

# MEMORANDUM

**Date:** November 10, 2016  
**TO:** All Faculty Senate Members  
**FROM:** Keith Koons  
Chair, Faculty Senate  
**SUBJECT:** Faculty Senate Meeting on November 17, 2016

---

---

Meeting Date: Thursday, November 17, 2016  
Meeting Time: 4:00 - 6:00 p.m.  
Meeting Location: Student Union Key West, Room 218

## A G E N D A

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Approval of Minutes of** *October 20, 2016*
4. **Announcements and Recognition of Guests**
5. **Report of the Provost**
6. **Old Business**  
None.
7. **New Business**
  - UCF Downtown Update – *Thad Seymour and Michael Frumkin*
8. **Committee Reports**
  - Budget and Administrative Committee – *Pradeep Bhardwaj*
  - Personnel Committee – *Stephen King*
  - Parking Advisory Committee – *Ahmad Elshennawy*
  - Undergraduate Council – *Kelly Allred*
  - Graduate Council – *Zixia Song*
9. **Other Business**
10. **Adjournment**

**Faculty Senate Meeting**  
Minutes of  
**October 20, 2016**

Keith Koons, chair, called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m. The roll was circulated for signatures.

**MINUTES**

Motion to approve the minutes of September 22, 2016 was made and seconded. The minutes were approved as recorded.

**RECOGNITION OF GUESTS**

Deborah German, Vice President for Medical Affairs and Dean of the College of Medicine

Ross Wolf, Associate Dean, College of Health and Public Affairs

Ellis Taylor, Associate Dean, College of Business Administration

Jana Jasinski, Associate Dean, College of Sciences

Kristy McAllister, Academic Affairs Information and Publication Services

Margaret Mlachak, Project Manager, Academic Affairs

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Dr. Koons informed the senators that the Student Government Association appointed Ms. Rachel Altfield, Vice President of the Student Body as the designated Student Government Association (SGA) representative on the Faculty Senate. As provided in the Faculty Constitution, Ms. Altfield is extended the privilege of participating in debate.

Reminded the senators to speak directly into a microphone when making comments or asking questions to facilitate everyone being able to hear. If you are sitting at one of the side tables, please go to a microphone to make a comment.

**OLD BUSINESS**

None.

**REPORT OF THE PROVOST**

Ronnie Korosec, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs attended on behalf of the provost. The provost was called to a meeting and sends his regrets.

Introduced Vice President for Medical Affairs and Dean of the College of Medicine, Deborah German to provide information regarding the new teaching hospital. A handout was distributed providing the rationale behind the decision for the College of Medicine to partner with Hospital Corporation of America (HCA) in building a teaching hospital. In 2006, the legislature approved the College of Medicine as a professional school and to be the anchor in Medical City. In 2012, the Board of Trustees approved the purchase of 25 acres of land. UCF has searched for a partner to build a teaching hospital, allowing UCF governance and ownership. In a short timeframe, UCF filed a certificate of need to build

a teaching hospital, received Board of Trustees approval to move forward with a partnership, and is now working on developing the public/private partnership with HCA. The only investment for UCF is the land and the UCF brand. HCA will build the physical hospital costing anywhere between \$150 and \$200 million.

Question: Who is paying for the operating expenses to run the hospital?

Answer: A previous College of Medicine grant has resulted in many strong physician relationships. UCF Health faculty and private physicians will staff the hospital.

Dr. Korosec expressed gratitude on behalf of the provost for those faculty that attended the first Provost Forum on Research and Graduate Studies. The next Provost Forum is scheduled for November 1 at 9:00 – 10:00 a.m. in the Global UCF Building, room 101AB on the topic of faculty prominence and excellence.

The Provost has asked that I communicate concerns with Resolution 2016-2017-10 Restore Section IV.I Resolutions when the Senate discusses the resolution later in the agenda.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### Amendment/vote on Resolutions Brought Forward by Steering on August 11, 2016

The eleven resolutions were approved by the Steering committee in August. The resolutions were brought before the Senate in September for discussion. Today the resolutions are up for possible amendment and voting.

Dr. Koons introduced each resolution previously distributed, noting only changes to the proposed amendment (in red) are up for amendment, not the complete bylaw.

