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The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. The Minutes from the September 17, 2003, meeting were approved as presented.

REPORT FROM FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT ELIZABETH BIRD

Faculty Senate President Bird’s report consisted of the following announcements:

• The new Faculty Personnel Rules are now in effect. The rules are accessible on the Board of Trustees’ web site.

• The Faculty Senate website is being revamped to make it a resource page where people can find important documents and information on faculty issues. Any suggestions about content, appearance, or features should be sent to President Bird.

• The two policies passed by the Faculty Senate last year, the Freedom and Responsibility and the Peer Review Committee for Terminating Faculty, are now official USF policy. The Principles of Shared Governance document has been forwarded to Interim Provost Khator. There will be a brief consultative process whereby a work group will be put together consisting of a vice president and deans.

• To contribute to the notion of shared governance with faculty, President Bird has proposed the establishment of a new Senate council called the Council on Educational Policies and Issues. It would become the forum for initiatives and responses to any academic policy. A draft charge has been supported by the Senate Executive Committee and it has been forwarded to the Committee on Committees for review.

• In September, she attended an Advisory Council of the Faculty Senates (ACFS) meeting in Tallahassee. Professor Howard Rock, the Florida International University faculty representative on the Board of Governors (BOG), presented some important points to the BOG. Some of these issues will be discussed later in today’s meeting. The ACFS also met with the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor and talked specifically about accountability measures.

• The Principles of Shared Governance document was distributed to the ACFS. As chair of the Governmental Relations Committee, Senator Hector Vila was at the meeting defending initiatives. He is hoping to have State Legislators attend the December Senate meeting so that the Senate will have an opportunity to talk to them and voice concerns about major issues.

• The biggest issue facing USF is SACS accreditation. Some important issues in that area are faculty credentialing and the need for USF to dedicate resources to the Quality
Enhancement Plan (QEP) which is a central feature of accreditation. QEP is a plan to infuse undergraduate research into the undergraduate curriculum. A member of the QEP committee plans to attend the November Senate meeting to report on what is going on in that group.

• There are two opportunities for volunteers from the Senate. First, the University Lecture Series Committee requires some faculty members to join them. This is a group that is mostly student funded, but they need two to three faculty members to help with planned speakers. Second, Jeff Mack, Director of Auxiliary Services, has requested one faculty member to fill a vacancy on the USF Parking Citation Final Appeal Committee. Anyone interested in serving on either of these committees should inform President Bird.

• Secretary Jana Futch Martin is recovering from surgery. Past President Nancy Jane Tyson is Acting Secretary while Ms. Martin is on leave.

REPORT FROM PRESIDENT JUDY GENSHAFT

President Genshaft expressed her appreciation to all who attended her University Address the previous week, as well as those who were able to watch the web cast. The speech is still available for viewing on the web. Since her address, there have been a couple of additional issues. One is the issue about Scripps pharmaceutical locating in West Palm Beach. USF did have an opportunity to meet with the people from Scripps earlier in the semester. The State Senate approved 310 million dollars for Scripps. President Genshaft believes it is good for Tampa Bay to have a large pharmaceutical located in the area. A 190 million dollar megafund has been set aside for Megatech and USF is working on having the group locate in the Tampa Bay area.

USF is working closely with the BOG in proposing a new funding formula for all of the universities. Several different organizations are also looking at the funding formula.

The other item that President Genshaft addressed was the potential opportunity for USF to go from Conference USA to the Big East. That is a possibility and USF will have to look at the numbers in terms of what it takes to leave Conference USA, what it takes to go into the Big East and what it means. She assured everyone that state dollars are not being used for athletics. If USF has the opportunity to be invited and does move from Conference USA to the Big East, the schools that USF would be competing with would be similar schools such as the University of Louisville, the University of Cincinnati, the University of Pittsburgh, the University of Connecticut, Rutgers, Syracuse, West Virginia.

President Genshaft announced that Dr. Ian Phillips will be chair of the search committee for the Vice President of Health Sciences and Dean of Medicine. She is working closely with faculty in the College of Medicine as to who should be on the search committee. An interim dean will be appointed.

