

1-1-2005

AY 2004/2005 SEC meeting minutes: 05 Jan 12

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fs_pubs

Scholar Commons Citation

Faculty Senate, "AY 2004/2005 SEC meeting minutes: 05 Jan 12" (2005). *Faculty Senate Publications*. Paper 175.
http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fs_pubs/175

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.

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

MINUTES

January 12, 2005

Present: Michael Barber, Laurence Branch, Glen Besterfield, Elizabeth Bird, Ellis Blanton, Susan Greenbaum, Carnot Nelson, Steve Permuth, Philip Reeder, Andrew Smith, Gregory Teague, John Ward, Kathy Whitley

Provost's

Office: Robert Chang, Renu Khator, Ralph Wilcox

Guests: Gregory McColm, Janet Moore, Antonio Peramo, Robert Potter, Stuart Silverman, Robert Sullins

The meeting was called to order at 3:09 p.m. The Minutes from the December 1, 2004, meeting were approved as presented.

REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT SUSAN GREENBAUM

President Greenbaum had a number of old, as well as new items, for today's meeting. She voiced concern about the attenuated nature of communications between the Faculty Senate and faculty. The Blackboard system is not working very well so another structure will be created to bring together the chairs of the colleges and branch campus councils so that the Senate can begin

to get some sense of what is happening at that level and to provide information about what is happening at the Faculty Senate level. Ideas to enhance the flow of information can be sent to her.

One other issue that was left over from last semester is the Board of Trustees (BOT) workgroups. The BOT is looking for nominations from all colleges and those need to be submitted before the appointments expire.

REPORT FROM PROVOST RENU KHATOR

Provost Khator reported that she had just received a report from the Campus Safety Committee. According to the new police chief, USF is a much safer campus. The total crimes for the university as a whole are down by 13 percent. Major crimes which include murder, sexual assault, robberies, aggravated assault, and burglary are down by 25 percent. Property loss is down by 18 percent, and stolen property recovery is up by 19 percent. The campus remains constant on alcohol violations and similar things.

Vice Provost Ralph Wilcox was asked to report on enrollment. He announced that the status for the spring 2005 first-day-of-classes enrollment continues to grow and is up 5 percent over what it was last year. At the end of this week, there will be a clearer and more confident position. The likelihood is that USF will be ahead of last year in both headcount and SCH which is the critical measure because that is what funds this institution. He pointed out, however, that the university is not quite moving in the direction it wanted to which is to see FTE growth at a higher rate per head count meaning more students taking more classes. A shift is expected beginning next fall.

He distributed a brief “snapshot” of current enrollment figures which showed a summary of SCH overall increase at the undergraduate level.

Vice Provost Robert Chang reported that the Faculty Academic Enrichment Program was started three years ago by the Provost’s Office to provide the opportunities to hire tenure-earning faculty. The arrangement is that the Provost’s Office provides the salaries for those individuals for the first three years then the college takes over the support. The money is returned to the Provost’s Office in order to continue the program. He announced that five highly qualified faculty members were recently hired under the program. Normally, at this time of year USF would be looking at applications for faculty to bring in 2004-05. However last year, the Center for Equal Opportunity in Washington, DC contacted the university. This group targets, nationwide, any kind of race-based faculty recruitment. However, it became apparent from the Office of the General Counsel that USF cannot continue in its current hiring fashion.

In November of 2004, Vice Provost Chang called a meeting of faculty representing each group (Black, Asian, Latino) and administrators to look at how the program can be reshaped to avoid some of the legal challenges from the center. The Office of the General Counsel advised that USF does not have a mission statement on diversity even though diversity is one of the strategic goals of this university. Associate Vice President Ted Williams of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity has drafted a mission statement which the committee will reconvene to work on.

