# MINUTES

**Trustees Present:** Annie Egan (Chair), Jason Barrett, Mike Binder, John Grosso, Steve Moore, Kevin Hyde

**Trustees Absent:** Allison Korman Shelton (excused), Chris Lazzara (excused)

**Item 1 Call to Order**

 Chair Egan called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

## Item 2 Public Comment

 There were no requests for public comment.

## Item 3 Consent Agenda

-Draft April 24, 2023 Academic and Student Affairs Committee

Minutes

Chair Egan asked for a MOTION to approve the Draft April 24, 2023 meeting minutes. Trustee Binder made a MOTION to APPROVE, and Trustee Moore SECONDED. The committee unanimously approved the draft minutes.

## Item 4 Proposed Amended Regulation – 5.0010R Student Code of Conduct

Ms. Robyn Blank, Associate Vice President and Chief Compliance Officer, presented revisions to the Student Conduct Code. Ms. Blank presented the redlined version of the Regulation 5.0010R Student Code of Conduct and highlighted the following changes:

The first group of revisions were those required by the Board of Governors which include a provision requiring biennial review of the student disciplinary system, guidelines for hearing administrators’ statement of appellate rights and language reflecting a commitment to civil discourse principles.

The second revision set provides for new hearing procedures for academic administrative hearings. These would be hearings of an academic misconduct nature that are conducted by a single hearing officer as opposed to a panel of faculty members, which mirrors UNF’s process for behavioral administrative hearings before a single hearing officer.

The third set of revisions is new code violations. They include a prohibition on vaping to align with UNF’s smoke-free designation and a prohibition on the use of artificial intelligence and academic exercises.

Hearing no questions, Chair Egan asked for a MOTION to approve the Amended Regulation – 5.0010R Student Code of Conduct. Chair Hyde made a MOTION to APPROVE and Trustee Grosso SECONDED. The committee unanimously approved the motion.

## Item 5 Committee Approval of Faculty Tenure Recommendations

 Provost Karen Patterson began with a refresher on the tenure process including the definition and purpose of tenure and the process of earning tenure at the University of North Florida. The Provost noted that the process of earning and awarding tenure to an eligible faculty member is completely different from the post-tenure review process, which is mandated by the Florida legislature and the Board of Governors.

 Among other points regarding what tenure is and is not, Provost Patterson stated that tenure means that tenured faculty members will be reappointed annually until voluntary resignation, retirement or removal for just cause. It was noted that tenure is not a guaranteed lifetime job and that faculty can face disciplinary action for inadequate performance, as it does not guarantee future promotions. Provost Patterson reviewed the one-year process for evaluating a candidate’s qualifications and eligibility for an award of tenure.

 Trustee Binder emphasized the serious nature with which faculty approach the evaluation of their colleagues, as well as the significance of the application and attainment of tenure. He expressed that, as a faculty member, he felt his primary service responsibilities were in the hiring of faculty and effectively managing and assessing the tenure process.

 Provost Patterson presented the slate of eleven faculty candidates recommended for tenure for the academic year 2022-2023.

 Chair Egan asked for a MOTION to approve the slate of Faculty Tenure Candidates for academic year 2022-2023. Chair Hyde made a MOTION to APPROVE and Trustee Grosso SECONDED. The committee unanimously approved the motion.

## Item 6 Proposed New Policy – Post-Tenure Review

Ms. Robyn Blank, Associate VP and Chief Compliance Officer, presented UNF's proposed policy on post-tenure review, required by BOG Regulation 10.003. The policy aligns with new BOG requirements, which requires a comprehensive review every 5 years for tenured faculty members. This review is separate from the promotion and tenure process and has distinct requirements.

Ms. Blank provided a summary of the post-tenure process: Each faculty member selected for review compiles a separate dossier showcasing their work, accomplishments, and performance during the review period. The dossier is submitted to their chair, who reviews it alongside other documents such as annual evaluations and performance concerns. The Chair then forwards the dossier and an assessment letter to the College Dean. The Dean reviews all materials and adds a second letter with a recommended performance rating (exceeds expectations, meets expectations, does not meet expectations, or unsatisfactory). The materials then go to the Provost, who assigns a final rating from the same four options.

Ms. Blank stated that in an effort to meet the BOG’s expectations, our policy adheres very closely to the BOG regulation. The policy has been vetted by the Faculty Association Leadership, CEROC, and the executive cabinet. Although it is a policy, not a regulation, she requested a vote on this item as per guidance received from the BOG.

Trustees asked for clarification on the difference between a policy and a regulation and why the post-tenure review was proposed as a policy vs. a regulation. Ms. Blank explained that a policy typically does not require board approval and pertains to internal matters within the university. A regulation is necessary when it impacts both the university and external stakeholders or when the BOG mandates it as a regulation. The BOG describes this document as a policy because it is internal to the institution.

 Trustee Binder stated as a representative of the faculty, he expressed concerns regarding academic freedom, the strength of the University, and most importantly, the competition for talent nationwide. Trustee Binder stated that he could not support this policy.

President Limayem acknowledged that the true impact of the policy remains uncertain. However, it was noted that non-adoption of the policy would result in non-compliance with the BOG. President Limayem highlighted that UNF has made efforts to put safeguards in place to make the post-tenure review process transparent and fair and to prevent administrative abuses. He stated that as leaders of the university, it is crucial to foster a culture and a compelling vision that attracts talented individuals.

 Chair Egan asked for a MOTION to approve the proposed policy on Post Tenure Review. Chair Hyde made a MOTION to APPROVE and Trustee Grosso SECONDED. Trustees Annie Egan, Jason Barrett and Steve Moore, voted in favor of the proposed policy. Trustee Mike Binder opposed the proposed policy.

 Vice President Stone indicated that because of the split vote, this item will be presented to the full board for Board consideration. Only items that are unanimously approved in committee are added to the consent agenda.

**Item 7 Proposed Amended Policy 5.0110P – Intercollegiate Athletes -- Name, Image, and Likeness**

Ms. Robyn Blank, Associate Vice President and Chief Compliance Officer presented changes to this policy for information purposes only. These amendments are required by recent legislative changes and revisions to BOG Regulation 6.022. Revisions include requirements to report all NIL deals in the manner adopted by the Athletics Department, allowances for use of UNF marks and logos with University approval, and creation of financial literacy and entrepreneurship workshops available to all student-athletes, regardless of whether they have NIL deals. Florida was one of the first states to pass legislation on the topic of name, image, and likeness for student-athlete compensation.

Trustee Egan asked if we currently have any athletes who are operating under this policy. Ms. Blank indicated UNF does not have any collectives but do have some athletes who would be subject to this policy.

Before concluding, Trustee Egan asked if there were any strategic items that anyone wished to discuss or share. Hearing none and with no further questions, the meeting was adjourned at 1:21 pm.