

1-1-2005

AY 2004/2005 SEC meeting minutes: 05 Feb 02

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 Feb 02" (2005). *Faculty Senate Publications*. Paper 176.
http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fs_pubs/176

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**

February 2, 2005

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

Provost's Office: Robert Chang, Renu Khator, Ralph Wilcox

Guests: David Austell, T. Hampton Dohrman, Gregory McColm, Antonio Peramo

The meeting was called to order at 3:07 p.m. The Minutes from the January 12, 2005, meeting were approved as presented.

REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT SUSAN GREENBAUM

President Greenbaum summarized the actions and results of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) thus far this year. A new issue to be addressed is the inadvertent changes in the wording regarding sabbaticals. This was discussed later in today's meeting. She did comment that the overwhelming Senate position was that there was never any intention to change or lengthen the amount of time before eligibility for sabbaticals.

As chair of the Shared Governance Committee, Senator Gregory McColm will be asked to give a progress report at the February Faculty Senate meeting. The Committee on Faculty Issues will be convened to address some problems with the Distinguished University Professor nomination process. Another issue for that committee to address is the status of non-tenure faculty and the question of whether there is a career development path for them.

President Greenbaum intends to convene a meeting of college councils to discuss common issues that are being addressed by them and the Faculty Senate. She would also like to set up an avenue of communication between the groups.

President Greenbaum announced that she would be meeting on Monday, February 7th, with the Honors and Awards Council to discuss two issues. The first is the Town and Gown Community Service Award which has created a problem in its implementation. Nominations for this award are solicited by the Honors and Awards Council. However, it turns out this award is granted to speakers of the Town and Gown Organization in a given year. There needs to be an alteration in the way the website describes this award, or the Honors and Awards Council should be persuaded to follow a different course in evaluating candidates.

The second issue for the Honors and Awards Council is the honorary degree process. President Greenbaum feels that the current guidelines are extremely vague. Some kind of consensus needs to be reached about what and who is suitable.

Included in today's meeting materials was a report from Dr. Howard Rock, Past Chair of the Advisory Council of Faculty Senates and Board of Governors on the Meeting of the Board of Governors, January 27, 2005, in Gainesville, Florida. President Greenbaum encouraged the SEC members to read his report.

REPORT FROM INTERIM PROVOST KHATOR

Provost Khator first discussed the issue of the wording change in the section on sabbaticals in the new collective bargaining agreement. According to Associate Provost Phil Smith the issue was specifically discussed at the bargaining table and the wording was intentionally put in to clarify. However, in doing this two separate issues arise: (1) What is it that needs to happen in the future? (2) What is it that should be done right now?

Her understanding was that there were exceptions granted under the previous collective bargaining agreement and language. The current language takes away from the faculty the possibility of an exception. What is done in the future has to be negotiated and go to the table. Provost Khator pointed out that there are two options: (1) Leave it where it is and negotiate for next year. (2) In order to be fair, extend the deadline allowing faculty to make an argument with a case and let the committee decide instead of the Provost's Office.

President Greenbaum commented that if the application process is reopened this would allow those people who were deterred to apply. That might at least be the solution for the current situation, because there is no time to change language and let that have an impact on people who might have applied.

Vice President Steve Permuth suggested that the SEC move toward the Provost's second recommendation. He also suggested it should be either communication between the chief negotiator or the president of the university, or between the president and the union, with a letter of agreement that for this year states this is the way it will be. If, in fact, that is what is done, it does not alter the agreement, it simply establishes another commentary. Vice President Permuth clarified that there was no intent of making it difficult. The language discussion occurred because of the situation that non-tenured people would want to seek tenure and then immediately take a sabbatical. He asked on behalf of the union perspective that it would be much better if the agreement was there and was enacted. Provost Khator replied that her office is just doing what was done in the past. However, if a letter of agreement is done then her office would step aside because it would go to bargaining. Therefore, she is willing to leave it to a Sabbatical Review Committee decision.