In the meantime, \$300,000 is being returned to the Provost's Office. This is the first investment that went out two years ago. Provost Khator decided that although the money cannot be used in 2004-2005 to support faculty, she would distribute the money to the colleges according to the faculty salary base of those colleges. How it is used is up to the individual deans, but the number one preference is to hire faculty. They can use it for raising awareness of diversity, or add funds to it to hire faculty that may require extra salary compensation in order to hire an under-represented individual. There will be accountability to the Office of Diversity and Equal Opportunity as to how the money is spent. Although there are a variety of uses, the money is to be returned to the Provost's Office so more hires can be generated in the future.

At this time Vice President Steve Permuth relayed to the SEC members the following regarding the ICAR document:

The document as President Genshaft has drafted in its final form is "heads and shoulders" above what was done in the past and has done an articulate job of modernizing the 1991 document in offering articulate support and supplement to the Memoranda of Understanding (MOA) that are on other campuses. Two of the goals the Senate articulated over the last two to three years were (1) a semblance of an understandable written policy that faculty at all campuses could understand, that seemed articulate enough so that there was no question of who, why or what, and (2) the feeling that there needed to be some sense of certainty that the chief academic officer was the Provost and the chief academic officer for all entities and faculty. That is now part of the written context. There are a couple of elements in the document that need further articulation, but the context of where it is now is this is the President's policy and now

confirmed. He stated that compared to where things were, this is an articulate, well drawn statement that does meet the needs of who USF is and it certainly does meet the resolution of the SEC. It affirms the principles as advocated by the Senate. Vice President Permuth hoped that the document would be presented to the whole Senate body to which it would be able to sign on as either a sponsor or communicate ~~a means of necquism ??~~ as a means it as a mechanism of collaboration between the administration and faculty.

Vice President Permuth suggested that this is now the President's document to distribute, but in the distribution the Senate should endorse it as a statement of support to the principles it advocated and voted on. He requested that the document be on the Faculty Senate agenda as a matter of information as a closure point.

REPORT BY OFFICERS AND COUNCIL CHAIRS

a. Committee on Committees (Ellis Blanton)

Chair Blanton had two issues for the SEC. First, was the approval of the following nominations to immediately fill current vacancies:

Council on Educational Policy and Issues
Paul Terry (Lakeland)

Library Council
Ilene Frank (Library)

The nominations came as a motion seconded and approved by the Committee on Committees. A motion was made and seconded for the SEC to approve these nominations. The motion unanimously passed.

The second issue was the announcement that nominations for serving on University-Wide Committees and Councils are due by February 1st. Chair Blanton asked the SEC to encourage faculty in their respective colleges to participate in the nomination process in order to generate as many nominations as possible in order to fill vacancies.

Discussion was held as to how to get more faculty to participate in the nomination process. Chair Blanton will send an e-mail to members of the Committee on Committees asking them to go to their colleagues and encourage them to either self-nominate or nominate colleagues. He suggested that an email to all faculty from President Greenbaum soliciting them to participate may also spur some interest.

The topic of rewarding faculty for serving on committees was brought up. Graduate Council Chair Carnot Nelson asked if there is any way to enhance the interest in being part of the governance of the university. COC Chair Blanton commented that maybe there is not enough emphasis from the university encouraging faculty that this is important. When President Greenbaum offered to write a letter to the department chairs, he added that this is “our” Faculty Senate, our responsibility and it should not depend upon people in administrative positions to fill committee positions. President Greenbaum agreed to send a letter to all faculty encouraging them to serve on university-wide

committees and councils. COC Chair Blanton again asked the SEC members to solicit their constituencies as well for nominations.

b. Senate Elections/On-line Voting (Kathy Whitley)

Secretary Whitley presented the following Faculty Senate election documents for 2005/2006: Voting Units and Apportionment, Senate Election Schedule, and Senate Vacancies. The election ballots will be electronically sent out on February 17th to eligible voters. Secretary Whitley explained that means the online voting site will be open on that date and will be closed on the deadline date of March 3rd. Voting can take place anytime during that period. The individual goes to the website and signs in with his/her name and employee ID number. [Note: the login process will be automatic for most faculty members; only a few will need to take additional steps to authenticate themselves-K. Whitley, 1-27-05] From there, they will be sent directly to their college list to vote. Voting can be from anywhere since the authentication is the individual's name and employee ID.

