

1-1-2005

# AY 2004/2005 SEC meeting minutes: 04 Nov 03

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fs\\_pubs](http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fs_pubs)

---

## Scholar Commons Citation

Faculty Senate, "AY 2004/2005 SEC meeting minutes: 04 Nov 03" (2005). *Faculty Senate Publications*. Paper 173.  
[http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fs\\_pubs/173](http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fs_pubs/173)

This Agenda/Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Publications by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact [scholarcommons@usf.edu](mailto:scholarcommons@usf.edu).

# SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

## MINUTES

November 3, 2004

Present: Michael Barber, Glen Besterfield, Elizabeth Bird, Ellis Blanton, Susan Greenbaum, Carnot Nelson, Steve Permut, Philip Reeder, Andrew Smith, Thomas Terrell, John Ward, Kathy Whitley

Provost's Office: Robert Chang, Philip Smith, Ralph Wilcox

Guests: Uday Murthy, Research Council Vice Chair

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. The first order of business was to approve the Minutes for the October 6, 2004, meeting as presented.

### **REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT SUSAN GREENBAUM**

President Greenbaum announced that the Senate was making progress on some issues. The ICAR resolution was not passed at the last meeting in its exact form but it passed in principle given the fact that it is a working document.

A related issue came up that is not on the agenda but will involve an ad hoc committee. It is program expansion from the main campus to branch campuses. This is partly a preemption of ideas that are floating around that with separate accreditation a program can be exported or appropriated to another campus. Further discussion will take place later in the meeting. An ad hoc committee will look into this with the notion of having consultation to develop a new policy.

President Greenbaum and Vice President Permut met with Provost Khator, Vice Provosts Chang and Wilcox and discussed a number of issues from the BOG strategic plan, specifically the tuition proposals that did pass at the meeting and the academic compacts which passed but with some ambiguity. One of the four goal areas is for meeting committee needs and fulfilling unique institutional responsibilities.

President Greenbaum would like to establish an ad hoc committee on university engagement to look at issues such as what is community engagement, who is doing it and how it is being done, who else does it and what kind of procedures and policies would be useful to increase its effectiveness and scope.

Part of the strategic plan calls for writing performance goals. President Greenbaum is now a member of the BOT Community Engagement Workgroup. She will remain on the ACE workgroup. Discussion took place on how faculty are appointed to the BOT workgroups. When first established, there was some discussion about the role of the Senate and making suggestions

on membership. Some suggestions were made and not all were accepted. There was some dissatisfaction about that and this issue resurfaced without ever being resolved. Senate President Greenbaum spoke to President Genshaft who is amiable to having the process changed to have the Senate more involved. President Genshaft expressed concern about having a process where nominations go before the Senate with no prior discussion. She suggested that nominations come before the SEC first where there is an opportunity to discuss them before being presented on the floor at Senate meetings. This process could be used for both Honorary Degree nominations as well as nominations for the workgroups.

President Greenbaum asked the SEC members to think about this proposal and forward thoughts and ideas to her. In the meantime, she will find out the status of the nominees and what kind of intervention the Senate would want to have. In an attempt to formulate a plan of action regarding workgroup nominations, President Greenbaum will forward to the SEC the original e-mail message she received soliciting nominations. Parliamentarian John Ward suggested that a policy should be established as to who receives notification of vacancies. President Greenbaum replied that she will look into having the SEC on the distribution list for the workgroup vacancies so that the Senate has an opportunity to be more involved in the process.

Provost Khator requested that the SEC follow up on her suggestion from the last SEC meeting that the Committee on Faculty Issues (CFI) convene to look at questions of career ladder and workforce issues and related matters that have to do with non-tenure faculty, lecturers, instructors, and soft money people. Although the CFI has a full roster of members, it does not have a chair to lead them. President Greenbaum will call a meeting of the committee to elect a chair and get them started on the issues put forward by the Provost.

Vice Provost Robert Chang has asked that the SEC consider the nomination process for the Distinguished University Professor (DUP).

The Budget Advisory Committee met with Provost Khator. This committee is designed to be a sounding board and consultation method for budget issues. One of the issues discussed was connected to the tuition proposal as to whether or not the university has the capacity to greatly expand summer teaching offerings. There will be a greater demand for summer classes under the new tuition formula. There are more constraints, so it remains to be seen what can be done to make that a possibility.

The departmental shared governance ad hoc committee is almost fully staffed. Seven members have accepted.

## **REPORT FROM PROVOST RENU KHATOR**

Provost Khator was out of the country, so Vice Provosts Chang and Wilcox gave a report on her behalf. Vice Provost Chang first reported that at the last Faculty Senate meeting President Genshaft stated that even though it has been shown that USF has great needs for laboratory space and buildings, USF is not on the PECO list. The following day BOT Chairman Mr. Richard Beard and President Genshaft were at the BOG meeting pointing out this fact. The BOG's

response was that it would take that into consideration. It was neither added nor discussed at the meeting.

