

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA  
Faculty Senate Office  
MEMORANDUM

To: All Faculty  
From: Jeffrey W. Cornett, Faculty Senate Secretary  
Date: March 31, 1992  
Subject: Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting - March 26, 1992

=====  
The meeting was called to order by Dr. Glenn N. Cunningham, Chair, at 4:15 p. m. The roll was passed for signature. The minutes of March 5th were approved.

**Unfinished Business**

None

**New Business**

Dr. Bruce Pauley moved Resolution 1991-1992-12 (Revision1). It was seconded.

**RESOLUTION 1991-1992-12 (REVISION 1)**

WHEREAS, fully self-supporting endowed chairs affirm the university's commitment to excellence, be it resolved:

- (1) The establishment of a fully endowed chair shall be subject to approval by the university, college, affected department, and the major donor. By definition, fully endowed chairs provide a self-supporting scholarly activity without cost to the university.
- (2) The appointment of an individual to a fully endowed chair shall be made for a five to seven year term following agreement by the university, college, affected department, and the major donor. This appointment may be renewable for successive terms. When agreement has been reached to accept a major gift of a fully endowed chair, the president shall establish a committee to process each application and nomination. Committee membership should include leading authorities in the academic discipline from inside and outside the university. All other procedures as specified in Faculty Senate Resolution 1991-1992-8 (Revised) shall be followed regarding selection and performance review of fully endowed Chairs.

Dr. Robert Pennington questioned the need for this resolution in light of Resolution 8 and requested clarification regarding the rationale for the resolution. After considerable discussion, it was moved that the resolution be sent back to committee. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Pauley moved Resolution 1991-1992-13. It was seconded.

**Resolution 1991-1992-13**

Whereas the faculty handbook and previous senate resolutions address review of academic administrators, the level of administrator to be reviewed is not specified; and whereas the unit/committee responsible for initiating and establishing the process or the dissemination of review results has not been established, be it resolved that

- a. All administrators at the level of Vice-President, Academic Dean and Director-Residence Center shall be subject to a major review no later than five years after first appointment or five years after the last major review.
- b. The primary purpose of such a review is to assist the administrator in improving his/her performance and effectiveness as well as establishing whether, and if so, for how long, the appointment of the administrator should be continued.
- c. The responsibility for the initiation of the review should rest with the Personnel Committee of the Faculty Senate. The composition of the impartial review committee will be subject to the approval of the President of the University.
- d. The composition of any review committee should reflect the constituency served by that office and the procedures of the review should insure the input of these constituencies in assessing the administrator/functioning of the office.
- e. It is expected that the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee will establish a sub-committee to determine the representation of the designated administrative review committee as well as monitor its progress.
- f. A copy of the evaluation results should be provided to the administrator's immediate superior, the administrator being reviewed and the Chair of the Faculty Senate. A brief summary of the review and recommendations should be included.

Dr. Nicolaos Tzannes moved that the resolution be amended to include Directors of Institutes and Centers in place of Director-Resident Center. The amendment passed. After considerable discussion, it was moved by Dr. Pennington that the resolution be sent back to committee. The motion failed. Drs. Naval Modani, Pennington, and Rosie Joels were appointed to edit the resolution during the meeting and present the edited version.

Dr. Paul Somerville moved Resolution 1991-1992-14. It was seconded.

**Resolution 1991-1992-14**

Whereas one week in each of fall and spring semesters is reserved for comprehensive final examinations, and whereas there appears to be a substantial majority of responding faculty who believe faculty should have the opportunity to give three hour comprehensive final examinations,

Be it resolved that future comprehensive examination periods be scheduled in three hour blocks.

Dr. Somerville stated that 135 of 170 faculty who returned the survey on examinations favored a three hour examination period. He stated that this would change the period by adding one day with Saturday examination periods possible. Following discussion, the resolution passed.

Dr. Robert Flick moved Resolution 1991-1992-15. It was seconded. Dr. Terri Fine suggested editorial changes which were accepted.

**Resolution 1991-1992-15**

Whereas one of the most important hallmarks of a university is a quality library, and

Whereas library quality depends almost entirely on a reliable (steady) source of funding that keeps pace with academic programs and enrollment,

Whereas a severe cut in one year's allocation reduces the base and thus erodes future support,

Therefore, be it resolved that the library be protected from cuts and given priority for support from capital campaign funds.

The resolution passed.

Dr. Pauley moved Resolution 1991-1992-16. It was seconded.

**Resolution 1991-1992-16**

No faculty member or administrative official shall participate directly in any recommendation or decision relating to appointment, reappointment, promotion, tenure, or other condition of employment at the University of a parent, child, spouse, sibling, parent-in-law, sibling-in-law, child-in-law, or stepchild, except under such circumstances as the President of the University may determine as warranting waiver of this prohibition in the best interests of the University.

A faculty member or administrative official should withdraw from participation in any personnel recommendation or decision involving potential conflict of interest.

Discussion regarding the degree of specificity necessary in the identification of particular relatives ensued. Dr. Joels suggested that the resolution be amended to read any family member to include (but not limited to) parent, etc. The resolution passed.

RESOLUTION 1991-1992-13

Administrative Review

Whereas the faculty handbook and previous Faculty Senate resolutions address review of academic administrators, the level of administrators to be reviewed is not specified; and whereas the unit/committee responsible for initiating and establishing the process or dissemination of review results has not been established, be it resolved that

- a. All administrators at the level of Vice-President, Academic Dean, area campus Director, and Director of an Institute or a Center shall be subject to a major review no later than five years after first appointment or five years after the last major review.
- b. The primary purpose of such a review is to assist the administrator in improving his/her performance and effectiveness as well as establishing whether, and if so, for how long, the appointment of the administrator should be continued.
- c. The responsibility for the initiation of the review rests with the Personnel Committee of the Faculty Senate.
- d. The composition of any administrative review committee should reflect the constituency served by that office and the procedures of the review should ensure the input of these constituencies in assessing the administrator/functioning of the office. The review committee will be appointed by the President of the University following consultations with the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee.
- e. The Faculty Senate Personnel Committee will monitor the progress of each of the administrative review committees.
- f. A copy of the evaluation results should be provided to the administrator's immediate supervisor, the administrator being reviewed, and the Chair of the Faculty Senate. A brief summary of the review and recommendations should be included.

The resolution passed.

Guests present included Dr. Frank Juge and Ms. Anne Marie Allison.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey W. Cornett  
Faculty Senate Secretary

Jeffrey W. Cornett  
Faculty Senate Secretary