

**M E M O R A N D U M**

**TO:** All Faculty Senators

**FROM:** Dr. Manoj Chopra  
Chair, Faculty Senate

**SUBJECT:** Faculty Senate Meeting on Thursday, March 22, 2007

---

---

**Senate Meeting Agenda**

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Minutes of February 22, 2007
4. Announcements and Recognition of Guests
5. Old Business - None
6. New Business
  - Resolution from Graduate Council on Adherence to Conduct and Conflict of Interest - Drs. Liberman and Bishop
  - Revisions to the Faculty Constitution - Dr. Cook
  - Focus on the Nation - Dr. Penelope Canan
7. Standing Committee Reports
  - Budget & Administrative - Dr. Bernadette Jungblut*
  - Graduate Council - Dr. Aaron Liberman*
  - Personnel - Dr. Jeff Kaplan*
  - Undergraduate Policy & Curriculum - Dr. Bob Pennington*
8. Other

## **Faculty Senate Meeting** **February 22, 2007**

Dr. Manoj Chopra, Faculty Senate Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

The roll was circulated for signatures. The minutes of the *January 25, 2007* meeting were unanimously approved with minor changes and clarification of information about multi-term registration. Dr. Schell clarified that the students who will be allowed to register for three semesters are those in the honors college and those with a UCF cumulative GPA of 3.5 or above. Other students still can register for summer and fall only.

### **RECOGNITION of GUESTS and ADMINISTRATION**

Guests included: Dr. John Schell, Dr. Allison Morrison-Shetlar, Dr. Lin Huff-Corzine, Dr. Dennis Dulniak, Mark Gumble and several members of the Library staff.

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Dr. Chopra announced:

- UCF will host the BOG meeting on Tuesday, February 27, 2007 from 10-3 p.m. This meeting will be a public hearing on the Pappas report. Dr. Chopra encouraged everyone to attend. Senators can visit their website at [www.flbog.org](http://www.flbog.org) to submit questions for the meeting.
- At the last meeting, the Faculty Senate approved Resolution 2006-2007-2 Electronic Thesis and Dissertations Dissemination Policy. This resolution has been pulled back and returned to the Graduate Council until certain legal and other issues that were raised after the meeting are addressed. Graduate Council will resubmit the resolution at a later time.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

NONE

### **NEW BUSINESS**

*Academic Progress and Faculty Mentors for Student Athletes - Mark Gumble*

Mr. Gumble distributed handouts regarding the Student-Athlete/Faculty/Staff Mentoring program and the Faculty/Staff Appreciation reception on Wednesday, February 28 from 6-7:30 p.m. in the UCF Arena Skybox. This event is just prior to the Men's Basketball Game that begins at 7:30 p.m. He stated that the success of student athletics is something we all can share. ASA is making great progress. For the third consecutive semester student athletics had an average GPA above 3.0. This past semester 54% of student athletes (276 of 508) earned a GPA above 3.0. UCF finished #1 conference USA in terms of scholar-athletes. One hundred and ninety student athletes had a cumulative GPA above 3.0. All faculty are encouraged to attend the reception and the basketball game.

Another focus of the ASA is the enhancement of the life skills program which helps student athletes with their career and personal development. A faculty mentoring program for student-athletes is currently under development. This is an excellent way for faculty who want to get involved to participate. There is a plan to pilot a program for incoming freshmen

## **Faculty Senate Meeting** **February 22, 2007**

football and mens/women basketball athletes in Fall 2007. If anyone is interested in this program, please email or fax the interest form to Mark Gumble by Friday, March 9, 2007. Question asked if the program is matching majors. ASA will look at majors and interest of the faculty but focus is on life skills, not necessarily related to major.

Question raised about the academic progress reports which are sent out to faculty. ASA has tried at a different approach last semester (distributed via campus mail) but it did not work well and had a return rate just over 50%. They have now modified this approach so there are individual letters to faculty with more time to get forms returned.

It was noted that there seems to be better communication between faculty and ASA staff. Student-athletes do not have control over the number of times they have to miss class because of competition.

### Pre-discussion on Academic Career Path Models- Drs. Schell and Morrison-Shetlar

Before the presentation and discussion, Dr. Chopra laid out the background and limits of this discussion and stated that there is no new policy on academic career paths or any new model which has been chosen for UCF. The purpose of this presentation and discussion is to give senators an opportunity to share any ideas or suggestion that would benefit faculty at UCF. Any task force would have members from each college and the regional campuses.

