, we are happy to report that the fund is being increased from \$35,000 to \$50,000 for the current year. Dr. Self expressed gratitude to the Office of Research, Faculty Excellence, and Academic Affairs for the assistance.

Motion and second made to allow Greg Schuckman, Assistant Vice President of University Relations to provide a Legislative update prior to the report of the provost due to time constraints.

Vote: all in favor; motion passes.

Motion and second made to amend the agenda by adding a discussion item in new business regarding the academic reorganization and the 2018-2019 Faculty Senate election.

Vote: all in favor; motion passes.

**OLD BUSINESS**

None.

## **LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

Mr. Schuckman introduced himself. He lives in Washington, D.C. and has represented UCF for the last seventeen years. The Student Government Association leaders were recently in Washington discussing student issues regarding the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA). The deadline is currently March 5 however, the president may provide an extension.

UCF has a federal priorities process where the faculty submit proposals for potential federal funding. This is a collaborative process between administration, faculty, and the trustees. Mr. Schuckman and Liz Klonoff co-chair the committee that reviews the proposals. The fiscal year for the federal budget starts October 1. The temporary budget expires in two weeks. Meanwhile, in early February, the president will submit the proposed budget for 2019-2020.

The federal state authorization is underway, which is of significant concern. The authorization defines the rules and eligibility for federal financial aid. UCF has \$93 million in pell grants and about \$250 million in student loans. They are discussing removing the in school interest subsidy for undergraduate Stafford loans, which would be detrimental to our students. They are also looking at eliminating work study programs and several other items that are problematic for students.

We don't know the fiscal impact of net neutrality yet, but there will be a fiscal impact. Because UCF provides online courses, the internet service providers (ISP) will probably charge a premium.

The legislative delegation in Orlando has changed with three freshman democrats. If you or your colleagues will be submitting a grant (except National Institute of Health or National Science Foundation) to a federal agency that is \$500,000 or more, it's probably a good idea to get a letter of support from a congressman endorsing the proposal. Mr. Schuckman indicated he would be glad to help in soliciting the endorsements.

## **REPORT OF THE PROVOST**

The provost was unavailable. Jana Jasinski provided the report of the provost.

### Academic Reorganization

The creation of the Lake Nona medical center and a new downtown campus presented two opportunities to strengthen our programs, better position our faculty, staff, and students for the future. The provost charged two task forces in August to make recommendations to realign our academic units and improve synergies and partnership opportunities in key areas of health care, urban innovation, education and communication, and new media. The task forces were led by Deborah German, Thad Seymour, and Elizabeth Dooley.

The changes mean the College of Education and Human Performance and the College of Health and Public Affairs will no longer exist. Two new colleges will be created that combines our strength in health care education, research, service, and partnerships; and

community facing programs and will thrive with opportunities downtown. A new interdisciplinary inter-college school will be formed with communication and new media programs that will redefine content creation, digital art, and communications for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The transition implementation teams are working now to ensure all changes occur smoothly for a transition date of July 2, 2018. The transition teams are working on a mechanism to continue to collect faculty feedback during the process. The Academic Health Sciences Center (AHSC) implementation team is led by Deborah German, the Urban, Innovation, and New Media implementation team is co-led by Sissi Carroll and Ross Wolf under the guidance of Thad Seymour. The new interdisciplinary school implementation team will be led by Robert Littlefield under Thad Seymour's guidance. Jeff Moore will serve as chair of the council that will govern the new school. Until July 2, each department will continue to operate as is, unless otherwise directed by a supervisor. The provost website (<https://provost.ucf.edu/bold-academic-vision/>) contains the original announcement, organizational charts, and frequently asked questions.

#### USA News Ranking

UCF is ranked #16 in Best Online Bachelor's Programs for 2018. UCF moved up from #36 last year. This demonstrates how we can have access, affordability, and quality in our programs. More than 80% of UCF students take at least one on-line course in any given semester. Online student credit hours are growing at about 2% per year. UCF's scale and excellence in digital learning was the focus of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation visit in October, and the foundation continues to look and recognize UCF's efforts in online education.