REPORTS BY OFFICERS AND COUNCIL CHAIRS

a. Committee on Committees (Ellis Blanton)

Chair Blanton announced that the draft of the proposed General Education Council Charge was being reviewed by the Committee on Committees (COC). He will make whatever recommended amendments from the COC and send out the charge to the SEC

members for review before it is presented to the Faculty Senate on February 16th. However, if there are issues that the COC determines it needs to meet to discuss, then the charge will be presented at the March Faculty Senate meeting.

Discussion was held regarding the low response to the call for nominations to fill vacancies on university-wide committees and councils. There are approximately 85 total vacancies with only fifteen nominations received. Chair Blanton pointed out that in the past when the solicitation for nominations was done via hard copies to everyone the response was significantly greater. When the change to e-mail was initiated two years ago, the number of nominations declined. He recommended that it may be worthwhile to return to using hard copy notification although it does cost. Due to the lack of nominations, the nomination deadline has been extended from February 1st to February 7th. President Greenbaum agreed to send a letter to all Senators encouraging them to either self-nominate or nominate colleagues for vacancies within their colleges.

b. Senate Elections (Kathy Whitley)

Secretary Whitley announced that the on-line voting test would be scaled back to just the SEC and not the full Senate as originally indicated. She distributed a sample ballot at today's meeting and asked for feedback. There is a functioning model at this point.

c. Proposed Research Incentive Stipend Plan (Gregory Teague)

Research Council Chair Teague's presentation of the proposed Scholarship and External Funding Incentive Stipend (SEFIS) centered on the following documents: a message from him that describes the materials and the history behind them, a page that describes the components in written terms, a question and answer document that poses certain questions about the rationale, a description of how to determine the merit to qualify for certain types of incentives, and a copy of the spreadsheet that can be used to calculate the result of an incentive based on the elements used and a picture of how one of the adaptations or variation would look.

He pointed out that USF has considerable room for growth in terms of the participation of the faculty in doing research. When external funding is generated increasing the level of cost recovery that the university gets, there is a fairly low indirect cost recovery. The second piece of important context is the function of performance incentives in general. Businesses operate this way and research in that area shows that incentives that are time limited are based on performance. This proposed stipend plan is structured to be consistent with that. The work came out of a joint subcommittee put together by the Research Council representing faculty and administrators. The concept has the support of the Vice President of Research who came up with the original structure, most of what was presented. Since then the plan has been looked at, questions asked, and preliminary answers provided which were also included. The associate deans for research have indicated their support for going forward with this plan. The structure was designed to address the following concerns:

First, the plan should be the kind of thing the university wants to have happen.

Second, it should be structured in such a way that it does not distort the incentive patterns and cause an imbalance, so there are multiple components. The federal auditors take a dim view of the use of grant funds that are steered inappropriately. These are not that way and, therefore, have stayed outside the danger area.

Third, this plan has some features that address the compensation issue. It applies widely to all faculty, faculty participation, and the establishment of criteria for rewards that are given for activities outside of external funding. This is grounded on levels which seemed to be satisfactory to the administration several years ago. The data analyses have only been able to address the savings portion because the database is set up for that.

At this time, President Greenbaum asked for advice on how to proceed with the proposed SEFIS. It was agreed that a “vehicle” for discussion, that is a step between the complexity of the SEC discussion and of the faculty, needs to occur before it is presented to the whole Faculty Senate. A motion was made and seconded to have the information disseminated to department chairs and college councils by a body that has standing (e.g., Provost’s Office or Office of Research) stating that this plan is being considered by the Research Council and ask for feedback. A deadline of March 1st was determined with comments to be directed to Chair Teague. The motion was unanimously passed.

OLD BUSINESS

a. Resolution on International Student Administrative Charge (SIAC)

Dr. David Austell, Director of International Student & Scholar Services, attended today’s meeting to give the history behind the International Student Administrative Charge (SIAC). He explained that the fee was implemented fall semester 2003 in order to pay for the federal Student and Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS) program. SEVIS is post 9-11 designed to provide information from institutions directly to the Department of Homeland Security. The federal government is required by law to raise money of their own to deal with the federal implementation of this project, leaving institutions to fund their own solution to getting the information per the institution to the SEVIS system. Therefore, part of the fee issue was to pay for this implementation. Also, it was originally hoped to raise about \$225,000 so that USF’s new international program could be bolstered with staff that assist students as well as faculty. However, that did not happen because of shared restraints. The E&G money was replaced by a good portion of the SIAC.