1. Resolution 2016-2017-1 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Section VIII. Joint Committees and Councils. Motion and second to approve the resolution. Open for discussion; none.  
Vote: All in favor; motion passes.
2. Resolution 2016-2017-2 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Various Joint Committees and Councils. Motion and second to approve the resolution. Open for discussion; none.  
Vote: All in favor; motion passes.
3. Resolution 2016-2017-3 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, University Promotion and Tenure Committee. Motion and second to approve the resolution. Open for discussion. First whereas clause indicates that Regulation 3.015 and 3.0175 exempt faculty from serving that have served the prior two years. This is stated in 3.0175 at the university level, but only at the college level in 3.015. Even though “exempt” is the term in the regulation, don’t think it is the right term. Think the intent is to exclude, not exempt. Exempt means you don’t have to serve, where exclude means you can’t serve. Reviewed regulation.

Motion and second made to delete the first whereas clause on line 3 and 4. Noted that the first whereas clause is correct referring to 3.0175, just not accurate for 3.015. Open for discussion. Discussed the term staggered. Determined staggered means staggering the membership terms to ensure continuity. Discussion closed.

~~Whereas, UCF Regulation 3.015 and 3.0175 exempts faculty from serving on the committee who have served on the committee within the last two years or are candidates for promotion; and~~

Vote: All in favor; motion passes.

Motion and second to change the term “exempted” on line 5, 18, and 37 to “exclude/excluded”. Open for discussion. If you limit the possibility of serving, will we have a situation where a college has only one representative? Yes. Discussion closed.

Vote: 3 opposed, remaining in favor; motion passes.

Motion and second to approve the resolution as amended.

Vote: 2 opposed, remaining in favor; motion passes.

4. Resolution 2016-2017-4 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Undergraduate Council and Committees. Motion and second to approve the resolution. Open for discussion; none.  
Vote: All in favor; motion passes.
5. Resolution 2016-2017-5 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Graduate Council and Committees. Motion and second to approve the resolution. Open for discussion; none.  
Vote: All in favor; motion passes.
6. Resolution 2016-2017-6 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Parking Advisory and University Parking and Transportation Committees. Motion and second to approve the resolution. Open for discussion; none.  
Vote: All in favor; motion passes.
7. Resolution 2016-2017-7 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Information Technology Resource Advisory Committee. Motion and second to approve the resolution. Open for discussion. Concern that the University Libraries is not represented in the membership on the committee. Article II of the Constitution defines academic units as each college and the University Libraries. Discussion closed.  
Vote: All in favor; motion passes.

8. Resolution 2016-2017-8 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Nominating Committee – no discussion. Motion and second to approve the resolution. Open for discussion; none.  
Vote: All in favor; motion passes.
9. Resolution 2016-2017-9 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Governance in Academic Units. Motion and second to approve the resolution. Open for discussion. Note: no red is displayed since the complete resolution is new.

Motion and second to amend lines 17 and 18:

~~Department/school faculty meetings called by and presided over by the leader should occur at least monthly during the Fall and Spring semesters. 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 should meet at least monthly with the college dean. 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).

Open for discussion. Opposition to the amendment expressed. Monthly meetings are not excessive and the COACHE survey results regarding leadership seems to support. Concern regarding the leader who is a director in units that have sub-directors. Reminded that the original language is “should” not “must” meet monthly. Others opposed to the “at least” monthly meetings. Sponsor indicated that departments know what they need and have the flexibility to meet when needed. Discussed a specific chair that makes you take personal leave if you don’t attend mandatory meetings. Discussion closed.

Vote: too close to call. Vote by show of hands called with the Secretary of the Senate verifying the votes.

Vote: 24, in favor; 18 opposed; motion passes.

Motion and second to insert a new #2 to B. Meetings:

The faculty in a Department/School shall be entitled to call a special faculty meeting upon presentation to the appropriate leader of such a request signed by the majority of the Department/School faculty. The special faculty meeting shall occur with 48 hours of the presented request.

Open for discussion. Discussed the request of majority; would like to see smaller number. Others expressed concern over number being too small. Expressed concern over “signed” being too difficult. These are out of the ordinary meetings that need to be called. Friendly amendments not allowed, will need to vote on this amendment first. Expressed concern over 48 hours being too short of a timeframe would recommend five business days to ensure faculty can attend.

Vote: 1 in favor; remaining opposed; motion fails.

Motion and second to insert a new #2 to B. Meetings:

The faculty in a Department/School shall be entitled to call a special faculty meeting upon presentation to the appropriate leader of such a request of one third of the Department/School faculty. The special faculty meeting shall occur with five business days of the presented request.

Open for discussion; none.