#### COACHE Survey

The initial COACHE survey was conducted in 2015. In early February, a follow-up survey will be sent out to determine if the initiatives implemented show any improvement. The survey will be open for two months. Please encourage your colleagues to complete the survey.

#### Provost Forums

Two forums were held during the Fall semester on Research and Graduate Studies and Faculty Prominence and Excellence. Currently our research awards are 23% higher than last year. Postdoctoral Scholars surpassed 100, up from 66 last year. UCF now has 1,009 tenured and tenure-track faculty, up 25% since 2014. UCF is on track to reach the 50% increase goal by 2020. We met the goal of 6 national academy members. UCF is taking the lead role to create a Florida Academy of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine with other State University System institutions. During 2017, 20% of the 65 tenured and tenure-track new faculty hired were from underrepresented groups. If the 20% underrepresented is maintained over the next three years, we can shift the nature of new faculty. This Fall semester, UCF reached 90% student retention. We have surpassed \$350 million in the Ignite campaign.

The forums scheduled for the Spring semester include:

**Student Success**

Dr. Elizabeth Dooley and Dr. Maribeth Ehasz

Wednesday, February 7, 2018

3:30 – 5:00 p.m.

Morgridge International Reading Center: Global Communications Room

**Funding and Philanthropy**

William Merck and Michael Morsberger

Tuesday, April 3, 2018

3:00 – 4:00 p.m.

Morgridge International Reading Center: Global Communications Room

The forums will be live streamed or can be viewed in the archive.

Provost College Visits

The half day college visits start with the College of Medicine on February 16. The provost will visit each college to learn what each college is doing to reach college-level goals.

Marchioli Collective Impact Innovation Award

Nominations for an innovative program or project that shows measurable outcomes and can be scaled is now open. Awardees will receive \$5,000 cash or a grant to continue their work. Applications can be submitted at <https://www.ucf.edu/strategic-plan/files/2018/01/UCF-Marchioli-Collective-Impact-Award-Nomination-Form.pdf>. The deadline for an application is March 9.

Collective Bargaining

The Board of Trustees ratified the agreement at the January 18 meeting. All in-unit faculty will receive a 2.25% increase, effective March 23 and a \$1,500 one-time payment on March 16 to make up for the delay. An equity increase will bring 9-month and 12-month faculty up to a minimum salary. Administrative discretion increases (ADI) will be continued until August. As soon as the agreement is ratified, we will use the ADI to address the equity adjustments for the 80 faculty identified in the salary gender study.

Question: Do we know what the student/faculty ratio is after all the new hires?

Answer: Will find out.

*Note: on January 26, the senate was emailed the following update: The current student/faculty ratio is 29.1 to 1. This is the first time the ratio has been below 30 since 2007.*

Question: If Jeff Moore is the chair of the council to govern the new inter-college interdisciplinary school, does that mean the college no longer has a dean?

Answer: All of the deans with faculty in the school and an equal number of elected faculty from the school make up the council. The provost is an ex-officio member of the council. Their role as dean does not change. Because this is the first year, Jeff Moore

has been appointed as the chair of the council for a 3-year term. Thereafter, the council would elect a chair from the deans on the council. The director of the school would meet on a regular basis with the chair of the council.

Question: How will this work for promotion and tenure or hiring decisions?

Answer: This will be addressed with the implementation team.

Question: If the retention rate is 90%, what is the graduation rate?

Answer: 75%

Comment: We should be focusing on graduation rate, making sure the students are persistent to obtain their degrees.