Dr. Schell began the discussion with members of the Faculty Senate about possible alternate career path models for faculty. Goal is to talk about possibilities and ideas of different career path models which might better serve our faculty and students. Dr. Schell stated there are no hidden agenda, no preconceived plan, and no thought that any alternative models would be applied to existing faculty. This discussion is about creating alternate ways to reward faculty, help faculty be successful, and examine ways to meet needs in our future growth as an institution.

Dr. Morrison-Shetlar is creating a website where information on career path models from other universities can be accessed. If the faculty come to a conclusion the tenure track system we have now serves our faculty well and it is what best meets our needs in the future then no change will be made. Question was raised if there are other ways to promote successful professional faculty career paths in the future that would better serve the needs of the university. Why do this or why even talk it? Dr. Schell stated that many faculty have had some sense of dissatisfaction with the one size fits all tenure-track mode. The motivation is to find a better system that can better serve our faculty and students.

There were many issues in the past. For example excellent faculty were denied tenure despite high quality teaching. The goal is to have a faculty-wide conversation <sup>about</sup> the possibility of providing other kinds of career tenure tracks, career non-tenure tracks and career models for our faculty who might want different kinds of professional career inside the university. This reflects that we are indeed an academy of scholar-teachers. There may be other ways to focus on a person's strengths and relieve them of the duties that they may not want to do or do not do well with the everyone being a more productive and more successful professional inside university setting. For example there may be a tenure track assistant, associate, full professor career model for people who wanted to do all teaching. They would come in with the required terminal degree, strong teaching credentials, curriculum credentials and strong advising credentials.

## **Faculty Senate Meeting** **February 22, 2007**

Several approaches were briefly discussed e.g. clinical faculty, faculty with focus on teaching not research, and faculty with focus on research not teaching. A comment was made that the optimal approach is to have accomplished researchers teaching undergraduate, graduate and doctoral courses.

Dr. Chopra asked if there is a need to establish a taskforce, either senate related or separate from the senate. Either approach would need broad faculty representation. Suggestion made that an adhoc committee be established composed of faculty who are willing to serve on this committee. Question asked if the FCTL would call a forum for all faculty to see what the issues are and discuss. It was determined that FCTL would not be the appropriate place and entity to hold this discussion. Question was addressed to Dr. Schell about whether this approach is taking away department prerogative. He replied there is no plan yet so it's hard to say what the plan's repercussions or consequences might be at the local level. It is not expected any plan which is developed would negate the department's role. Rather, it is expected there will be different possibilities so the departments would have more flexibility.

Dr. Pennington commented that the Senate is responsible for any concerns which involved more than one or more college in a broad educational policy as the basic legislative body of the university. He brought forth a resolution for the formation of a study group to explore the possibility of any new academic career path models.

Motion was made that an adhoc subcommittee be formed to examine the concept of alternate faculty tenure career tracks and report back to the senate at some date in the future. A friendly amendment was made to ask Dr. Schell to chair this group. Dr. Cook suggested that the motion does not need to include where this group is housed. Dr. Schell will coordinate its operations with Dr. Morrison-Shetlar. All faculty members should be encouraged to come forth with their opinion. Dr. Schell will solicit participation from different parts of the faculty and regional campus faculty. Participants should come from each college and academic entity.

The question was called and seconded. Unanimously approved. Motion (see above) was then voted on and unanimously approved.

### **STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS**

➤ **Budget & Administrative** - Dr. Bernadette Jungblut reported

The Budget and Administrative Procedures Committee met earlier this month and selected 33 proposals to be funded for a total of \$403,025.21.

Seven (7) colleges and two (2) additional units received funding.

Colleges and Additional Units Funding Breakdown:

Burnett College of Biomedical Sciences	=	19,867.20
Burnett Honors College	=	5,200.00
College of Arts and Humanities	=	112,812.77
College of Education	=	32,030.00
College of Engineering and Computer Science	=	58,874.00
College of Health and Public Affairs	=	60,577.54
College of Sciences	=	99,813.70
Office of Undergraduate Studies	=	3,000.00

## **Faculty Senate Meeting** **February 22, 2007**

University Libraries = 10,850.00  
The Undergraduate Teaching Equipment RFP for 2006-2007 has been discharged.

The committee will meet with the bookstore to discuss issues with textbook orders. Please forward any problems with bookstore to Dr. Jungblut. The committee will produce a report with recommendations.

➤ **Graduate Council** - Dr. Aaron Lieberman reported

The council is continuing work on three resolutions. One resolution was passed and approved by the senate but not the Provost and was sent back to the committee. The Council will continue the work on other resolution Graduate Faculty Conduct and Thesis Dissertation. Next meeting is scheduled for March 1<sup>st</sup>.

