

1-1-2006

AY 2005/2006 SEC meeting minutes: 05 Sep 07

Faculty Senate

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

Scholar Commons Citation

Faculty Senate, "AY 2005/2006 SEC meeting minutes: 05 Sep 07" (2006). *Faculty Senate Publications*. Paper 190.
http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fs_pubs/190

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

September 7, 2005

Present: Michael Barber, Larry Branch, Elizabeth Bird, Susan Greenbaum, Steve Permuth, Philip Reeder, Greg Teague, Harry Vanden, Kim Vaz, John Ward, David Williams

Provost's
Office: Renu Khator, Dwayne Smith, Ralph Wilcox

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 pm.

REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT SUSAN GREENBAUM

President Greenbaum introduced Barbara Monz who is replacing Ann Pipkins while she is on extended leave.

President Greenbaum reported on the Advisory Council Faculty Senate statewide meeting held in Tallahassee last week and passed out information from the meeting. Two major issues were discussed:

1) The chancellor group

The chair of the ACFS, Martha Palaez, a psychologist from FIU, is the only academic on the search committee for the new chancellor which is chaired by Peter Rummell, CEO of the Saint Joseph Paper Company. The ACFS passed a resolution urging the committee to adopt a PhD requirement for the new chancellor which was rejected by the search committee. The concern is that the chief academic officer of the state will not have an academic background. The search committee agreed to advertise for the position in the Chronicle of Higher Ed.

2) Academic freedom

The ACFS discussed at length the request from OPPAGA to all universities seeking information regarding academic freedom which is an extension of the legislative effort put forth last year by Representative Baxley. The ACFS believes that if this legislation is passed, students who are uncomfortable with controversial topics brought up in the classroom will be allowed to sue the professor. There are steps short of litigation in terms of grievances that are

possible, even if the legislation is not passed. It was agreed that it is premature to take a position and go public with it at this time.

USF submitted a response. When the OPPAGA has tabulated all the responses received, the university will be able to determine what other universities are doing.

President Greenbaum then reported on SEC activities during the summer. The SEC normally does not meet in the summer; however, it was decided to hold meetings in June, July and August to discuss issues that the SEC would like to explore and establish a direction before the term started. There was a special meeting about shared governance. President Greenbaum met with Provost Khator to establish a process where everyone understands and agrees on the circumstances and bases of faculty input into various kinds of appointments of relevant positions.

The SEC spent some time discussing the difficulty in communicating with the faculty as a whole. USF is fragmented in terms of branch campuses and colleges and the Faculty Senate has been able to achieve limited visibility. The SEC would like to establish linkages with other elements of faculty governments in the university. One suggestion was to establish a monthly report or newsletter going to the entire faculty informing them of Senate activities. The newsletter also could include highlights of faculty activities and accomplishments as well as a spotlight on a particular college.

The SEC also discussed the development of the system document. Steve Permuth and Larry Branch were elected to serve on the System Development Committee. Dean Klasko from the College of Medicine will attend the first Faculty Senate meeting and will address some of its issues and how we can strengthen that relationship.

Audit and Compliance was discussed. Audit and Compliance is in the process of reorganizing. Steve Permuth, Greg Teague and Susan Greenbaum met with Marie Hunnicutt of Audit and Compliance to discuss the role of the faculty in ensuring that Audit and Compliance is sensitive to faculty issues.

The general process of promulgating policies was discussed. There is not a good linkage between the Senate and the production of policies. Not all policies are relevant to faculty concerns; however, the faculty should be involved at the inception.

President Greenbaum then reported that Human Resources is in the process of printing a new faculty directory. Staff had requested that home addresses and telephone numbers be eliminated from the directory and wanted to know faculty's opinion about eliminating their home addresses and telephone numbers. If they

are not able to get a consensus before this directory is printed, they will include that information, but eliminate it next year if that is faculty's preference.

President Greenbaum stated that there are many vacancies on the university-wide councils and committees. There is a new configuration of the Board of Trustees' workgroups. There are now four workgroups and the Provost has requested that the Senate submit two names each for the ACE and Finance Groups. The overriding problem in the nomination process is that there is no chair of the Committee on Committees at this time. There is work that must be done by the councils and decisions that must be made and the committees must be fully staffed so that the legitimacy of their decisions cannot be called into question.

REPORT FROM PROVOST RENU KHATOR

Provost Khator began by welcoming the members of the Senate Executive Committee. Hurricane Katrina has impacted this school year and faculty and students have responded quickly and are offering to do whatever they can to help. To date, USF has admitted 52 undergraduate students and has received more than 160 inquiries. In order to deal with the problem, the Provost's office established a coordination committee and requested someone from the Faculty Senate to be part of it.