Ms. Carol Dann, with Instructional Technology, is preparing the site for a run-through or a test of the full Senate and Kathy should be able to announce that date at the next meeting. Secretary Whitley queried the SEC as to whether not using the full Senate is too much or should it be just with the SEC. It was agreed that the full Senate should be used in testing because it offers a broader range of participants from each college.

A motion was made and seconded to accept the three election documents presented by Secretary Whitley. The motion was unanimously passed.

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

Included in today's meeting materials was the newest version of the Consensual Relationship Policy (CRP). Chair Reeder pointed out that the Council on Educational Policy and Issues (CEPI) felt its work on the policy was complete and he asked for guidance on where to go from here with it.

A brief discussion was held and a motion was made that the task requested by the Faculty Senate has been completed and the policy is endorsed by CEPI. The CRP will now go to the Faculty Senate for a vote. The motion was seconded and unanimously passed.

d. Research Council (Gregory Teague)

Research Council Chair Teague distributed copies of a "Proposed Scholarship and External Funding Incentive Stipend." He explained that a subcommittee of the Research Council and the associate dean for research created this plan. It is related to compensation. The proposal has been approved in principle, but the vice president of

research is trying to have it actively reviewed and considered by the president, and discussions are proceeding. Vice President Permuth suggested that Research Council Chair Teague contact the United Faculty of Florida regarding the compensation issue of the proposal and any implications it might create.

To allow time for the SEC members to read the proposal, it was agreed that it would be electronically disseminated for the February meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

- a. Resolution on Web Accessibility (Andrew Smith)

Library Council Chair Smith presented the following, revised resolution on the “Accessibility of USF Web Content:”

Accessibility of USF Web Content 2 December 2004

In less than 15 years since its invention, the World Wide Web has become an essential tool for the University of South Florida as it communicates with students, faculty, staff, alumni, the community, and other interested parties. Like any other relatively new technology, the technology of the Web has developed in a somewhat haphazard manner. As a result, current USF-based Web sites reflect the complete spectrum of application of current industry standards. Unfortunately, this means that the content of most, if not nearly all, USF-based Web sites is inaccessible to at least some part of the potential audience. Inaccessibility is a problem for a variety of potential or existing Web users, whether it is due to the use of new technology used to access Web content (such as smartphones), the unique environment in which users may find themselves (such as listening to Web content read aloud while driving a car), or to the unique physical requirements of the user (such as users with visual, hearing, or motor impairments). The World Wide Web Consortium (W3C), the primary organization responsible for Web standards, defines the goal of accessibility as the creation of “Web content that is

perceivable, operable and understandable by the broadest possible range of users and compatible with a wide range of assistive technologies, now and in the future.”

Accessibility of Web content is at the same time a legal issue, a moral issue, and an economic issue. Section 508 of the Federal Rehabilitation Act Amendments requires that electronic information be accessible to those with disabilities. This has an impact on any organization that accepts Federal funding. Even in the absence of Section 508, USF would have a moral obligation to make its information equally accessible to all potential and current students, faculty, staff, and members of the general public. And from a competitive economic standpoint, USF cannot afford to deny access to any potential students, faculty, or staff.

While USF currently provides a brief set of guidelines to those responsible for the development and maintenance of official USF Web sites, the current guidelines fail to identify specific industry standards (such as XHTML 1.1 and CSS), legal requirements (such as Section 508), and specific tools (such as Bobby) that could assist Web developers in improving the accessibility of their sites' content. (An example of such a guideline would be for all Web developers to test their sites not only in the most recent version of Internet Explorer, but also in the most recent version of another standards-compliant browser, such as Mozilla Firefox.)