➤ **Personnel** - Dr. Jeff Kaplan reported

Dr. Kaplan had no report at this point. There are two issues on the agenda and will have a report at the meeting in March.

➤ **Undergraduate Policy & Curriculum** - Dr. Bob Pennington reported

At the February 13, 2007 meeting, the committee passed degree policy statement in terms of degrees being revoked. The committee also approved a plagiarism policy statement which is being sent to all faculty for possible inclusion in their syllabi. Question asked if there were other places to include the policy on plagiarism. Dr. Schell commented that there were two parts that were approved, a short statement that faculty may or may not have in their syllabus. The second is a longer discussion of plagiarism that will be posted on FCTL website. Undergraduate Course Review Committee meets on March 6, 2007. A meeting scheduled during spring break has been postponed.

### **OTHER**

Parking Advisory meeting - Dr. Cook.

Dr. Cook encouraged faculty who are representatives on this committee to attend the meetings and voice opinions regarding parking. The chair of the committee Dr. Gunter would like to ask that administration take into account that this committee does exist and respond to its many recommendations.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:34 p.m.

## Resolution 2006-2007- 3 on Adherence to Conduct and Conflict of Interest

Whereas, the Faculty Senate recognizes that there exists a statute namely, Florida Statute Chapter 112, Part III, known as the Code of Ethics for Public Officers and Employees which mandates the Policy on Professional Conduct and Conflicts of Interest,

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate endorses the development and promulgation of guidelines interpreting the specific aspects of actual and potential Conflicts of Interest and the management of such, and encourages the appropriate University entities to disseminate such guidelines to the university community.

Be it also resolved that the Faculty Senate endorses the examples in the March 5, 2007 statement of the Graduate Council (attached below) regarding conduct of personal relations between university employees and employers, and employees and students as an example of such promulgation.

## Resolution on Adherence to Conduct and Conflict of Interest

Whereas, the Faculty Senate recognizes that there exists a statute namely, Florida Statute Chapter 112, Part III, known as the Code of Ethics for Public Officers and Employees which mandates the Policy on Professional Conduct and Conflicts of Interest,

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate endorses the development and promulgation of examples that elaborate guidelines interpreting the specific aspects of actual and potential Conflicts of Interest and the management of such, and encourages the appropriate University entities to disseminate such guidelines to the university community.

Be it also resolved that the Faculty Senate endorses the examples in the March 5, 2007 statement of the Graduate Council (attached below) regarding conduct of personal relations between university employees and employers, and employees and students as an example of such promulgation.

### Statement of the Graduate Council –

#### Clarification and Guidance for Faculty on Conflict of Interest in Personal Relations with Students

Conflicts of interest may also arise in the conduct of personal relations between university employees and between university employees and students. Employees are expected to treat students and fellow colleagues with courtesy and to respect their rights, including, but not limited to, academic freedom and freedom from coercion or the imposition of a *quid pro quo* relationship. The potential for conflict of interest in personal relations between employees and between employees and students is grounded in the distinctly unequal power in certain relationships, such as between a director and a subordinate employee or between a thesis advisor and a graduate student. It is often the case that the subordinate in a work or school relationship of this type will feel that they cannot say no to a request by the individual having the evaluative role or the more authoritative position. The individual with the predominant or controlling position in such relationships should be aware of this fact and of the potential for abuse of this unequal authority and control.

Employees and students must realize that even consensual amorous relationships may lead to sexual harassment, other breaches of professional obligations, or charges of sexual harassment or ethics complaints. This is particularly true where the relationship is one of unequal power (i.e., where one of the individuals in the relationship has a professional responsibility toward the other, such as in the context of instruction, advisement or supervision). No faculty member shall have an amorous relationship (consensual or otherwise) with a student who is enrolled in a course being taught by the faculty member or when academic work is being supervised by the faculty member or when that faculty member has or *is likely to have* academic responsibility over that student at any time during that student's tenure at UCF. No person in a supervisory position shall have

romantic or sexual relationships with anyone that he or she evaluates. Romantic partners, including spouses, will be separated for purposes of evaluation and direct supervision.

A faculty member may not involve university students or other employees in the faculty member's external activities if such involvement is coerced or presented as a *quid pro quo*. Additionally, if it is another employee who is being involved in an external activity of this sort, then that involvement in the external activity must not conflict with the employee's required commitment of time to the university. This proscription is especially relevant to employees in their relationships with students and with employees over whom they have a supervisory or evaluative role.

