

1-1-2005

AY 2004/2005 FS meetings minutes: 05 Jan 19

Faculty Senate

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

Scholar Commons Citation

Faculty Senate, "AY 2004/2005 FS meetings minutes: 05 Jan 19" (2005). *Faculty Senate Publications*. Paper 182.
http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fs_pubs/182

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.

**FACULTY SENATE MEETING
MINUTES**

January 19, 2005

Faculty Senate President Susan Greenbaum called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. The Minutes from the November 17, 2004, meeting were approved as presented.

REPORT FROM FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT SUSAN GREENBAUM

President Greenbaum welcomed everyone to the new semester. She pointed out that at today's meeting Senators were going to observe the final product of the Inter-Campus Academic Relations (ICAR) document which is now complete. In addition, the Consensual Relationship Policy would be discussed, which should also reach a final conclusion. As today's agenda was short, President Greenbaum allocated additional time for Issues from the Floor to talk about what is going on this year outside the formal agenda.

At this time, President Greenbaum reported on the following issues:

- The first issue was the letter she sent to Senators regarding her vote on President Genshaft's raise. That vote raised two questions that Senators may want to discuss at the end of the meeting. The first is how President Greenbaum should determine to vote as a member of the BOT. She feels it is worth considering what her obligations are. Also, how could she determine the consensus of the faculty?
- The second issue was the value of shared governance. She believes that faculty involvement was a critical factor in resolving the conflict that arose during that period. There is a difference on this campus compared to most others in Florida, and she would like to see that opportunity expanded upon and build even stronger structures of faculty participation in shared governance at all levels of the university. The Shared Governance Committee is making progress and that committee may be contacting Senators in the future to respond to a very brief survey. The Committee on Faculty Issues, chaired by Dr. Larry Branch, will be addressing the rights and status of non-tenure faculty. These two issues, shared governance and non-tenured status, are also the subject of policy-level inquiries. President Greenbaum is presently collecting information from the college councils across the whole USF system in order to coordinate an effort on these similar subjects. She would like to establish a mechanism for regular communication between the Senate and these faculty councils as a way of improving the flow of information. Anyone interested in assisting President Greenbaum in this effort should contact her and any help would be appreciated.
- The Advisory Council of Faculty Senates (ACFS), which is the statewide body of Faculty Senate presidents, unanimously voted for the following resolution condemning the adoption of programs without appropriate Faculty Senate reviews. "The Advisory Council of Faculty Senates strongly believes that only new degreed programs that have received full, appropriate faculty review and recommendations through a Faculty Senate or an equivalent, representative structure should come before the university BOT and BOG." She pointed out that the ACFS was not commenting on the scientific merits of chiropractic, which is a separate and important issue.

- The ACFS also passed a resolution about methodologies used by the MGT Company, the contractor that develops a ten-year enrollment projection exercise. MGT staff are apparently to meet with interested faculty and staff on each of the campuses in the coming weeks. There may be opportunities to renegotiate this trend.
- Chancellor Deborah Austin told the ACFS that the academic learning contracts will now be at the program level. This would relieve some of the administrative burden which is yet to be determined.

REPORT FROM PRESIDENT JUDY GENSHAFT

President Genshaft reported on the following items:

1. A press release would be forthcoming that names Ted Williams the Associate Vice President for Diversity and Equal Opportunity. He is currently a member of the College of Medicine and Professor of Biochemistry, and Associate Dean for Diversity. He has been the Interim Associate Vice President for Equal Opportunity since last fall. A national search was not conducted as President Genshaft believes this to be a good appointment for the university.
2. The Inter-Campus Academic Relations document is now finished and will be on the web by the end of the day. It was approved, in principle, by the Senate. The document reasserts one university geographically distributed with one president, one provost, one BOT and underscores the importance of shared values across the university and campuses, as well as shared governance, academic excellence, and equitable work conditions. Academic responsibility rests with the faculty. That is, one faculty that shares the same rights, privileges, and opportunities regardless of campus. It does outline the revised procedures and articulates new and shared responsibility that in order to be successful will require the campus leaders, chairs and faculty members to take on a sense of deeper, multilateral collaboration as USF moves to extend the regional accreditation. In a year and a half the document will be revisited to determine whether it requires any updates or revisions. Copies would be provided to the Senate if requested.
3. There is a new brochure on legislative priorities at USF that have been endorsed. The first priority is preserving base funding with a new formula that has been adopted by the BOT. If this formula is enacted, USF would receive \$22 million more than what it receives today for the same number of students. This formula has also been agreed to by all the SUS presidents.
4. The new facility for Visual and Performing Arts has been renamed the Visual and Performing Arts Teaching Facility to fit better with legislators. This is a top priority for the Tampa campus and it is hopeful that this will move forward. Additional money has been asked for through economic development and matching gifts.
5. The final item was the announcement that the President's Office is working with Faculty Senate President Greenbaum to create a committee to begin planning for the 50th anniversary of USF, beginning January 2006 and running through December 2006.