At this time, President Genshaft answered questions from the floor.
Graduate Council Chair Sara Mandell asked for clarification on whether or not USF has received the largest fine for overhead use that any university has ever received from the Federal Government. There is a rumor circulating that USF has to pay between four and five million dollars.

President Genshaft replied that there was an audit that had been on-going for three years. In particular, the College of Public Health was targeted where a variety of all the state and federal grant activity was observed. It was then extended to other colleges within the university. Indiscretions were found. All projects were finished, all products that came out of the projects were turned over and nobody is arguing with the product or the process that was used during the grant activity. However, there were indiscretions that did occur in that faculty would report they were on a certain percentage of the grant as they turned the grant in and upon the exit interviews and accountability of those grants the effort reported did not match, or some federal funds were used to enhance some state dollars that were short. There were a significant number of items purchased by using federal funds that were not on the grant. USF did have to pay a fine of four million dollars back to the federal government. The primary targeted colleges were listed in the newspaper and they were the Colleges of Public Health, Marine Science, and Medicine. The audit was for the years 1998 up to the year 2000. The new accountability rules have been put into the compliance and new training activity for researchers.

REPORT FROM INTERIM PROVOST RENU KHATOR

At the September Senate meeting, a request was made for Interim Provost Khator to provide an organizational chart which she distributed at today’s meeting. She pointed out that it was an administrative and not a functional chart which means the forty lines that appear on the last page are required by the Legislature. This is where USF stands legally today. Interim Provost Khator hopes to have a functional chart for the November meeting when the committee finishes the work on the Regional Campus Guidelines.

The other piece of unfinished business was the issue about the FAST! implementation. Vice Provost Robert Chang has been working with Vice President Carl Carlucci’s office to determine where the problems are and how to fix them. The good news is that there was a backlog of approximately six thousand invoices, now that number is in the range of two thousand. Nine additional OPS people were hired to work on the invoices. Dr. Chang has been able to identify the pattern leading to this kind of backlog and it is being taken care of to the extent possible.

The BOG is meeting in Tallahassee and one of the issues they are working on is the funding formula. The current funding formula does not favor USF in that USF does not receive the funds at the same level, teaching the same students of the same discipline as some of the sister universities. A new funding formula is needed that would tell how USF is going to get funding in the future. The process is being carefully monitored.

The second piece that the BOG is working on is performance measures. Information on the process can be found on the home page of the Provost’s Office. The documents are in summary and table form so a comparison can be done on who is talking about what kind of performance measures. Interim Provost Khator pointed out that university presidents do not have any voice at
the table, but faculty do. She urged everyone to do whatever is possible to get their voices heard because this is going to impact USF in terms of accountability measures and funding formulas.

USF is working on its application to Phi Beta Kappa. Interim Provost Khator thanked all the members of the Phi Beta Kappa group who have put a good application together and now are hiring somebody to polish it. The application deadline is November 1.

There are two pieces to the SACS accreditation. One piece is compliance and the other piece is the future or the vision. For the compliance piece, USF is concerned about two issues. One is how does USF define its governance structure? The second piece is about faculty selection. A checklist will be going to all departments so that everyone knows what SACS requires. Clarity is needed so that USF can function and make sure that it has everything in the right order.

The second piece of USF’s vision is the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). The Quality Enhancement Committee has been working on this plan for some time. The main theme of the QEP is undergraduate research experience. There are two pieces to that. One is general education, and the other is a more structured undergraduate research experience. Interim Provost Khator has received summaries but not the plan itself. Senate President Bird will receive a copy of the plan.

REPORT FROM USF UNITED FACULTY OF FLORIDA (Gregory McColm)

Senator McColm announced that two weeks ago the faculty at Florida State University voted on whether or not they wanted to be represented by the United Faculty of Florida (UFF) in bargaining and grievances. He reminded everyone that a year ago faculty were visited by people with collective bargaining cards asking everyone to sign them to try to call for an election. That was the choice that was presented. What those cards said was that if the administration did not voluntarily recognize the UFF, an election would be called and faculty would vote on whether or not they wanted to be represented by the UFF. Of the ten universities and one college in Florida, three of them chose not to recognize the UFF. Last summer there was an election at the University of West Florida, and of the faculty voting ninety-one percent voted in favor of being represented by the UFF. Two weeks ago at Florida State University, ninety-six percent of the faculty voted in favor of being represented by the UFF. The University of Florida is involved in a very complex litigation even over the election. Most of the Boards thus far have chosen to recognize UFF but not the contract. However, since UFF’s primary reason for existence is the contract, UFF should plan to continue to press on the issue.