As with conflicts of interest based on private and commercial interests, conflicts of interest based on relationships are necessarily fact-specific. Therefore, the university has not attempted to provide an exhaustive list of fixed rules on the potential for conflicts of interest created by such relationships. Individuals who have questions about how this policy applies to a particular situation should seek advice from the Office of the Provost or the Office of the General Counsel.

Below are examples of activities that constitute ***actual conflicts of interest*** that are inconsistent with University policy.

*A student's grades or progress towards a degree are conditioned on participation in a personal relationship, such as a romantic relationship, with an employee.  
[Note that this conduct may also constitute sexual harassment.]*

*A student's grades or progress towards a degree are conditioned on participation in a personal activity of the faculty member evaluating the student's progress, such as assisting the faculty member with babysitting activities, running personal errands, etc.*

*A supervisor engages in a romantic or sexual relationship with another individual (student or employee) over whom he or she has evaluative responsibility.*

Below are examples of situations that constitute ***potential conflicts of interest*** in that they may develop into actual conflicts of interest inconsistent with University policy. Situations that raise the potential for conflicts of interest should be monitored to address any conflicts that might arise during the activity.

*A supervising faculty member asks a student with whom the faculty member has a professional friendship for a personal favor, such as house-sitting during the faculty member's absence.*

*Student enrolls in an academic program in which student's parent (or other immediate family member) is a faculty member.*

Where there is doubt in the mind of any individual about a potential conflict of interest, the individual should raise the issue with his/her supervisor and/or the Office of the

Provost. More information can be obtained from the [General Counsel's Web site](#). In-unit faculty should also refer to Article 19 of the [UCF BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement](#).

**Report on  
Revisions to the Faculty Senate Constitution  
Topics for Consideration**

The ad hoc Constitutional Revision Committee has been working on revisions to the Constitution during the Spring 2007 term. These revisions are in response to the creation of two additional colleges in the university, Nursing College and Medical College and other adjustments in university committees and offices.

The following information is being provided to allow you to consider possible changes, to share with your colleagues, and to offer suggestions to the Revision Committee. It is anticipated that the work will be finalized by the end of Spring 2007 term, but the Senate must vote on the changes before it can be taken to the Faculty Assembly for final approval. Any revisions approved by the Faculty Senate must then be circulated to all faculty before a meeting of the Faculty Assembly can be held to finally approve them.

In the interim, and because they are not officially established in the Constitution as colleges, a temporary solution based upon the precedent that was used by the Rosen College of Hospitality Management and the College of Optics and Photonics will be used. To allow for representation of the new colleges' faculty, each new college may designate/elect two representatives who will be encouraged to attend Senate and committee meetings which are of central importance to their colleges' interests. They will not be able to vote, but may participate in discussions in order to assure that their colleges' interests are represented.

With the addition of two new colleges, Nursing and Medicine, there are two questions:

- a. Definition of faculty membership:
    - i. How shall the representation be determined in light of the medical, clinical assignments vis a vis academic general faculty assignments?
  - b. Apportionment of Faculty Senate membership per college:
    - i. Currently the membership of the UCF Faculty Senate is determined using the total number of 60 members and the definitions and apportionment formula in Attachment 1.
    - ii. The new total number of members is suggested to be 72, which would be easily divisible for apportionment.
2. Examples of how other state universities with medical colleges address these topics are provided in attachments.
- a. the University of Florida Senate (Attachment 2), and
  - b. the University of South Florida Senate (Attachment 3).

The Committee encourages faculty to contact the ad hoc Constitutional Revision Committee members with any input and suggestions by April 15<sup>th</sup>. Arlen Chase [achase@mail.ucf.edu](mailto:achase@mail.ucf.edu); Ida Cook, [cook@mail.ucf.edu](mailto:cook@mail.ucf.edu); Robert Pennington, [Robert.Pennington@mail.ucf.edu](mailto:Robert.Pennington@mail.ucf.edu) or the Faculty Senate office.

*bus.ucf.edu*

**Attachment 1**

**UCF Faculty Senate Membership and Apportionment**

**3.2 Membership.** The Faculty Senate shall consist of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, elected members, and the immediate past chair of the Faculty Senate as an ex officio member. The term of office for an elected member shall be two years, with approximately one half of the members being elected each year. An ex officio member is a person who holds an appointment by virtue of office. This individual 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 a committee unless specified otherwise.