Anyone interested in working on the committee should contact either President Genshaft or President Greenbaum.

REPORT FROM PROVOST RENU KHATOR

Provost Khator's report consisted of the following items:

- The first item was the Governor's budget. The BOG requested \$78 million, the governor's budget allocated only \$28 million. If the budget is approved, resident undergraduate students could expect to see a 7.5 percent tuition increase. USF's request for \$196 million in matching grants was met with an allocation of \$133 million in the Governor's budget. However, Provost Khator pointed out that is only the Governor's budget, the process has just begun
- The BOG will be engaged in an exercise about whom the university can and should teach in what discipline and how many. In other words, the BOG would like to define as to what they will fund. On January 25th, a consultant will review USF's ten year strategic enrollment plan to determine where USF is and what it needs to do.
- Under the auspices of the ICAR document, an Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs on the regional campuses has been defined. The Provost announced that Dr. Judith Ponticell has been appointed to this position at the Lakeland campus. Dr. Ponticell will assume her new duties on March 1, 2005.
- There are two hundred faculty searches taking place on all of the campuses. Provost Khator made a personal plea to faculty leaders to make sure that every candidate is as strong as possible. It is going to be global, diverse, and highly competitive very soon.

REPORT FROM USF UNITED FACULTY OF FLORIDA PRESIDENT ROY WEATHERFORD

United Faculty of Florida (UFF) President Weatherford reported that the collective bargaining process that has made things difficult for the last two years has been peacefully and successfully resolved. It is a clear fact that faculty and the bargaining unit have a democratically elected collective bargaining agent, United Faculty of Florida, and together with the administration a legally enforceable collective bargaining agreement has been negotiated that is subject to binding arbitration and has the force of law. It includes the previous guarantees of academic freedom, some of which the Senate and the president had a great deal to do with. In addition it has a 5 percent average raise, and the first time the promotion increases do not come out of the general salary increases. This is a very good first step.

President Weatherford thanked the members of the UFF, the Senate, and the outstanding way the Faculty Senate and the faculty union stood and worked together to do what was right for the faculty. This is not the case everywhere. Those who support unionization and those who support more traditional stuff will find themselves at organizational odds. He also thanked Past President Elizabeth Bird, President Greenbaum, Vice President Steve Permut, and especially Senator Graham Tobin who did a very difficult job on the Rules Committee with a lot of questions and problems, which he did with grace and dignity and deserves a lot of thanks.

President Weatherford thanked President Genshaft and Provost Khator, and stated that he regrets having had to go through this. He emphasized though that whatever faculty think of what they are going through at USF, their sisters and brothers at other universities are going through a lot worse. Whatever they think of the policy and positions this administration adopted, they were never mean or inconsiderate and had they been adamant about stomping on the faculty union, things could have been a lot worse. He thanked them for their cooperation and good will and begrudgingly thanked the BOT. President Weatherford added that he is still worried about the BOT, not because he thinks they want to harm the faculty. One of the greatest challenges will be to educate the Board to see that the heart of what faculty do is not the same as the heart of what they do.

The union will now focus on membership. In the faculty governance part of what the union does, it will embark on year-round consultations. The grievance procedure is backed up and there are a lot of problems to work on. He thanked chief negotiator Noreen Segrest and Associate Provost Phil Smith who are primarily responsible for the day to day operations of the negotiations. As the grievance procedure kicks in, these two people are going to work even harder as they have to solve everything right here at the university. UFF will be back in April doing the best it can on behalf of the faculty.

REPORT FROM STUDENT GOVERNMENT LIAISON DAVID HOFFMAN

Mr. Hoffman announced that two weeks ago the Student Senate passed a resolution against President Genshaft's proposed pay increase. With the backing of this resolution, Student Body President Bijal Chhadva was the only BOT member who voted "no" on the proposed increase.

The Student Government is unhappy with the Florida Student Association (FSA), the lobbying company that works on behalf of students. FSA will soon be evaluated and other options are being investigated.