Comment: As a faculty member from the College of Education and Human Performance, I have grave concerns on procedural matters. I have asked if any senators were on the two task forces to assist in the decision making in the tsunami-like decisions made for the college. Only one faculty member from sports and exercise science was involved in the decision. Who played the devil's advocate? When people of like minds get together, it's a cocktail party, not the work of senators. Someone needed to say that the change was a horrible idea, especially when the main stakeholders were not present. I think the College of Health and Public Affairs was afforded time to discuss the options, but we were not treated the same way even though we are one of the oldest colleges in the world. The word innovation has become a fashionable word, but Education is at the end of it. Whenever you change a name, it can take months of discussion among faculty. If the provost was here, I would say; Sir, not too long ago you were leaving, now you're staying and the president is leaving. Shouldn't such a transformation at this massive level be left to the vision of our new president? Procedural matters done without regard to the education faculty is an insult, an assault to our history, our nation, our nature, and scholarship. I motion to put a moratorium on the organizational changes until the new president is hired. I hope the University of the 21<sup>st</sup> century is bold in strengthening collegial decision making, transparency, and grounded on the power of the faculty to make decisions before they are imposed.

Response: The Faculty Senate doesn't have the ability to impose a moratorium. The Senate can develop a resolution that would go to administration if passed. The resolution would need to be submitted to the Steering Committee for placement on the Senate agenda. The Senate would then review and vote on the resolution.

Response: The senator will develop a resolution with the faculty and given to the Steering member.

Request: Asked Dr. Jasinski to let the provost know of a concern over the name of the college. The use of the term "urban" in relation to the work that the College of Education and Human Performance limits what we do as a college. We are far beyond just urban educators, we have many initiatives in suburban and rural areas. The term really limits our potential and would like that to be made part of the discussion.

Question: For the equity raises, will the raise be before the 2.25% across the board or after? We feel it should be before the across the board raise and will be disappointed if the raise is after.

Answer: Not sure, I will ask.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### Resolution 2017-2018-5 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Governance in Academic Units

The resolution last year was denied by the provost. An informal working group led by Kevin Coffey modified the resolution.

Motion and second to approve Resolution 2017-2018-5 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Governance in Academic Units. Open for discussion.

Question: Does this mean each department must have bylaws?

Answer: Must have bylaws, but no requirement for what the bylaws contain. This would be similar in structure to the annual evaluation standards and procedures or tenure criteria.

Comment: Section B., line 22 indicates the opposite.

Response: It says what areas should be addressed, but does not mandate how the departments address each area.

Comment: The Constitution contained a one line statement indicating academic units should provide for faculty governance but didn't any rationale or guidelines for governance.

Question: Is there a date when bylaws have to be completed?

Answer: Not yet. I would expect the same rollout as the annual evaluation process.

Response: Dr. Jasinski indicated that once approved, Faculty Excellence would move to implementing, but it wouldn't be an overnight process.

Question: If the resolution was denied last year, has the concern been addressed?

Answer: Yes, the version last year had specific requirements that couldn't easily be implemented university-wide.

Question: With rapidly changing structures, I wonder if this document should contain mostly should instead of will?

Answer: Academic units involved in the restructuring wouldn't be required to create bylaws at this point.

Comment: The original intent of the resolution is to protect faculty, especially junior faculty. There are very few items in the resolution that must be done.

Comment: Support the resolution. Bylaws provide order with enough flexibility to put in what you want.

Comment: Concerned that we are too eager to impose additional work of the faculty. Some units have bylaws where others don't. Let the departments determine if they need bylaws. We shouldn't legislate when there is no need.

Comment: The approved resolution last year dealt with the will versus shall issue. I feel we are opening up the same discussion that we agreed to pass. Some units that need bylaws, and have spent two years drafting bylaws have submitted the bylaws through the ranks and now are being held up by Faculty Excellence since this resolution has not been passed yet.

Question: Line 46, does this refer to how items are posted, not that the budget is posted?

Answer: Exactly what is posted online should be determined by a majority vote.

Question: Is line 35 problematic in regards to what is in the Collective Bargaining Agreement and promotion and tenure?

Answer: Don't think so. What is in the bylaw goes to the chair, dean, and Faculty Excellence. If there is any conflict, it would be caught.

Comment: In regards to the effort. It is a lot of effort to develop bylaws from scratch. However, many units already have bylaws and since they will be posted, you can review all options and use one as a template.

Motion and second to approve Resolution 2017-2018-5 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Governance in Academic Units.

Vote: 1 opposed, remaining in favor; motion passes.