Bargaining has begun on setting up a new grievance process. Those faculty within the bargaining unit should be getting a blue survey form asking what issues they think are important. Senator McColm asked that those who are in the bargaining unit please fill out this form and send it in. The bargaining team will be using it as a guide.

The UFF State Senate met and discussed the situation taking place at SUNY. Some of the various Faculty Senates there voted no confidence in their Boards. One of the major points of contention was the attempts of the Boards to use uniform testing and accountability measures in order to determine curriculum. Senator McColm pointed out that what was seen in K12 is
beginning to creep into the universities. As more and more politicization and commercialization is coming through the Boards into the administration, at the same time there are more and more budget cuts which are accompanied by various lectures on how frugal everyone should be.

Senator McColm mentioned that in-unit faculty should be receiving a quarterly newsletter and an electronic newsletter. If not, he should be notified.

REPORT FROM ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT FOR DIVERSITY AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY DEBORAH LOVE

President Bird introduced Associate Vice President Deborah Love who has been at USF for about nine months. Dr. Love came to USF from Washington State. She attended today’s meeting to propose a new Council on Diversity Issues. This is not a standing council, so the Senate will not have jurisdiction over it. Also, the Senate will not be able to edit the document.

Dr. Love first described the duties and responsibilities of the Office for Diversity and Equal Opportunity. The diversity work is on-going but the office has had to take time to evaluate where the university is and where it needs to go. This council is an opportunity to do that. Some of the functions of the office are to improve the mediation process and work with all the presidential advisory and advocacy groups. Under the Equal Opportunity (EO) umbrella, her office provides consultation on EO laws, and the Americans with Disabilities Act. The Office of Diversity and Equal Opportunity is responsible for working with federal and state agencies that monitor employees to comply with state and federal non-discrimination laws. It also works with federal agencies such as the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs. Some of the classes provided are Understanding the Value of Diversity, Diversity in the Workplace, Developing Diversity Perspectives, and Diversity Leadership in the Twenty-First Century. EO training and sexual harassment prevention classes are also offered. There are classes designed so that supervisors know what discrimination is and know how to react to the policy and get information to her office.

Dr. Love gave historical background with regard to the Diversity Council. USF has developed a diversity initiative and plan for each college and vice presidential area. However, it is her understanding that there really are not any long term plans to ensure that USF has a university-wide diversity plan. Turnover occurred and some things did not continue. What Dr. Love would like to do with the Diversity Council is get out of the mode of crisis orientation and into prevention orientation. That can be seen by looking at the USF strategic plan. It is important that USF look at diversity as an overall system, integrated with specific language, specific goals, and specific actions in terms of climate, recruitment and retention imbedded in the strategic plan. Other institutions have formed councils to oversee diversity work. These institutions have also integrated diversity into the strategic plan.

Dr. Love hopes the council will work with the institution to refine the vision, goals, objectives, and actions, and do some assessment and evaluations to foster strategic ownership primarily through the development of a strategic diversity management process. The strategic diversity management process would involve finding goals and objectives, investigating diversity issues, evaluating assessment, diversity work to date, planning, strategizing USF diversity work for now
and in the future, and providing guidance and leadership. An implementation plan needs to be established.

Dr. Love proposed that the council would consist of approximately 15-20 members, 50 to 60 percent to be faculty, with a Faculty Senate liaison. She pointed out that it is important that the Faculty Senators endorse this work and be a part of it. Primary efforts include providing guidance on the assessment and resolution of climate and diversity issues that the organization may face by recommending appropriate interventions in programs, taking the framework USF has articulated in its Strategic Plan and refining objectives, goals and strategies and how they relate to diversity, and identifying policies, programs and practices that are in need of revision to meet the needs of diverse faculty, staff and student body.