Dr. Austell brought up two issues regarding the SIAC:

1. Is the fee legal? The answer is certainly yes. It has been tested in the Office of the General Counsel, the Provost, and presented to the Board of Governors which has moved it to a joint committee to deal with these issues. However, no

instruction about whether or not this is a good idea has been received. In the meantime, UCF has implemented a very similar system.

2. The other side of this is, is this a good message to send to students? This has to be seen only as a small part of a much larger issue. That has to do with the fact that the foreign population at USF has steadily eroded since 9-11. Many institutions in the United States are struggling with this. To counter the message that some misread that international students are not welcome, some universities are trying to figure out ways to help by paying the \$100 SEVIS fee or by assisting them in other ways.

An International Leadership Council has been established so that USF can hear directly from them. Dr. Austell commented that SIAC is an irritation and an insult to some students, but the issue is to get at this in the context of erosion of growth population. If the SIAC went away, this would not reverse the erosion of the population of international students at USF. There are much larger concerns than that such as the restricted VISA requirements, the tendency for foreign nationals to think the United States is no longer the place to study abroad, when they are being so heavily recruited in the Pacific. Dr. Austell felt that those are the issues that have to be addressed.

Past President Elizabeth Bird asked if it would be possible to spread the fee across the whole student body which would show some support. Dr. Austell replied that the issue of spreading the fee across the entire student body was not been too enthusiastically received. Student government has been looking at this for at least a year. There are other possibilities and there may be alternatives which the International Office will do the best it can in offering solutions.

President Susan Greenbaum commented that it seemed that a large part of the problem is budgetary and the question is how to pay for the SEVIS fee. She added that even if the Faculty Senate was to pass a similar resolution, it would not alter the financial situation. The agenda has to be the constant looking for alternative fees to “raise the entire ship” and not just one issue. Provost Khator recommended that this issue should be looked at in a broader context. If alternative funds are sought to replace funds diminished by the policy, then that is true for all programs with a philosophic strength. Vice President Permuth asked for a resolution that recognizes its importance as a function of international student privacy, but cannot fail to recognize that there are other important programs that are also under funded.

At this time, Past President Bird made the following resolution: Be it resolved that the USF Faculty Senate, recognizing the value of international students to the entire USF community, requests the Provost immediately to charge a working committee representing all stakeholders to develop more equitable options to levy the funds currently collected through the SIAC fee, and to bring these options to the attention of the Provost by the end of the 2005 Spring Semester. The motion was seconded and discussed. It was clarified that this fee was not for services, but was a levy for an

unfunded mandate. There was a call to question on the discussion. A vote was taken and the resolution as proposed by Past President Bird was unanimously passed

NEW BUSINESS

a. Shorter Term Limits on Research Council (Gregory Teague)

Research Council Chair Teague has requested the reduction of the term limits of the council members from three to two years. However, rather than have it first discussed by the SEC, President Greenbaum asked that he and COC Chair Blanton meet and suggest a remedy to the situation. The issue was tabled until this is done.

b. Sabbaticals (Susan Greenbaum/Phil Smith)

President Greenbaum reopened the discussion on sabbaticals to find out what, if anything, the SEC would like to proceed with the issue. It was decided that President Greenbaum ask the Provost to reopen the application process to those who were perceived to be ineligible and their applications should be regarded without prejudice. Applicants should be given two weeks.

OTHER

On behalf of Student Government, Senate President Pro Tempore T. Hampton Dohrman attended today's meeting to request consideration by the SEC of a proposed change to the grading scale, specifically a recommendation to add a weighting of 4.33 to the A+ grade distinction. However, due to the time limitation and the fact that the SEC members did not have the materials beforehand, President Greenbaum tabled the discussion until the March SEC meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.