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

This resolution has been under discussion since the emergency Steering Committee meeting last summer. We had a rich discussion at the December meeting. The resolution is now up for discussion and vote.

Motion and second to approve Resolution 2017-2018-7 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, University Promotion and Tenure Committee and Procedures. Open for discussion.

Blake Scott provided a brief update on the committee work this year. As you can see by the handout, there is no clear pattern of all unanimous votes by any one college. This year, the committee had 63 applications to review, which is less than half of what is anticipated by 2019-2020. Of the 63, about 40 were unanimous votes. It did allow the committee to focus more on mixed-vote applications. The committee tried a slightly abbreviated write-up, but it still took two full days. We did have one application that received all unanimous votes, but the committee forwarded a negative recommendation. That had more to do with the lack of clarity of the criteria. Still in favor of the resolution as it will help the committee focus on the most important task, which is sorting through mixed-votes. This resolution does require a Regulation change that will not take effect until the 2019-2020 cycle.

Question: If the resolution passes, the one application that was unanimous this year that the committee forwarded a negative response would not have been looked at. I'm confused if this is a good or bad idea now.

Answer: The benefits outweigh the unusual case in five years that this occurred. The change would have worked in the faculty members benefit in this case.

Comment: The provost conducts a thorough review and would request the committee to review any application in question which the resolution allows.

Comment: In talking with other faculty, some view it as a loss of faculty governance. If we value as a faculty body our voice in reviewing potential future colleagues who may become permanent, and we give that up in the name of expedience, then that is a real loss.

Comment: We still have smaller colleges that will not be getting the critical review. It should be in the purview of the committee to decide how work is assigned.

Response: If applications are reviewed differently, it would open up the possibility of a law suit.

Comment: The current regulation requires committee members to review each case being voted.

Response: A small group could flag applications to be reviewed by the full committee.

Question: Is this the first step to eliminating the university committee in the future?

Answer: I think there would be very little support in eliminating the committee and mixed votes should absolutely be reviewed.

Question: Is there any other viable alternatives?

Answer: The resolution was developed by a Senate committee with faculty input. We considered alternatives by other universities. At no point did we consider eliminating the committee.

Comment: Departments have different criteria. The majority of the work is done at the department level. The most time consuming part is the write-ups. Maybe consider doing no write-up and just vote. If there is a concern, then a write-up can be done.

Comment: This weakens faculty governance. Don't care about law suits.

Comment: Decisions should be made by the department and colleges.

Motion and second to call for a vote. This has been debated over several meetings and everyone knows how they are going to vote.

Vote: all in favor; motion to call for a vote passes.

Motion and second to approve Resolution 2017-2018-7 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, University Promotion and Tenure Committee and Procedures.

Vote by hand count: 26 in favor, 17 opposed; motion passes.



### Resolution 2017-2018-9 Faculty Participation on University Committees

This resolution is the result of a topic list item developed over the summer. The resolution was developed by a Steering Ad Hoc Committee to ensure faculty participation on university committees, asks for a central list of committees, and requests that the Committee on Committees has a role in faculty participation. This was also an issue in the COACH survey results and other peers and aspirational universities are transparent with committee information.

Motion and second to amend line 22:

“2. Creating a clearinghouse that lists the membership and committee charge of all university committees, task forces, and working groups as identified in 1 above.”

Vote: All in favor; motion passes.

Question: What does “with the approval of the Faculty Senate Committee on Committees” mean on line 25? Does it mean the only way faculty can be solicited is through the Senate?

Answer: The intent is not to have the Committee on Committees approve every faculty appointment, but to review and possibly suggest other more appropriate faculty to the committee charge, or to suggest a rotation.

Comment: It asks the administration to develop a process for staffing the committees with the approval of the Committee on Committees.

Question: Does the approval relate to all three items or just item 3?

Answer: No, it only relates to item 3.

Comment: Item 3 needs to be re-written to clarify the intent.

Motion to amend line 24:

“Having the Faculty Senate Committee on Committees approve faculty participation on university committees, task forces, and working groups as identified in 1 above.”

No second; motion fails.