Provost Khator then shared the enrollment data and passed out information collected from Ecofile. Total number of students is 23,250. The average SAT is 1134, up from 1108. Since USF recruited a better class this year, we will probably see better graduation rates in four years.

Provost Khator distributed the legislative priorities from the Presidents' group (State University Presidents Association (SUPA) and the Provosts' group (Counselor Academy of Vice Presidents (CAV), including the Goldman Growth funding, Major Gift Connection, where the state matches donations, technology needs and the outlay of departments' funding.

Provost Khator then distributed three documents providing key policies which are important requests through the Board of Governors to the legislature. One is residency for graduate assistants and fellows. The Board passed a policy to classify graduate assistants as Florida residents for tuition purposes; however, the legislature denied it. The second document related to tuition flexibility. The Governor's bill that was passed, HV1001, said that the tuition that is collected cannot be kept locally, but must be turned over to the state and then universities request it back to get funded. The BOG is suggesting to the legislature that campuses be allowed to have tuition flexibility. Third document is technology funding. There is no technology key and no basis for any type of technology-related funding. Technology is funded either from enrollment growth or other

sources. The BOG is requesting a technology funding source from the legislature.

Since the BOG tracks almost a year ahead of time, Provost Khator distributed an update on this year's Legislative process and explained the spending formula. The budget is driven by full time enrollment. USF does have some difficulty in funding special projects as there are not many USF graduates in the Legislature to champion for them. Also, USF's system has five fiscal budgets that were appropriated from the legislature where all of the other universities have only one.

USF has grown much more than all the other universities. It needs to strategize what to do for the Legislature and need to reconsider growth patterns and other sources of funding. As the Governor's budget comes out, the Provost's office will post the BOG's budget request and the Governor's budget.

The Legislative budget recommended a 5% increase in tuition. The only new money is coming from growth. Quality of faculty will result in quality of graduates, etc. USF is not getting the support from the state that it needs.

Provost Khator reported on the search for new deans. The graduate dean search has begun which is critical. The search for an international dean has not started. The Vision Committee is ready to give its report. Telephone interview have been conducted for the business dean, but more candidates are needed.

The university has not received any state funds for the Patel Center; however, groundbreaking may be held in May.

REPORTS BY OFFICERS AND COUNCIL CHAIRS

a. Committee on Committees

In the absence of a chair, John Ward reported. Dr. Ward reported that Ellis Blanton, the former chair of the Committee on Committees sent an email memo requesting prospective members. The committee is structured so that there are representatives from all parts of the campus and needs six members to have a quorum. The members of the committee must elect a chair. It will be the responsibility of the chair to work with nominations. Email has proven to be a good way to communicate. Over half of last year's business was conducted by email.

Three years ago, the Faculty Senate changed the Senate Bylaws to extend membership or the potential for membership to university-wide committees and councils by adding to the definition of faculty to allow more faculty to participate.

A motion was made and seconded that Dr. Ward be appointed interim chair of the Committee on Committees in order to reorganize the committee. Dr. Ward reminded the members that the charge of the committee required the vote of the committee to elect a chair; however, he would accept an appointment as interim chair to organize the committee so that the committee could vote. The motion was passed unanimously.

b. Graduate Council

Chair Carnot Nelson reported that Graduate Council policies are in need of being reviewed and the committee continues to review all policies of the university. The curriculum subcommittee is doing a great job. For the past four years, any new program, doctoral or master program, must go through the Graduate Council. Prior to that, some programs went to the Provost's office without the Council. The Health Sciences complained that we only meet nine months a year. After discussion, the Council will be meeting eleven months a year, every month but July. There was an organizational meeting in August. The Council needs two members.

c. Research Council

Chair Gregory Teague reported that his committee had organized in order to obtain as many members as possible and had gotten candidates for all positions, including one at-large member from St. Petersburg. The deans and associate deans have been helpful as they know who is active and available in their colleges. Council members met with Bob Chang, the new Vice President for Research, over the summer and are looking forward to having him closely involved in the Council. He is interested in maintaining the internal awards process as it has been done; however they plan to talk to him about some moderate changes.