Ideally, Web accessibility can and should be built-in to Web sites as they are first being designed and developed. In reality, it is recognized that many USF Web sites would need to be modified or re-designed in order to accommodate current best practices. In order for USF to meet its legal and moral obligations in this area, there will need to be a significant expenditure of time and effort by those individuals responsible for USF Web sites. Nevertheless, this effort should take priority over further site development.

Thus, be it resolved that the USF Faculty Senate requests that individuals and departments responsible for official USF Web sites make accessibility one of their highest priorities, and that the USF administration provide sufficient support and encouragement to implement this priority.

This version has been approved by the Instructional Technology and Distance Learning Council. Chair Smith explained that an example of a guideline was provided at the end of the third paragraph. The other recommendation was to define the word accessibility which he has done. And, third, Chair Smith reviewed the entire document and realized that it refers not to accessibility of the USF website, but of web content/materials.

Therefore, he rephrased or reworded anything that addressed site with content. Those are the changes made and it is ready to be presented to the Faculty Senate.

Without further discussion, a motion was made and seconded to approve the revised resolution and present it to the Faculty Senate at its January 19th meeting. The motion was unanimously passed.

b. Proposed General Education Council (Glen Besterfield)

Undergraduate Studies, Evaluation and Testing, and the Center for 21st Century Teaching Excellence submitted a proposal to establish a General Education Council (GEC) that will be a standing Council of the Faculty Senate with a similar make up and representation to that of the Undergraduate Council. This council would review the courses that would be approved for general education. The focus is less on group memorization and more on critical thinking skills. Undergraduate Council Chair Besterfield explained the reason for proposing a new GEC is that in the past the depth that it would take far exceeded the time available to the Undergraduate Council.

Discussion was held regarding the three options listed under “Membership.” It was agreed that in order to keep the council’s membership more in line with the other councils under the auspices of the Faculty Senate, Option 1 was selected. Secretary Whitley recommended that due to **information** literacy **compositions** **issues**, a Library representative should be added to the membership. There was a call to question at this

time. With the addition of a Library representative and the selection of Option 1 Membership, a motion was made to adopt the proposed charge for the General Education Council to be forwarded to the Committee on Committees for review. The motion unanimously passed.

- c. Resolution on International Student Administrative Charge (SAIC) (Antonio Peramo/Gregory McColm)

A motion was made and seconded to continue discussion of the following resolution:

Resolution: USF Faculty Senate in relation to International Students and the SIAC fee

Whereas:

1. USF international students have a fee of \$50/semester levied by the University, starting fall 2003, paid every semester via OASIS accounts. Failing to comply with payments could mean lose of visa rights. The decision of the BOT (May 20, 2004) was taken with the opposition of the Organization of International Students.
2. The fee was imposed following a decision of the Provost Office to “help offset both the cost of SEVIS and the cost of additional staff in ISSS and International Admissions”.
3. The International Student and Scholar Services (ISSS) is an integral part of the administration of USF, and should, therefore, be fully funded as any other USF administrative service.
4. The University, via the Office of the Provost, decided to cut the funding of the ISSS office by 60% last year and make that cut of funding permanent. The Dean of Int. Affairs, Joanne McCarthy, agreed with the Provost Office to use the SIAC fee to replace the ISSS E&G funding being eliminated and simultaneously include the whole budget of the Office of International Admissions to be paid with the SIAC fee.
5. The fee is assessed only to international students – the reasoning being that they are receiving “services” (in any case, not voluntarily requested by our part) from ISSS. However, the approximately 250 J-1 visa holders at USF that receive the same or similar “services” from ISSS, are not charged the fee.
6. The well known and real SEVIS fee is assessed by the Department of Homeland Security to all foreign visitors under F-1 (students, \$100) or J-1 (visiting scholars,