The Student Senate made its first official step toward a firm goal of an improved grading scale by passing a resolution on accountability and a fair grading system. Mr. Hoffman stated that he looks forward to meeting with members of the Undergraduate Council during the next few weeks to discuss and develop this plan. He also hopes to give a full presentation to the Senate Executive Committee and Faculty Senate at next month's meetings.

COMMITTEE REPORTS AND ACTIONS

a. Recommendations from Committee on Committees (Ellis Blanton)

Chair Blanton presented the following nominees to fill vacancies immediately:

Council on Educational Policy and Issues
Paul Terry (Lakeland)

Library Council
Ilene Frank (Library)

The slate of nominees came as a motion seconded and approved by the SEC. A vote was taken and it was unanimously approved.

b. Senate Elections; On-Line Voting (Kathy Whitley)

Secretary Whitley presented the 2005/2006 Senate Election Schedule, Senate Vacancies and Voting Units and Apportionment. The total number of eligible faculty for this election is 1,594. There are twenty-two vacancies to fill for next year. Nominations to fill vacancies are due February 4th.

She announced that IT is working on setting up a test of the on-line voting process using only the Faculty Senate. It is anticipated that this will take place early February.

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

c. Consensual Relationship Policy (Phil Reeder)

Chair of the Council on Educational Policy and Issues (CEPI) Philip Reeder presented the sixth version of the Consensual Relationship Policy (CRP) dated January 14, 2005. He explained that the council has been working on the policy since November 2004 with distribution during a comment period, incorporating comments, with recommendations sent to the Office of Audit and Compliance who produced a new policy. The dilemma the CEPI faced when it first discussed the policy came down to two facts: (1) prohibiting any type of relationship between faculty/student and (2) managing situations. The council decided it could not entirely prohibit that type of behavior. This is the version that the council voted to endorse and was presented at today's meeting, being forwarded from the Senate Executive Committee. A motion was made and seconded to adopt this document and the floor was opened to questions and discussion.

There were several Senators who were opposed to the strong language in the new version in that it could be grounds for dismissal as well as turn faculty into "relationship police." It was suggested that if this language is used, it needs to be stipulated operationally what it means. Some commented that the policy would create an overload of grievance cases that deal with a violation of university policy. President Greenbaum clarified that the policy does not state that all relationships are prohibited, only supervisory relationships. In addition the policy does not say anything close to violations leading to termination or any other kinds of adverse actions, it is more about disclosure and that something had to be done.

CEPI Chair Reeder commented that there are a lot of grey areas. For example, how is the longitudinal time factor associated with the evolution of relationships worked out? By requiring and using stronger language.

At this time, there was a call to question and discussion ended. A vote was taken on the motion to adopt this policy which passed with two opposed.

OLD BUSINESS

a. ICAR Document (Steve Permuth)

As chair of the Inter-Campus Academic Relations Committee, Vice President Permuth presented the following five basic items pertaining to the ICAR document:

1. Content of shared governance is less than rhetoric, it is the substance and measure of quantifiable leaps ahead on not only what people say but what they do. He suggested that this is the opportunity of solidifying the contrast of last year under a new CEA mandate. The ability of having a document like this that says great things about shared governance is reality. The rationale for the ICAR document emerges from a process of attempting to find for faculty, primarily those who were non-tenured, a sensible, logical and understandable protocol to assure that there is one system and one set of protocol that are constant so everyone knows what they are. The fundamental strength of this document is exactly that. It is clear and direct and the standards are the same regardless of campus.
2. There was a concern of the academic agenda of an institution when it is not very clear about the role of the provost. The document suggests in a couple of ways that the provost will have a say or a joint statement of say in the hiring and dismissal of an associate vice president for academic affairs, and for all manners academic, that person reports directly to the provost. The person will also have a direct linkage to the academic wing through the provost and then to the president. But regardless of matters academic, the primary voice leads through and to the provost of the university, ultimately the president.
3. There were apparent inconsistencies between what were termed memorandums of agreements/understanding that were established between the Tampa campus and the regional campuses. So the question was, are there ways in which some of those inconsistencies can be drawn? In the memo of agreement between USF Tampa and USF Sarasota, there is a statement that tenure can be garnered at the regional campus but not in a department. This document now supersedes that and does so very cleverly and appropriately by saying that if there is an inconsistency between this document and former documents, this document now holds sway.
4. There is a 9th amendment to this. The 9th amendment to the constitution says this document will be reviewed after 18 months to determine whether there are problems that are being raised.
5. There are statements in this documents that have been asked for by chairs and deans saying what is my job exactly? What is the responsibility of the chair? What is the responsibility of the dean? What is the responsibility of the regional vice president of academic affairs? This is a substantive document that addresses and supports the principles that the Senate voted to support. The Senate said it needed a document to help clarify and codify and present a statement of academic code and consistency. It is his belief that this document does that.