At this time, Vice Provost Wilcox gave a report on the performance funding model. He distributed a copy of the presentation he gave to the BOT's Workgroup on Fiscal Affairs and its executive committee. Main points included the BOG performance funding proposal slated for action at the next BOG meeting. It is the BOG's response to House Bill of 915 (2003) that requires the FBOE to establish a set of recommendations on funding K thru 20 education in the State of Florida on the basis of performance, holding back 10 percent of the base budget annually which for USF amounts to a little over 28 million dollars.

Under the leadership of Mr. Steve Uhfelder, the committee developed seven performance measures. Based upon the BOG's ranking of importance, it was then divided into USF's \$28 million base. Meeting the goal of increasing access to and production of degrees is worth \$4.8 million to USF. Establishing those goals are problematic because it is unclear whether in fact these goals will be established based upon past performance of institutions or based upon peer expectations. President Genshaft is in the process of developing an institution-wide strategy to address some of these concerns with appropriate parties. She and Mr. Beard will be reaching out to the president of the Faculty Senate to determine who will communicate which concerns, in what way, to what party

The tuition policy was on the BOG's Agenda for discussion. It was discussed and acted upon. The full document is on the BOG website. There are six principles:

1. The State would establish a combined tuition and fees ceiling for all in-state undergraduate students within which universities would be able to establish their own tuition and fee rates. For all other students the BOT would have full flexibility to establish tuition rates on the basis of what the market would support.
2. Requires that 5 percent of all tuition and fees be set aside for need-based financial aid that would flow into a central pool to be distributed to students on a need-based formula.
3. There is a recommendation of leveling a 25 percent tuition and fee surcharge on any hours taken over 110 percent of required degree hours.
4. The block tuition elements of this proposal would require all institutions to establish block tuition. Their preferred model is one that would require students to pay for 15 hours once they registered for 9 hours. However, there would be flexibility for institutions to establish that point at which the block would kick in. Students would still have to pay for 15 hours but there would be the flexibility to allow the block to kick in somewhere between 9 and 12 hours. UF went on record as saying that they fully intend to set their block at 9. UCF shortly thereafter spoke of 12. An interesting twist to this is that if a student did indeed pay for 15 hours but chose not to or was not able to take the full 15 hours, they could bank any hours that they had paid for and not used and enroll in them the following summer. This would be the anticipated demand for summer.

The question was asked what happens now. Which of the block tuitions is going to be used? Vice Provost Wilcox replied that this is probably going to create the greatest excitement during the upcoming legislative session as far as higher education is concerned, because it is really the point at which the BOG has chosen to take on the State Legislature. The BOG believes now that it has the constitutional authority to make this happen. The history in Florida has been that the Legislature has never shown any willingness to release its grip on student tuition. Meanwhile, the university cannot afford to sit around and wait to see what happens, because the recommendation as it stands does propose implementation in 2005/2006 Academic Year. There are some systems concerns whether the university has the ability to put the systems in place such as the student information system, the necessary budget and financial systems, to accommodate this rather complex program.

The last point from Vice Provost Wilcox was to follow up on Vice Provost Chang's comment regarding the PECO list. He was commenting on the three year PECO list which is the state funded construction budget for institutions. USF does not get any new construction for the next three years. Two thousand and nine would be the earliest and even that is optimistic given the five year list, because USF does not have any projects on the Tampa campus. The highest ranked project is the multiuse science and technology facility in St. Petersburg. Meanwhile, USF is slated to wait to get \$10 million in infrastructure this year, \$9 million next and \$12 million the year after. Again, the president and chair of the BOT appealed very powerfully to the BOG based upon their own data which revealed that when one looks at institutional space needs there are three institutions that appear at the bottom and they are UCF, FIU, and USF. These three institutions could make a very good case for the BOG to look more carefully at space need-based allocations for PECO projects in the future.

Associate Provost Phil Smith announced that at this point the administration and UFF have signed a tentative agreement. The contract, which is approximately 85 percent parallel to the previous contract, is now moving forward for ratification by the faculty. The BOT will move to ratify. He anticipates that by the end of the month or the first of December there will be a ratified contract with salary provisions for an 85 percent package which is the largest salary package this university has seen in fifteen to twenty years. It will be retroactive to the beginning of the contract period which is August 7<sup>th</sup>. That is in addition to the legislatively appropriated \$1,000 bonus. Vice President Permuth added that faculty should have ballots sent to their home address early the following week. The ballots should be returned to UFF by November 18<sup>th</sup> with a count to be done on November 20<sup>th</sup> for a report. It is anticipated that the BOT will call a special meeting during the week of Thanksgiving. The UFF hopes that lump sum checks will be given to all faculty before Christmas. Associate Provost Smith stated that the administration will do its best to stay on track with the ratification process. He added that both the administration and UFF heartily endorses this contract as a solid contract.