At this time, Dr. Love answered the following questions:

Graduate Council Chair Mandell brought up the issue of the problem on campus with the number and location of disabled spots. Dr. Love replied that this issue had been brought to her attention. She will take this information back to the Physical Activities Work Group Committee. A Diversity Council could look at a long term plan to ensure that USF is in compliance.

At this time a motion was made and seconded for the Faculty Senate to endorse and support the creation of the Council on Environment and Diversity. The motion unanimously passed.

REPORT FROM STUDENT GOVERNMENT LIAISON (Kali Campbell)

Student Government Liaison Campbell made the following announcements:

• President Khan and Vice President Morris were not impeached.

• A grievance was also filed against their Budget Chair, but there were no grounds found for impeachment.

• The Ninth Justice of the Supreme Court has been confirmed, so the Court membership is complete and is hearing cases.

• Student Government is beginning to overhaul its elections rules.

• USF Student Government is trying to get the Florida Student Association to work on its Legislative agenda for this year, but there has been no response. USF’s Student Government may not renew its contract with FSA if the group continues to be inactive. However, this could be a major problem since USF is a major contributor to issues.

COMMITTEE REPORTS AND ACTION

b. Revisions to Honorary Degree Nominations (Merilyn Burke)
Honors and Awards Council (HAC) Chair Merilyn Burke attended today’s meeting to present recommended changes to the Honorary Degree Nomination Guidelines (attached). Chair Burke explained that the HAC requested the removal of the last line of section one and a shortened version of item number 2. The HAC wanted to improve this process by deleting and streamlining the four criteria to be replaced with one statement. This allows the HAC and nominees for the Honorary Degree more. Therefore, item number 2 would read “The nominee must have demonstrated eminent achievement and scholarship that embodies the objectives and goals of the honorary degree. In addition, the nominee must be one who has made a noteworthy contribution to faculty, students, and/or other units of the University, or to Academia in general.” This recommendation came as a motion from the Senate Executive Committee to the Faculty Senate, which needs to endorse it before the revision becomes policy. President Bird asked if there were any suggested amendments to the wording at it stood and the floor was opened for discussion.

A motion was made and seconded to amend the wording in the first sentence to read “The nominee must have demonstrated eminent achievement, extraordinary humanitarian contributions or scholarship that embodies the objectives and goals of the honorary degree. The motion unanimously passed. There was a call to question. At this time a motion was made and seconded that the Faculty Senate approve the proposed revisions to the honorary degree nomination guidelines as amended. The motion unanimously passed.

OLD BUSINESS

a. Proposed Changes and Amendments to Constitution

The Senators received an amended version of the Constitution based upon the changes that were discussed at the September Senate meeting. President Bird asked the Senators to discuss and to disseminate the Constitution among their constituents and to send comments back to her. Senator John Ward asked if there was a procedure whereby general faculty could provide input on the Constitution. President Bird replied that discussion about the Constitution will be delayed until the November meeting with a final version in the spring. However, if a general faculty meeting to discuss it would be useful it should take place at that time.

President Bird would like the amendments to the Bylaws to occur at the same time as the Constitution amendments. However, there has not been any report from the Bylaws Committee at this point so a co-report cannot take place. Bylaws Committee Chair Sara Mandell announced that amendments would be presented at the next meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

a. 1991 Policy on Regional Campuses and New Proposed Policy
President Bird explained that this proposal was created by a group of associate deans and CEOs on regional campuses. It was slated to go into effect in August of this year. In July, President Bird received a copy of the proposal and became concerned about the way it was created and some of the provisions. Interim Provost Khator agreed to delaying its implementation. An ad hoc committee of the Senate was created and charged to obtain faculty input. Senator Steve Permuth is Chair of the ad hoc committee which has been visiting all the regional campuses, departments and councils around the university. Senator Permuth will present a response to the document at the next faculty meeting on November 12. The committee is working with Vice Provost Ralph Wilcox who is reviewing the document and its implications. Senators can still send any responses to the ad hoc committee.