Copies of the document were distributed. A motion was made and seconded that the Senate approve this document in substance and in form. The floor was opened for discussion. There was concern that the document was “substantially approved but substantially changed” and Senators should be given the opportunity to read the final document. Vice President Permuth reiterated that the Senate gave its advice and approved the document “in principle.” It was forwarded to President Genshaft who sought the advice of others before it is sent out under her signature. He stated that there is no rationale to vote for a document that was approved in principle and sent forward to the president. Vice President Permuth agreed that if this was a document that the Senate would be voting on, then they would have it in great detail. The Senate did not agree with all details only in principle. In his view the Senate has acted and it is the president’s choice of how to present the material, not ask for a vote. The motion has no place.

It was clarified that the issue was that the Senate was provided a copy of the document for informational purposes only. This document simply reflects the underlying principles and is indeed a document propagated by the president certainly within her role as president. The motion was withdrawn and the discussion was terminated with a call for point of order.

NEW BUSINESS

a. Resolution on Accessibility of Web Content (Andrew Smith)

Library Council Chair Smith presented a draft resolution on the Accessibility of Web Content. He explained that the current guidelines of USF web sites fail to identify specific industry standards, legal requirements, and specific tools that could assist web developers in improving the accessibility of their sites. Justification for the resolution was included and discusses the fact that accessibility and web content are a serious issue. The resolution was drafted by the Instructional Technology and Distance Learning and Library Councils and presented today as information for review and to be voted on at the February Senate meeting. President Greenbaum asked that the Senators share it with their constituents.

ISSUES FROM THE FLOOR

1. Senator Christopher Steele from College of Visual & Performing Arts brought up the wording of the Sabbatical section (Article 223E4) of the new collective bargaining agreement that states “an employee shall not normally be eligible to apply for a second sabbatical until six years of continuous service are completed following the first.” In other words, 6-years of continuous service, one year to apply and then the sabbatical is granted. This is in contrast to the original wording which stated that “an employee shall not be eligible for a second sabbatical until six years of continuous service or completely following the first.” Senator Steele asked if this was intentional or just bad wording. He added that it does seem to be very disrespectful of the faculty and is certainly disrespectful of the English language to continue to call it a sabbatical. He suggested something be done about it. Vice Provost Robert Chang volunteered to meet with Associate Provost Phil Smith to discuss this issue with him and will communicate to President Greenbaum as to the correct scenario.

2. Senator Bochner from the College of Arts and Sciences raised the issue about the frustrations with the process during Faculty Senate meetings. He suggested that the Senate Executive Committee look at how the Senate is using rules of order and how issues are discussed and debated. First, the speaker should not be interrupted. Secondly, there needs to be an opportunity for someone to give opinions before the speaker moves on. Respect needs to be shown for all members whether they agree or disagree with the group. There needs to be a better balance of participation at the meetings. President Greenbaum agreed that a balance needs to be reached and his comments were duly noted.
3. Senator Steve Tauber from the College of Arts and Sciences commented on President Greenbaum's statement that she did not have time to consult the Faculty Senate or faculty on President Genshaft's proposed raise. He stated that that was a shameful act on the part of the Board of Trustees to not give the appropriate governing bodies the opportunity to consult their constituencies. To make matters worse, holding meetings via a conference call may be legal by BOT bylaws, it sets a terrible example and makes it even more shameful and disgraceful for a Board that control this university. He recommended that President Greenbaum bring up this issue at the next BOT meeting and that they should take more responsibility to not push issues through and to give the Faculty and Student Senate governments the opportunity to consult with their constituents and to have people present at the meetings. Faculty Senators must be present at their meetings, there must be a quorum. and the BOT should be held to the same responsibilities.

President Greenbaum responded that the real issue was about how she should translate her own perceptions of things into a vote for the BOT and whether or not that is her prerogative. Senator McColm stated that for whatever reason some issues may come up with such short notice that President Greenbaum will not be able to consult the Faculty Senate as a body. Therefore, it should be recognized that in such instances, the Faculty Senate is empowering President Greenbaum to act on its behalf according to her best judgment.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:08 p.m.