

**Emergency Faculty Senate Steering Committee Meeting**  
Minutes of  
**June 24, 2015**

Keith Koons, chair, called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. The roll was circulated for signatures. Recognized Robert Folger, CBA and Bari Hoffman-Ruddy, COHPA on conference call. Quorum was established.

While waiting on Provost Whittaker, Dr. Koons communicated the purpose of the emergency meeting was to discuss the May 27, 2015 letter from the Provost regarding Faculty Senate Resolution 2007-2008-5 Appointment and Evaluation of School Directors and Department Chairs (Revised). Dr. Koons informed the attendees that he responded to the Provost expressing concern and asking for clarification on four main points:

1. Authority. The Faculty Senate is an advisory body to the president and provost of the university. Resolutions passed by the Senate are delivered to the provost, who has the authority and responsibility to approve or veto them. However, any authority for the provost to nullify a resolution from a previous year which has been approved by a previous provost and incorporated into official UCF policy is not stated in the Constitution.
2. Intent. Senate Resolution 2007-2008-5 provides an important voice for faculty in the appointment and reappointment of chairs and directors – their immediate supervisors. By taking out that opportunity for faculty input, the concept and benefits of shared faculty governance are diminished.
3. Rationale. The letter dated May 27, 2015 stated a conflict with Article 4 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Article 4 speaks about management rights of the Board of Trustees. How is this a conflict with faculty input on chairs and directors?
4. Current enforcement of policies. The letter stated a conflict with current hiring practices. By approving 2007-2008-5, Provost Hickey took the step of adopting the elements of the resolution as official UCF policy. It seems that current hiring practices should follow approved policy, not the other way around.

Dr. Koons welcomed Provost Whittaker and informed him of what transpired in the meeting thus far.

#### **MINUTES**

Motion to approve the minutes of April 9, 2015 was made and seconded. The minutes were approved as recorded.

#### **RECOGNITION OF GUESTS**

Stephen Kuebler, Faculty Senator, COS, Chemistry  
Joseph Harrington, Faculty Senator, COS, Physics  
Elsie Olan, Faculty Senator, CEDHP, School of Teaching, Learning and Leadership  
Bob Jones, Faculty Senator, CAH, School of Visual Arts and Design  
Lucretia Cooney, Faculty Excellence  
Sherry Andrews, Associate General Counsel, General Counsel's Office  
Diane Chase, Vice Provost, Academic Program Quality  
Manoj Chopra, Interim Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies

## **OLD BUSINESS**

There is no old business.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

Dr. Koons turned the floor over to Provost Whittaker. The Provost first clarified principles of faculty voice and selection of a chair. The hiring authority has the ultimate responsibility and accountability for choosing the best person for the position. The most important stakeholder group is the faculty. Faculty have to provide their voice to the hiring manager in order for the hiring manager to make a reasonable choice. The point of discussion are the words “vote” and “public vote.” What are the best ways for faculty voice to be expressed to a hiring manager? In dean searches, he prefers to receive the summarized input from committees so individual input is protected since all records are open to public record.

The Provost requested the Steering Committee reconsider the resolution and consider what the best mechanism is for allowing faculty input, and to what point the input is recorded. Faculty do vote on the tenure for external candidates. He suggested a discussion on the nature of the word “vote.”

The Provost agreed to limit the conversation to Directors and Chairs since the level of faculty input for a Dean is different than the current issue. Discussion continued on the following points:

- Voting process in the resolution is not a binding vote; advisory in nature. Why is the vote problematic? The resolution does not specify the vote to be anonymous, instead allows departments to formulate procedures; allowing potential for variability. Having the hired candidate know faculty were not in favor of hiring. Discussion continued on a candidate or hired chair knowing the vote; whether the vote is anonymous; internal versus external; pros and cons.
- The terminology used in a vote (e.g., outstanding, acceptable, unacceptable), and how hiring managers interpret.
- Resolution compels all departments to vote. He prefers we not require every department to vote.
- Faculty allowed to vote; different in reappointment and search process.
- Resolution was implemented in Faculty Handbook. According to Sherry Andrews, Associate General Counsel, the Faculty Handbook is not University policy. Policy would have to be formulated and go through the University Policy or Regulation Development procedure.
- Once a Faculty Senate Resolution is passed and accepted by administration, follow-up and implementation is up to administration not the Faculty Senate. The specific procedures should be handled by each college and the Provost. Resolution 2010-2011-5 Revision to Policy Concerning Appointment and Evaluation of Chairs and Directors asked for clarity; also not implemented.