## REPORTS BY OFFICERS AND COUNCIL CHAIRS

### a. Committee Nomination (Ellis Blanton)

Committee on Committees (COC) Chair Blanton brought two issues before the SEC. The first was a nomination from Dr. Martha Coulter for membership on the Graduate Council which was received after the nominations closed for the last cycle. Dr. Coulter's nomination was approved by the COC via e-mail. Therefore, her nomination was ready to be moved and seconded by the SEC. If it is approved, the nomination would be presented at the November Faculty Senate meeting.

The second issue was the receipt of a nomination from Dr. Deirdre Cobb-Roberts for the Committee on Faculty Issues. Although her nomination had not been processed through the COC, Chair Blanton would request approval after the SEC approved the nomination. Hence, it would then be presented to the Faculty Senate for consideration.

At this time, motions were made and seconded to nominate the following faculty to fill existing vacancies:

- Dr. Arthur Shapiro, College of Education, Graduate Council
- Dr. Cobb-Roberts, College of Education, Committee on Faculty Issues
- Dr. Martha Coulter, Public Health, Graduate Council
- Dr. Patrick Finelli, Visual and Performing Arts, Library Council
- Sharon Gieger, Honors College, Undergraduate Council

The motions were seconded and unanimously approved contingent upon the receipt by the COC of the appropriate nomination materials.

A brief discussion occurred regarding the lack of participation by the branch campuses on both the committees as well as the Faculty Senate. The suggestion was made that in the case of committee participation the nomination could include the offer to a branch campus person not to have to make the hour drive and participate through distance learning technology. It could be more attractive for people to accept the nominations.

Parliamentarian John Ward commented that before teleconferencing was offered as an option, there needs to be an interface between the Bylaws and the Instructional Technology and Distance Learning Council (IT-DLC) to make sure it does not violate the Bylaws.

IT-DLC Chair Terrell added that Educational Outreach Interim Dean Kathleen Moore should be included in the loop. President Greenbaum asked Parliamentarian Ward and IT-DLC Chair Terrell to discuss and find out what is involved in offering teleconferencing.

b. Library Council (Drew Smith & Tom Terrell)

In response to a discussion at the October SEC meeting regarding the growing awareness of the USF website and security issues, Library Council Chair Smith presented a draft proposal titled “Web Accessibility of USF Web Sites.” He intentionally kept it minimally technical so as not to throw terms at people. It affects everyone potentially, in terms of what environment one happens to be in or what one is using. He pointed out that it not only a disability issue, but is more an issue of appropriate use of technology on campus.

IT-DLC Chair Terrell explained that this has been discussed with people from Academic Computing and Educational Outreach and one of the things they were hoping to get was an agreement that it would be possible to increase faculty awareness and web building awareness by offering classes through existing mechanisms. By offering classes and getting the right people to them, and having the weight of the Faculty Senate behind it, it becomes a grassroots effort from the faculty to serve student constituencies. This is relatively simple but not easy. It is hoped that this resolution would start that process.

A motion was made and seconded to present this resolution to the Faculty Senate for consideration. The motion unanimously passed.

c. Council on Educational Policy and Issues (Philip Reeder)

Chair Reeder announced that the Council on Educational Policy and Issues (CEPI) met on October 25<sup>th</sup> and discussed potential future issues such as intercampus academic relations, top ten compliance issues and the consensual relationship policy (CRP).

The CRP, which was originally called the “amorous” consensual relationship policy, is in its third draft. CEPI is concerned that this policy should be dealing with actions associated with things occurring *within* the university, because someone’s behavior away from their place of employment cannot be regulated. A lot of the related language in this regard was removed. The policy is now ready to move to the next level.

Parliamentarian Ward pointed out that there is no mention in the policy of dual or financial relationships. He also felt that nepotism should be mentioned to in the policy. President Greenbaum commented that spousal relationships adhere to a different policy.

Chair Reeder will incorporate these items into the draft time for it to be presented to the Faculty Senate at its November 17<sup>th</sup> meeting. At this time a motion was made and seconded to place the CRP on the Faculty Senate agenda for discussion. The motion unanimously passed.