- \$35) classification; is paid to the DHS by the individual directly, without the intervention of the ISSS, at the moment of visa issue at the US embassy in the foreign country. This fee is independent and unrelated to the SIAC fee and is used by the Federal Government to pay for the SEVIS system.
7. Within the Florida SUS, only 2 other Institutions have this fee (UF and UCF) and the validity of the fee is now under the technical study of the Florida Board of Governors.
 8. Other Universities consider such a fee a discrimination against international students and have eliminated the fee after strong complaints (Wisconsin-Madison) or demonstrations and refusal to pay (Massachusetts-Amherst) by international students.
 9. “the processing of F-1 and J-1 visa requirements ... and the updating of data pursuant to SEVIS is a typical human resources activity... that the University routinely provides to every other employee without charge or fee” as indicating by The American Arbitration Association in the resolution of a grievance by one of its tribunals regarding the fee at U. Massachusetts at Amherst
 10. International Students and their relatives contribute annually with a net worth of 12 billion dollars to the US economy, with \$600 million to the Florida economy and with \$26 million to USF.
 11. The net effect of several immigration and university policies on international students is a decline in enrollment that has been steady and persistent since year 2001 with international students’ number going from 2573 in 2001 to a probable 1900 in the current semester.
 12. The effect of this decline at USF will be perceived and felt in the near term by the Schools and Departments that make most use of them. In the medium term, the objectives of the whole University will be affected.
 13. A NSF study places USF as the fastest growing university in the US in the areas of Science and Engineering, with grant funding for research way above expectations. It is important to note that international students, who in Sciences and Engineering represent about 50% of all graduate students depending on the Department, gather most of the preliminary data as well as perform the actual experiments.

Be it resolved, at the request of the Organization of International Students, that the Faculty Senate is in support of the complete elimination of the SIAC fee; that the Faculty Senate considers that the fee represents an additional financial burden imposed on international students and that the fee will cause problems in the recruitment efforts to bring international students to USF; that the imposition of the fee on its international students is creating a negative perception of USF and the US that is already being sent to other people and students in foreign countries and that this type of action will have a contrary effect on the long term objective of USF to be among the 50 most important Research I US Universities.

Undergraduate Council Chair Besterfield brought up the comment made at the December SEC meeting by Vice Provost Ralph Wilcox that there were some issues in the resolution that might have been inaccurate; there seemed to be some difference of opinions. This is the student version. Chair Besterfield asked if there was anything else from International Affairs or a response from another party. He also asked if Joanne McCarthy, Dean of International Affairs, has seen this document and whether it has been reviewed by someone from the administration. Antonio Peramo responded that the resolution is based upon public documents.

President Greenbaum clarified that the issue is the fairness of the way the fee has been imposed. At this time, a motion was made that David Austell, Director of Students Affairs, be invited to the February SEC meeting prepared to present the pros and cons of this fee and explain why this is a just policy. In addition, President Greenbaum was instructed to correspond with Mr. Austell and Provost Khator as to why/how the decision was made to charge international students a \$50 SIAC fee. The motion was seconded and unanimously passed. A copy of the resolution will be provided to Mr. Austell and Provost Khator. Further discussion on the resolution was tabled until the February meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

- a. President Genshaft's Proposed Raise and Bonus (Susan Greenbaum)

The following day, President Greenbaum would be asked to vote on President Genshaft's proposed raise and performance increase, so she asked for feedback from the SEC members. The consensus of the group was that the proposed 5 percent salary increase was acceptable, but not the \$35,000 performance bonus. The recommendation was that a statement should be made that the faculty wants to be more in solidarity with the administration and faculty and the bonus and average increase should be the same as that received by faculty.

b. Proposed School of Chiropractic (Susan Greenbaum)

President Greenbaum will be attending the Advisory Council of Faculty Senates meeting in Tallahassee at which a vote will be taken on the proposed chiropractic school at Florida State University. The consensus of the SEC members was that it is a bad idea and that President Greenbaum should vote against it.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:11 p.m.