

## **University Faculty Meeting**

May 1, 2025

Agenda:

1. Opening Remarks from Provost Skomp
2. Continued discussion of Faculty Governance Reform proposal documents (Alan Green and Steven Smallpage)

The meeting was called to order at 1:15 pm by Provost Skomp.

### **Opening Remarks from Provost Skomp**

Provost Elizabeth Skomp opened the meeting by welcoming attendees and delegating the role of presiding officer to Steven Smallpage, Faculty Senate Chair.

### **Continued discussion of Faculty Governance Reform proposal documents (Alan Green and Steven Smallpage)**

Steven Smallpage, Faculty Senate Chair, opened the special May Day meeting by commenting on the ongoing process of faculty governance reform, citing the central goals as streamlining the faculty governance structure and reducing the administrative burden on committees.

Alan Green, serving as Parliamentarian, outlined the procedural rules for the meeting to ensure an efficient and orderly discussion of the proposed faculty governance changes. He explained that there are two sets of bylaw amendments under consideration, one for the university faculty and one for the Faculty Senate, and that announced a plan to vote on both together since they were developed in tandem by the Policies and Procedures Committee. Combining the votes will streamline the process and require only one paper ballot. Although this means applying the more stringent voting threshold required for university faculty bylaw changes (two-thirds of voting faculty present), Green stated that this was acceptable to uphold the integrity of the unified proposal. He clarified who qualifies as voting faculty and then reviewed the debate procedures: faculty should identify themselves, indicate whether they support or oppose the proposal, and may make one motion and one amendment per turn before rejoining the queue if they wish to speak again. For those proposing formal amendments, he encouraged them to come to the front of the room to facilitate smooth identification and participation. He concluded by inviting any questions or objections to the proposed rules.

During the discussion, faculty raised concerns about procedural issues with combining votes on the university faculty and Faculty Senate bylaw changes, citing Robert's Rules and differing voting requirements. It was clarified that while the documents were written to align, they must be voted on separately to remain compliant. The group agreed to proceed with individual votes, beginning with the faculty bylaws, and confirmed that procedural rules would still need to be formally approved before moving forward.

A motion was made to discuss the Faculty Senate bylaw change. This motion was seconded by Eric Kurlander. In the following discussion, faculty expressed strong opposition to the proposed elimination of UCCAP, arguing that it provides a more reliable mechanism for curriculum

oversight and serves as the only faculty body that checks the power of the Faculty Senate. Faculty warned that removing UCCAP would centralize too much authority in the Senate, weakening overall faculty governance.

Carolyn Nicholson then proposed to change the quorum definition from 60 voting faculty members to 60% of the voting faculty. The motion was seconded by Jennifer Foo.

Joel Davis called the proposed amendment to question, and a second was provided by Eric Kurlander. A voice vote was inconclusive, so a raised hand vote was conducted. The motion failed.

- Against – 41 votes
- In Favor - 46 votes

Eric Kurlander then moved to end discussion and vote on the original motion (as presented with no amendments) to change the faculty senate by laws. A second was provided by Robert Askew. A voice vote was inconclusive, so a raised hand vote was conducted. The motion failed and was returned to further discussion.

- Against – 42 votes
- In Favor - 34 votes

Monica Mendoza proposed a motion to simplify and broaden the definition of a voting faculty member by removing the list of specific academic titles (e.g., lecturer, assistant professor) from the bylaws. Instead, she suggested defining a voting faculty member simply as a “full-time DeLand faculty member,” to ensure inclusivity of all faculty roles without specifying particular titles. A second was provided by George Glander.

Eric Kurlander suggested a secondary amendment, making this change contingent on the university adopting AAUP guidelines that protect contingent faculty’s academic freedom and due process. However, concerns were raised that this amendment was not germane to the bylaw changes formally submitted for review, as it had not been shared at least seven days in advance. The chair ruled the amendment germane, but this was challenged, prompting a vote on whether to overrule the chair’s decision and proceed with the discussion.

A voice vote was inconclusive, so a raised hand vote was conducted. The motion failed and the amendment was not considered germane.

- Against - 60 votes
- In Favor - 21 votes

The discussion returned to the original faculty by-laws change that was presented. Robert Askew moved to close discussion and proceed to a vote on the unamended Faculty Senate bylaw change. A second to the motion was provided by Susan Peppers-Bates.

A voice vote was inconclusive, so a raised hand vote was conducted. The motion to close discussion and move to a vote was passed.

- Against - 24 votes
- In Favor - 53 votes

Steven Smallpage explained that the proposed change to the faculty bylaws would proceed with a secret ballot. The vote did not meet the required 2/3 majority, so the proposed bylaw change failed.

- Against - 34 votes
- In Favor - 56 votes
- Abstain – 4

Steven Smallpage stated that the meeting was now adjourned with nothing left to discuss. Smallpage added that UCCAP (University Committee on Curriculum and Academic Policy) is currently operating outside the bounds of its defined membership, and that this issue is expected to be addressed over the summer. He emphasized the importance of adhering to the governing documents and Robert's Rules of Order in faculty governance. He noted that any changes to the bylaws should go through the appropriate committees.

Jeremy Posadas then moved to reconsider the proposed Faculty Senate bylaw changes. Robert Askew seconded the motion. Attendees noted that some of the faculty left the meeting after the preceding announcement of adjournment, and the chair stated that there was no motion to adjourn.

It was noted that Roberts' Rules state that only a faculty member who voted in opposition to the motion could move to reconsider the proposed Faculty Senate bylaw change. Some faculty expressed the desire to speak; however, the chair explained that no further comments would be heard and the motion to reconsider would now be voted on.

The motion passed with a simple majority.

- In Favor - 49
- Against - 35

Robert Askew called the question on the proposed faculty bylaw change. Susan Peppers-Bates seconded this motion. A vote by hand was conducted.

- In Favor - 47
- Against – 29

A 2/3 majority was not reached, so the motion did not move forward to a second vote.

Robert Askew moved to continue further discussion in the fall semester. Sam Houston provided a second. A conclusive voice vote with no opposition to continue the discussion in the fall semester passed.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting concluded at 2:45 PM.