## OLD BUSINESS

### a. Status of Grievance Procedure (Elizabeth Bird)

Past President Bird iterated that this policy must be approved at the next Senate meeting if it is going to be in the catalog for next year. For those SEC members not familiar with the history of the policy, she gave a quick review. The academic grievance procedure that was passed at the end of the previous year went into effect but contained problems to which people objected. It was decided to bring it back to the Senate and create an ad hoc committee to work on the procedure. The main issues were:

- the definition of an academic grievance was too broad and would open the door for people to come in with all sorts of general complaints, and
- the time lines were also unclear and there were too many levels of possible appeal.

The procedure has been changed so that the definition of grievance is much more focused and the third level has been removed except on the basis of an appeal. The time line was cleaned up so that it was consistent throughout. All the appropriate groups have approved it. Graduate Council Chair Carnot Nelson added that the Policy Committee would be reviewing it at a meeting the following week.

Vice President Permuth made the motion that the SEC approve this policy to be presented to the full Senate at its November meeting. The motion was seconded and the floor was opened for discussion. There was a motion to call to question. The motion was seconded and unanimously passed.

Past President Bird added that Psychology Department Chair Emanuel Donchin has one issue that has not been met in that psychology is the only department that has an actual written, formal grievance procedure. It is a very long and complicated procedure at the departmental level. Dr. Donchin has been insistent that if a student goes through that procedure then they should not go to the college level. The ad hoc committee and everyone else have basically agreed that it is not good because it leaves the students in psychology no further recourse, except where the procedure of the psychology department was violated. All students should have the opportunity for common hearing under the same guidelines based at one level. Dr. Donchin still disagrees with this. Therefore, on behalf of Dr. Donchin Past President Bird presented the following proposed amended language for consideration by the SEC:

The offending language is:

"...If the grievance cannot be resolved, the department Chair/Director shall notify both the student and the instructor, informing the student of his/her right to file a written request within three weeks to advance the grievance to the College Level. The instructor may file a written response to the grievance petition...."

This language is used in the footnote that addresses the situation that arises when the department does have a formal process. As the footnote ends with:

"...If the Department does not uphold the grievance, the Chair will report the fact to the Dean. The student may, in such cases, request the College Level review as outlined in these university procedures..."

I would amend the footnote's language to read:

"...If the Department does not uphold the grievance, the Chair will report the fact to ALL PARTIES TO THE DISPUTE AS WELL AS TO THE DEAN. The student may, in such cases, [request the College Level review] APPEAL THE DEPARTMENT'S DECISION TO THE DEAN WHO WILL LAUNCH A College Level review as outlined in these university procedures... "

This point is important to us because it underlines the fact that there has been a formal review at the Department level, a review conducted at the student's request, and with the student's consent. The student had a right to bypass the department, a right the student chose not to exercise. Thus the College review will be conducted explicitly as an appeal. When reviewing such an appeal the College will not, and can not, ignore the fact that a prior review has taken place.

This seems to me a compromise that will recognize the fact that some departments have done the right thing and developed formal procedures to deal with student grievances. It will also show respect to the laborious and detailed manner in which we chose to deal with students' grievances. It is insulting to deal with this as an interim process on the way to the "real" review at the College level.

Perhaps your committee will accept the above as a friendly amendment, and have it introduced to the text before, or at the SEC.

With regards,

Emanuel Donchin, Professor and Chair  
Department of Psychology

The SEC reviewed the proposed amended footnote language. Past President Bird pointed out that the ad hoc committee had wanted to avoid the word "appeal," but that if the SEC wished to modify the language, there should be a second for the amendment. SEC members did not wish to accept the amendment, and it died for lack of a second.

The policy as presented at today's SEC meeting will go forward to the full Senate at its November meeting.

b. ICAR – Next Steps (Steve Permut)

Vice President Permut announced that the ICAR document has been submitted to President Genshaft. No response has been received from her.

c. Degree Expansion Program/Ad Hoc Committee (Steve Permut)

Vice President Permut has been asked to chair an ad hoc committee to look into how a program would be transferred. Currently, there is no policy for doing so. This will be a on a fast-track with a committee report to be submitted to the SEC in either January or February.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

a. Agenda for the December Faculty Senate Meeting

A brief discussion was held regarding whether or not to cancel the December Faculty Senate meeting. It was agreed that this should be put on the agenda for the Senators to decide.

b. Senate Listserv (Susan Greenbaum)

President Greenbaum has received a request that a mechanism be developed whereby Senators are able to communicate with one another electronically in between meetings. Library Council Chair Andrew Smith suggested a discussion board within a Blackboard community. In addition, it could be used to send out announcement regarding issues.

President Greenbaum will bring up the issue at the November Senate meeting. In the meantime, Secretary Whitley and IT-DLC Chair Terrell will work on putting together Blackboard instructions for the entire group.

c. Committee on Faculty Issues (Susan Greenbaum)

This topic was covered during President Greenbaum's opening remarks. She had nothing more to add at this time.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.