Chairman Teague reported on items from the past:

1. Faculty survey. The survey was discussed last year; however, there wasn't time to complete it during the spring term and the Council would like to discuss with Dr. Chang some of the information that may be useful. It is anticipated that the survey will be completed in the spring.
2. Incentive proposal. There was an opportunity to present it to a group of deans on behalf of the Provost and Vice Provost. The feedback suggested that there was concern about the start-up costs for the college. The model was modified to reduce or eliminate start-up costs. The Research Council will be discussion the proposal with Dr. Chang
3. Effort reporting. The Provost convened a workgroup to address problems in effort reporting. The goals include efficiency, validity, and consistency in

reporting and reduction of financial losses resulting from reporting errors. A tentative framework for revising the way effort reporting is done that could be expected to impact many things including the way faculty duties are assigned and interactions between faculty, chair, and other elements. Dr. Chang will have the lead on moving this initiative forward.

There was discussion about the president appointing interim position in order to conduct business. It might be possible for the president to approve ad hoc members pending presentation and nomination of these members at the following Senate meeting. President Greenbaum asked that Dr. Ward, Dr. Teague, and Dr. Nelson work together with Vice President Permuth on this issue.

d. Committee on Faculty Issues

Chair Larry Branch reported. The committee is focusing on three issues this year:

1. The career ladder for non-tenured faculty to ensure that there is consistency within the colleges. Faculty input into the creation of the career ladder is necessary.
2. Faculty review of administrators within the University of South Florida.
3. The distinguished university professorship procedures.

e. Council on Educational Policy and Issues

Chair Philip Reeder reported. He stated that the Council needs to devise some mechanism so that faculty may be involved in policy making before policy has been promulgated. Since there is a push for compliance at this time, the committee hopes to work on ensuring that the university is in compliance with all the different rules it needs to follow in spending grant money. The Council will be working with the office of Audit and Compliance. The first policy to be reviewed is the non-criminal investigation policy when people misuse grant money unintentionally, not to the point of a criminal offense. The current policy was adopted in 1999, so the Council will look at the procedures to ensure that they are up to date. Last year's subcommittee dealing with the Consensual Relationship Policy came up with a better policy than the existing one.

f. Council on Technology for Instruction and Research

Chair David Williams reported. Two committees, the Academic Computing Committee and the Instructional Technology Council were merged to form on committee. There is an interesting issue with committee members since, in some cases, there are too many faculty from one college, and other cases, there is not representation. One of the things that was started last year was a survey

of faculty to try to get a sense of faculty use of technology and faculty needs of technology. There was a question as to whether USF would continue Blackboard; however, Dr. Williams reported that there has been no word about discontinuing it.

g. Honorary Awards Committee

Chair Rajan Sen reported. There was some discussion about the loophole in the honorary degree procedures to permit the College of Medicine to give honorary MD's without committee review. President Greenbaum met with President Genshaft and it was requested that the committee consider closing that loophole. The Dean of the College of Medicine is in agreement. It was also requested that the committee review the guidelines and procedures for submitting honorary degrees and the requirements for receiving honorary degrees. There was a motion made offering advice or assistance from members of the Senate Executive Committee which was seconded and passed unanimously.

h. Shared Governance

Dr. Gregory McColm, Chair of the ad hoc committee, reported. The Senate Executive Committee was provided a copy of the Executive Summary. The report is being proofread at this time and will be distributed electronically. It is a large report, so its effects will take longer to percolate; however, it is hoped that the effects will extend for a much greater period of time. It can serve as a basis for continued work, particularly for the task force that will be going into Shared Governance.

There have been a number of past efforts. The Senate passed a resolution on shared governance. The Provost's office was impelled to ask departments their opinions on what should be in the faculty domain, what should be in the administrative domain, and what should be shared. Thirty-one departments responded to the survey and a collection of principles was composed from the responses which were presented to the SEC. Most departments reported that they thought research efforts should be in the faculty domain, the assignment of resources should be in the administrative domain, and the remainder should be shared.

This is an academic study that education leadership and several other fields might look at. There is a slow development of research into faculty governance which seems to be in the early stages. Larger and more prestigious institutions tend to have more formalized written procedures. There was a bellwether issue of whether or not there are any procedures for dismissing or recommending the dismissal of a chair and approximately one-quarter of those reporting said there was some kind of language included.

The report is supposed to be descriptive, not prescriptive. It contains a major recommendation that departments compose, get approval for, and promulgate governance documents. The department should decide what their documents contain. The report contains a kit consisting of an enumeration of issues to address and questions to be answered. It includes language on tenure and promotion, interim chair, etc. The report recommends that there be a central resource for departments which are composing their governance documents so that departments may be able to determine if their governance document language articulates with college or university policies and state or federal law.

There was discussion regarding next steps to be taken by the Senate. It was decided that the report be distributed to the Executive Committee as soon as possible to be reviewed and discussed in depth at the next Senate Executive Committee meeting.

There being no further business to come before the meeting, the same was duly adjourned at 5:30 pm