- Confusion surrounding search votes, hiring votes with tenure for external candidates, and internal hiring votes.
- Lack of procedures and inconsistent college communication of appointment of directors and chairs (how selected, why recommended not selected, etc.). Annual evaluation of chairs not happening consistently. Lack of faculty recourse.
- Currently, feedback in some form is given, but the resolution is not implemented in colleges. Should be same feedback as the 5-year or annual review or same procedure as tenure.
- Resolution allows colleges to determine at what point the faculty vote is reviewed (e.g., to the search committee, to the dean after the search committee recommends, etc.). The Provost prefers the input go through the search committee.
- The Provost is uncomfortable with the word “vote,” “recorded vote,” or defining which faculty provide feedback. Is more comfortable with text feedback or even compelling feedback.

A suggestion was made to the Provost that he can take the current resolution and direct the deans to develop procedures that he would support.

Motion made to send this issue to the Personnel Committee to include anonymous feedback, guidelines not clear enough and not practiced. Motion seconded.

Discussion continued regarding the previous bullet points and whether the issue should be sent to the Personnel Committee. An approved resolution in the past can't be changed, a new resolution would need to be formulated. Would be helpful to know the intent of the resolution (search or hiring).

Clarify motion: draft multiple resolutions including: hiring, reappointment, 5-year review, and annual review.

Senate needs to work with Administration so the Senate is notified when a resolution is implemented into policy, regulation, or procedures. The university community also needs to know of changes.

The Provost requested a revised resolution that articulates principles, keeps the request simple and flexible, and includes a mechanism where violations are handled. He was asked to compel the deans to come up with policies.

Question: Is there anywhere where the status of Faculty Senate resolutions is defined as permanent and binding? It seems like the only way a resolution can't be revoked is if it's in official UCF policy. Dr. Koons expressed the expectation is after a resolution is approved by the senate and the provost, action is taken by administration to implement the policy, procedure or confirm acceptance, if just a statement. The Provost agreed with the expectation and indicated that this resolution is too ambiguous to accept or deny. He indicated that what is missing is his feedback to the Senate once accepted on how administration will proceed.

Motion and second was made to send the topic to the Personnel committee. Motion repeated for conference callers. Vote: four opposed, motion passes. Topic will be sent to the Personnel committee at the start of the 2015-2016 senate session.

Clarification: The Provost was asked if he discussed the issue with the chair or other senate leadership prior to sending the memo. He indicated no, and that he should have.

Suggestion made to appoint a Parliamentarian in charge of clarifying procedures. Dr. Koons indicated it is up to the chair to appoint a Parliamentarian and asked everyone to let him know if they were interested.

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

No other business.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Motion to adjourn made and seconded. The committee adjourned at 10:32 a.m.

**John N. Gardner Institute for Excellence in Undergraduate Education**  
**Review of Undergraduate Education at the University of Central Florida**  
Summary Findings and Recommendations

**PURPOSE:**

This report summarizes an external evaluation of UCF's coordination of undergraduate education and Office of Undergraduate Studies from the John N. Gardner Institute in December 2014. Commissioned by the Provost and the Vice President for Student Development and Enrollment Services (SDES), the review assessed the current structure of Undergraduate Studies and provided recommendations for new organizational directions for undergraduate education to advance UCF's goals and its primary focus on moving to a 21st-century model of undergraduate education emphasizing *excellence, innovation and distinction* within and beyond the state of Florida.

**KEY FINDINGS:**

The review found great uncertainty and lack of clarity about the mission, purposes and organizational structure for Undergraduate Studies as a unit that transcends the academic colleges and therefore undergraduate education at UCF. These findings are in contradiction to the high level of importance given to undergraduate education in President Hitt's five key goals for UCF, and contrast with the clearly understood mission of SDES in promoting academic student success. The review also found disproportionate attention the current structure provides graduate education, given the gross number of undergraduate students versus graduate students (about 51,000 vs. 9,000) and the nature of structure that supports graduate education (a College) versus the structure that supports undergraduate education (currently an Office).