Comment: Line 20 should be modified to fix items 1, 2, and 3.

Comment: Really wanted number 3 moved to 1 to show Senate involvement.

Motion and second to table Resolution 2017-2018-9 Faculty Participation on University Committees to clarify language.

Vote: all in favor; motion passes.

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

After the Guidelines for Academic Units was passed last year, an Ad Hoc Committee was formed to develop guidelines for Centers and Institutes. The members included faculty in centers and institutes and college faculty. The group did extensive research and developed recommendations in the resolution and guidelines going forward. The resolution supports tenure in academic colleges and urges administration to work with

tenured and tenure-earning faculty in a center or institute to find a tenure home for the faculty within an academic unit.

Comment: This resolution is based on meetings with faculty leaders, Academic Program Quality, Institutional Knowledge Management, the Office of Research, and Faculty Excellence.

Comment: In favor of the resolution. Faculty that are tenured in centers or institutes lack most of the protection that academic unit faculty have.

Question: Where did the language come from on page two line 81 defining centers and institutes? I also thought Liz Klonoff was looking into the definitions.

Answer: Liz Klonoff was included in the development of the resolution and her feedback helped shape the resolution. The specific language came from looking at the Board of Governors and UCF Regulations, and research on how other universities define centers and institutes.

Question: Line 16, urges the administration to help find an academic home. Is there any procedure for this? Does the department have a role in this?

Answer: The department would probably vote on the faculty tenure home being moved. We aren't trying to dictate the process.

Question: What if the department votes no?

Answer: They would look for a different tenure home.

Comment: This would fall under the hiring process.

Question: These units that are not academic units that have tenured faculty and are in all but name, a department. If there is no other tenure home, the unit goes away and they lose the ability to have tenured faculty. Should we say in the resolution that if a tenure home can't be found that a catch all unit will be formed to cover them?

Answer: The way the Be It Resolved is worded, we don't say that, but understand the concern. We are suggesting that tenure going forward not be granted in a center or institute.

Question: So the alternative option is to make them an academic unit?

Answer: The goal of the Ad Hoc Committee was to define centers and institutes going forward. This group was all faculty from centers and institutes and colleges.

Comment: We need some kind of language to protect the faculty from being fired if a tenure home can't be found.

Motion and second to table the resolution.

Comment: Against the motion to table. This has been a problem for many years. We are asking administration to work out a solution. We know that Dr. Klonoff supports this and has already found solutions for many of the faculty.

Comment: Against the motion to table. This resolution came from a group of faculty working in the centers that unanimously said this is what they want. The university is working on ways to handle tenure homes, including the new interdisciplinary college.

Motion and second to table the resolution.

Quorum called. A quorum is not present. The resolution will be placed under old business for the next meeting.

#### Academic Reorganization and Faculty Senate Election

We currently have an academic structure that will exist until July 2. Senate elections are already underway. The call for elections has gone out to the colleges in the current academic structure. The new academic structure has at least two departments that will be in multiple colleges. Elections are by department or at-large seats for senators. We can't vote for senators in academic units that don't exist. For three colleges that are impacted, we are considering having the new senators elected to a 1-year term. This way, the college seats are appropriately allocated under the new structure.

Question: As an alternative, can we just maintain the current senate for the next year?

Answer: If you can get support, bring it to Steering.

Question: Since the unit will disappear July 2, wouldn't the senate seat no longer be valid and be voted in the new department?

Answer: Apportionment occurs once a year, on the first day of the Spring semester.

Comment: The interdisciplinary school with departments from the College of Arts & Humanities and College of Sciences will maintain departmental senators.

Comment: Being from the School of Visual Arts and Design that is moving downtown, we are overwhelmed and would support continuing the current senate for one year.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

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

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

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

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

### **SECTION IX. Governance in Academic Units**

A. Operation and Bylaws

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

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

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

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

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

*Approved by the Faculty Senate on January 25, 2018.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section VIII. Joint Committees and Councils

**University Promotion and Tenure Committee**

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

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

*Approved by the Faculty Senate on January 25, 2018.*