Vote: All in favor; motion passes.

Motion and second to approve the resolution as amended.

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

10. Resolution 2016-2017-10 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Restore Section IV.I. Resolutions. Motion and second to approve the resolution. Open for discussion. Dr. Koons re-directed to Dr. Korosec for the Provost's comments to be considered prior to voting.

Article 5.1 of the Board of Trustees bylaws gives the president of the university the responsibility for the operation of the university including efficient and effective budget and program administration. The board does not normally get involved in the day-to-day operations. In addition, the Faculty Senate already has a voice on the Board of Trustees by virtue of the chair of the Faculty Senate as a board member. Board members are almost universally business people with little to previous exposure to, or understanding of faculty member's work. The board looks to the provost and president.

Dr. Koons commented that the resolution specifies the approval process once approved by the Senate and provides an appeals process. Dr. Korosec clarified that what the provost would like the Senate to consider the last part of the appeal process where the Faculty Senate can appeal directly to the Board of Trustees.

Question: So the Provost does not want the Senate to be able to appeal to the Board of Trustees because he feels the board would not be favorable, so the Senate shouldn't have the right to try?

Answer: He prefers the appeal process not include the Board of Trustees. It's a duplication of effort since the chair of the Senate is a trustee and has the ability to directly appeal to the Board of Trustees.

Question: The resolution gives the Senate a mechanism to appeal to the Board of Trustees. In the absence of the resolution, how would an issue be brought to the trustees?

Answer: You always have the ability to address concerns with the chair of the Senate who serves on the board. The chair of the Senate can therefore bring the issue to the board.

Follow-up question: Is that alternative mechanism as strong as a resolution from the Senate?

Answer: Probably a matter of perspective.

Question: What would happen in the case where the Senate held one opinion and the chair of the Senate holds a different opinion?

Answer: As chair of the Senate, I carry the voice of the Senate regardless of personal opinion.

Voiced support as written. With all due respect, if the Senate conducts a two thirds vote to overturn the decision of the president, that is not a normal circumstance. This clearly would only come into play under extremely rare circumstances. But, it's nice to have the appeal as an option. A trustee is one person. The Senate is intended to be the voice of all faculty.

Question: Has the Senate ever appealed to the Board of Trustees?

Answer: The appeal language was in an early version of the Faculty Constitution, dating back to 70's. When the Constitution was re-organized into the Constitution and Bylaws in 2010, this language was omitted. The purpose of this resolution is to restore the language. The language has never been used. Only issue that can be imagined where it would be used is in a vote of no confidence in the president.

Question: Did this language in the resolution appear as written in the previous Constitution or has it been altered?

Answer: Word for word from the previous Constitution.

Question: Who removed the language in 2010?

Answer: It was a massive re-organization and was inadvertently dropped. Spoke to Ida Cook, she is not aware of any deliberate attempt to remove the language.

Question: So the provost had no objection until he found out it wasn't there?

Answer: Yes, this is previous language.

Question: Is the appeals process for resolutions not in the areas of legal authority or all resolutions? By what authority do we give ourselves an appeal process?

Answer: All resolution. If passed, would be addressed by the provost. If approved, it's put into place. The Senate is advisory to the president and the provost.

Question: Why a resolution? If a mistake, why isn't it put back?

Answer: Because it was previously approved by the Senate, provost, and signed by the president in 2010. Any change has to be voted and approved.

Question: If not approved, the Senate has no appeals process?

Answer: Correct.

Discussion closed.

Vote: 2 opposed; remaining in favor; motion passes.

11. Resolution 2016-2017-11 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Section IX.  
Amendments. Motion and second to approve the resolution. Open for discussion;  
none.  
Vote: All in favor; motion passes.

### **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

#### Budget and Administrative Committee – Pradeep Bhardwaj

Committee met on October 5. A presentation made on the new college budget model.  
Discussion on the model followed.

#### Personnel Committee – Stephen King

Discussed the university lactation policy. Will be forwarding a resolution to the Steering Committee soon. Talked about the salary study and trying to determine the best way to move forward since the outcome is bargained. On the same note, also looking into the status of the Emeritus policy.

#### Parking Advisory Committee – Ahmad Elshennawy

First meeting is scheduled for Monday, October 24.

#### Undergraduate Council – Kelly Allred

The October meeting was canceled due to lack of agenda items. The executive committee met to review and revise policies and procedures that will go to the committees for approval.

#### Graduate Council – Zixia Song

No report available.

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.