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

A summary of the report's recommendations are grouped into four themes –

**Creation of a College**

The Office of Undergraduate Studies should be elevated to a College in parallel with the College of Graduate Studies, and the dean position should be regarded as one with a level of authority, status and access to the highest levels of university leadership and officers for decision-making and resource allocation.

Undergraduate Studies should be reconstituted as a College to provide the normal administrative structure that could allow for future faculty appointments or joint appointments as appropriate to degrees and certificates offered by the College.

## **Curricular Leadership**

The most important overarching role of the Undergraduate Studies is to enhance, complement, strengthen and support undergraduate education across the university and existing colleges.

Undergraduate Studies should serve as the academic home and degree-awarding College for students enrolled in selected interdisciplinary degree programs, and the new College should initiate and develop new undergraduate degree programs either not appropriate to other colleges or primarily interdisciplinary in nature.

Undergraduate Studies' role for championing, revising, studying, assessing and monitoring general education programs must be strengthened and made more explicit across the university. The new College of Undergraduate Studies needs to lead UCF's rethinking of its general education program assessment, particularly to move beyond course-level assessment to overall general education curriculum-level assessment.

## **Greater Collaboration Across the University**

The new College and Dean must serve as the convener, moderator and simulator of university-wide conversations and activities to affect UCF's transformation to a 21st-century prototype university noted for *excellence, innovation and distinction* in undergraduate education.

This includes collaborating with deans of all Colleges, and partnering with the Dean of the College of Graduate Studies to promote further connections and integration between undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, instruction and research; and increased movement of UCF undergraduates into graduate programs.

The new College and Dean should provide a principal advocacy role alongside SDES in supporting all undergraduate students, including transfer students, and function in a strong partnership with SDES for integrated academic advising and personal development to enhance student success and learning for all undergraduate students.

## **An Incubator for Teaching and Learning**

The new College and Dean should serve as an advocate for a university-wide emphasis on undergraduate innovation. This innovation would be applied in nature but have a scholarly basis.

The College should coordinate integration of these innovation efforts across campus and sponsor and house research initiatives to study, assess and support undergraduate education, including the specific support of the scholarship of teaching and learning. The College should disseminate UCF's findings across campus, and more broadly to the national and international scholarly and practitioner community to help further innovation in undergraduate education.



University of Central Florida  
STATUS DATE: 4/9/2015

	NUMBER OF EMAILS SENT				Total Response Rate	Total Survey Completion Rate	Total Survey Retention Rate
	INVITATION	1ST REMINDER	2ND REMINDER	3RD REMINDER			
All Universities TOTAL	31532	25331	22313	19670	51.94%	41.94%	80.76%
University of Central Florida	1225	1037	896	783	51.84%	42.86%	82.68%
College of Arts and Humanities	247	204	175	150	57.89%	45.34%	78.32%
College of Business Administration	93	80	70	63	40.86%	36.56%	89.47%
College of Education	115	99	90	85	42.61%	29.57%	69.39%
College of Engineering and Computer Science	136	125	120	104	44.12%	38.97%	88.33%
College of Health and Public Affairs	130	105	88	80	47.69%	40.00%	83.87%
College of Hospitality Management	44	37	28	26	63.64%	52.27%	82.14%
College of Medicine	68	49	37	29	70.59%	63.24%	89.58%
College of Nursing	43	23	20	16	72.09%	67.44%	93.55%
College of Sciences	288	258	218	182	51.74%	43.40%	83.89%
Research-AMPAC	2	1	0	0	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Research-CREOL	24	23	20	19	45.83%	37.50%	81.82%
Research-FSEC	6	6	5	5	16.67%	16.67%	100.00%
Research-IST	12	12	10	10	25.00%	16.67%	66.67%
Research-Nanoscience	15	13	13	12	60.00%	40.00%	66.67%
Undergraduate Studies	2	2	2	2	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>34097</b>	<b>27279</b>	<b>23942</b>	<b>21086</b>	<b>52.52%</b>	<b>42.53%</b>	<b>80.98%</b>

Generated: 4/9/2015 8:17:57 AM

Fixed filters: None