Senator Permuth announced that it would be very helpful if before the next meeting everyone reviewed the 1991 document and the current document because by definition there will be thoughts about both in the committee’s report to the Senate. He added that once the Senate Executive Committee has reviewed it, it will be immediately posted so everyone can view it before the November meeting. President Bird asked everyone to come to the meeting prepared to discuss the report.

b. **Revisions to Emeritus Professor Award (Emanuel Donchin)**

At the request of President Bird, Senator Emanuel Donchin attended today’s meeting to present a new proposed policy on the Emeritus Professor process (attached). President Bird explained that last year in the College of Arts and Sciences there was quite a broad discussion about the Emeritus process at USF. During these discussions, it was pointed out that the process at USF is anomalous compared to almost any other university in the country. Usually, Emeritus status is automatically given upon retirement and that is very common. Some universities have a time frame while others have a much more simple process that might be something along the lines of somebody being nominated within the department. Essentially, it puts the decision making for an Emeritus in the department because that is where the faculty member has spent his or her time.

The department chairs in Arts and Science brought forward a proposal last year with the goal of it coming to the Senate. Unfortunately their recommendations did not go directly to the Senate, they went instead into the Provost’s office and no further. So it was decided to revisit the issue this year and to move on it very quickly. Toward the end of the summer President Bird appointed an ad hoc committee chaired by Senator Emanuel Donchin from the Department of Psychology which has been one of the groups talking about this for some time. The recommendations then went to the Honors and Awards Council. The SEC and the full Senate need to do two things, one of which is recommending that the awarding of Emeritus moves out of the Honors and Awards Council and into the purview of the Senate. Second, is recommending that this is the process to be followed. At this time the floor was turned over to Senator Donchin. The first motion that the consideration of and the granting of Emeritus status will no longer be within the charge of the Senate’s Honors and Awards Council was unanimously passed.
The next part of the motion was to adopt the policies and procedures which came to the Senate as made and seconded. At this time Senator Donchin led discussion of the motion. When asked if it was the intention of the committee to have faculty on regional campuses approved through a campus department, Senator Donchin replied that that issue was not addressed. It was not clear to him that it was clarified at all what the relationship is between the campus department and the satellite departments. A motion was made and seconded to address this with different wording by amending the proposal to add the words “department chair or applicable academic unit.” The motion unanimously passed.

The issue of parking was discussed. A motion was made that Emeritus faculty members would have the right to upgrade from a green parking tag to a gold parking tag and pay the difference between the two lots. The motion died due to a lack of a second.

At this time, there was a call to question. A motion was made and seconded to approve the Proposed Policy on Emeritus Status as amended to include the regional campuses. The motion passed.

c. **Advisory Council of Faculty Senate Resolutions**

President Bird presented the following motions that were passed by the Advisory Council of Faculty Senates during its September meeting in Tallahassee. She pointed out that one will have an impact on the university, the other two are wish lists. The motion came to the Senate made and seconded by the SEC to consider each item separately.

**Resolution proposed and seconded by the Senate Executive Committee**

Whereas the Advisory Council of Faculty Senates (ACFS), representing the faculty of the State University System in Florida passed the following motions at the September 19th meeting, it is resolved that the USF Faculty Senate endorses each motion:

1. **University Entrance Requirements.**
   The ACFS resolves that all candidates for admission as freshmen to the SUS must fulfill the General Requirements for High School (four years) or its equivalent. The Standard College Preparatory Program (3-year) and the Career Preparatory Program (3-year) are not acceptable for admission of freshmen in the state university system (see attached).

2. **Presidential Selection Standards.**
   The ACFS strongly recommends that, except in extraordinary circumstance, all finalists for the position of university president have both strong academic credentials and substantial experience at the senior levels of university leadership.

3. **Faculty Salaries.**
   The ACFS recommends that individual faculty salaries in the SUS be brought up to the national averages in comparable universities, disciplines, and levels within 5 years. It also
recommends that faculty salaries be increased to the same percentile nationally as that of senior level administrators.