**3.3 Apportionment.** The number of elected members of the Faculty Senate will be apportioned among the colleges and units as follows:

**(Number of eligible faculty in a college or unit)**

**Number of senators = 60 x -----**

**(Number of eligible faculty in the University)**

The number of senators representing a college or unit will be determined by rounding the above calculated value to the nearest whole number. A unit is defined as any degree granting academic unit, not within an established college, and shall have proportionate representation on the Faculty Senate as defined above.

**3.3.1** Each college will have a minimum of two representatives in the Faculty Senate. The professional librarians shall have two voting representatives in the Faculty Senate to be elected by the professional staff of the library.

**3.3.2** Apportionment will be made only once each year, based on the number of individuals with full-time tenured, tenure-earning, or multi-year appointments who are listed as faculty on official records of the University on the first day of the spring semester of that year.

**3.3.3** Each college or unit, shall by majority vote of its faculty, decide on a system of internal allocation of Senate representation, e.g., at college/unit level, by department, by proportion to department size, by a combination of department and college/unit representation, etc. Each college shall inform the chair of the Faculty Senate of the details of such allocation and any subsequent changes in it.

**3.4 Eligibility.**

**3.4.1** Only full-time professors, associate professors, and assistant professors with tenured, tenure-earning, or multi-year appointments, and professional librarians of comparable rank shall be eligible for election to the Faculty Senate. Visiting

## Attachment 2

### University of Florida Faculty Senate

#### Article III

##### The Faculty

**Section 1. FACULTY DEFINED.** The faculty of the University of Florida are those persons employed by the University of Florida during the regular academic year whose primary assignment is to carry out the academic mission of the University, namely, teaching, research and academic service. Titles of these persons shall be set forth in the Senate Bylaws...(p. 4)

#### Article IV

##### The Faculty Senate

**Section 2. MEMBERSHIP** – The Senate shall consist of elected voting members, ex officio voting members, ex officio non-voting members, and student non-voting members. The elected voting membership of the Faculty shall be apportioned equitably among the Academic Units based on a membership of one hundred (150) members. Academic Units, which form the basis for representation, shall be: The Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (IFAS), the University Libraries, the Florida Museum of Natural History, each college (except the College of Agriculture which is represented in IFAS), and one unit representing all Faculty not otherwise represented in a college or other unit. Each year prior to the Senate elections the Academic Units will be notified by the President, or the President's designee, of the number of faculty eligible for election.

The number of elected members of the Senate will be apportioned among the Academic Units based on the number of faculty in each unit with each Academic Unit having at least two elected voting members. The remaining seats shall be apportioned among the Academic Units based on the number of faculty members in each unit, with the restriction that no Academic Unit will have a number of voting elected members larger than one-sixth of the elected voting membership of the Faculty Senate. The specific quotas shall be computed as set forth in the Senate Bylaws.

Only faculty as defined in **Article III, Section 1**, of this Constitution are eligible to be counted in determining the proportional representation of Academic Units within the Faculty Senate, to be elected to the Faculty Senate, and to vote for members of the Faculty Senate. (p. 11-12, University of Florida Constitution)

faculty, regardless of their rank or duration of appointment, are not eligible to serve on the Faculty Senate.

**3.4.2** Faculty members who hold administrative appointments as president, vice president, associate vice president, assistant vice president, vice provost, dean, associate dean or assistant dean, and persons acting in the above capacities are not eligible for election to the Faculty Senate.

Attachment 3

**Constitution of the Faculty  
Of the University of South Florida**

**Article II. Faculty Senate**

**A. Membership**

The Faculty "Senate shall be composed of sixty elected members apportioned among and representing the academic colleges and the regional campuses of the University of South Florida in accordance with the apportionment criteria contained in Section B of Article II and such ex officio members as stated in this section. IN establishing representation, the Faculty Senate may determine that a unit be represented that is not a recognized college. .... (p. 1)

**B. Apportionment**

Annually prior to election, the membership of the Faculty Senate shall be apportioned equitably among the academic colleges and campuses, based on the number of members of the general faculty in each college or the members of the faculties of the campuses. The apportionment shall be reviewed by the Faculty Senate, subject to the approval of the President of the University. Each college, campus or unit shall have at least one representative. (p. 2)

***BYLAWS OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA***

**Article II. Membership**

**A. General Eligibility**

The *Constitution of the Faculty of the University of South Florida* specifies those eligible for membership in the Faculty Senate.

**B. Clinical Faculty**

Full-time clinical faculty with the rank or title specified in the Constitution shall be considered members of the general faculty as defined. However, for purposes of apportionment of the Faculty Senate, only fifty percent of their number shall be counted toward the total membership of the faculty of their respective college/campus/unit. (p. 1)