The first motion was the University Entrance Requirements. The Legislature pushed for new graduation requirements for high school graduates, and there is now a new program that allows a student to graduate in three years instead of four with 18 credits instead of 24. The goal is to move people out as quickly as possible. The general requirements are the same, and the standard college preparatory is the three year program. This is not an accelerated program in the sense that they do more in less time. It is saying “you don’t have to do as much to get into college.” Then there is a career preparatory program for those not going to college. It deletes requirements for American history, government, fine arts and quite a few other things. From the faculty perspective they feel this is inadequate preparation and that the State University System should not accept this as an entrance requirement. The motion presented to the Senators was that the candidate must fulfill the general requirements for high school of four years or its equivalent. The Standard College Preparatory Program is not acceptable for admission as a freshman into the State University System. The motion to not accept the Standard College Preparatory Program was unanimously passed.

The second motion dealt with Presidential Selection Standards. It recommends that, except in extraordinary circumstances, all finalists for the position of university president have both strong academic potential and substantial experience at the senior level of the university leadership. The motion was unanimously passed.

The third motion dealt with faculty salaries. The ACFS recommends that the faculty salaries in the State University System be brought up to the national average. It also recommends that faculty salaries be increased to the same percent as that of national senior level administrators. Based upon research conducted on the subject, salaries for senior level administrators are at the national average but not for faculty. President Bird commented that if it is so important to recruit senior administrators at national salary, it should to be as important to recruit faculty under the same circumstances. The motion was unanimously passed.

**ISSUES FROM THE FLOOR**

Faculty Senate Vice President Susan Greenbaum distributed copies of the following resolution regarding the practices of the Florida Retirement System (FRS).

**Proposed Resolution regarding concerns about investment practices in FRS**

Many faculty at the University of South Florida are participants in the Florida Retirement System, and are critically dependent on the performance and ultimate solvency of the fund for their future income security. Faculty have a strong stake and interest in the management of this fund, and are justified in raising questions about practices that jeopardize its wellbeing.
In the past two years, the FRS has lost large sums that had been invested in highly publicized corporate failures -- $335 million to Enron and more than $80 million in WorldCom. FRS losses in the Enron collapse were three times as large as any other state retirement fund, and the bulk of our investments were made after the unsound state of the company was publicly known.

It was disclosed (St. Pete Times 9/25/03) that an FRS investment manager (Liberty Partners Inc.) plans on acquiring at least $174 million in shares of Edison Schools, Inc. This purchase would make FRS the owner of more than 90% of the stock in a company that appears, like Enron and WorldCom, destined for failure. The current value of the company’s stock is $1.76 a share, down from about $37 a share two years ago. Edison’s corporate performance is so poor that it must be deemed a very high risk investment. Liberty Partners, Inc. reportedly also has a poor record of performance as an investor. The FRS trustees have a fiduciary responsibility to protect the assets of the retirement fund and ensure that the beneficiaries’ interests are primary.

Currently, the Florida State Board of Administration, which administers the FRS, is last among the states in the number of plan participants represented on the board (we have zero). Lack of oversight and participation by the most important stakeholders raises further concerns with the governance of this critical public fund.

Therefore, I propose that the Governmental Relations Committee of the USF Faculty Senate undertake an inquiry into the recent investment practices of the FRS and the process by which such decisions are reviewed and evaluated.

Vice President Greenbaum expressed concern about a recent decision on the part of Liberty Partners Inc., an investment company that works for the FRS. They have decided to become the owner of Edison Schools. Edison Schools is the pioneering privatization of K-12. It has been unsuccessful. Its stock has plummeted and now FRS wants to buy it all.

Vice President Greenbaum added that the other thing that has more relevance is that the governance of the FRS is unique among all others in the country in that there is zero representation from beneficiaries and stockholders so these are decisions that operate outside the purview of those people whose future livelihoods are at stake. These are very questionable decisions where this is not supposed to be a high risk outfit. She proposed that the Governmental Relations Committee of the USF Faculty Senate gather information about the recent investment practices of the FRS and process by which such decisions are reviewed and evaluated. The motion was seconded. An amendment was made to the last paragraph to strike the word “recent.” The motion to approve the motion as amended was unanimously passed.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.