

1-1-2007

AY 2006/2007 SEC meeting minutes: 07 Nov 07

Faculty Senate

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

Scholar Commons Citation

Faculty Senate, "AY 2006/2007 SEC meeting minutes: 07 Nov 07" (2007). *Faculty Senate Publications*. Paper 208.
http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fs_pubs/208

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 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES
July 11, 2007

Present: Michael Barber, Roger Brindley, Gail Donaldson, Susan Greenbaum, Kim Lersch, Gene Ness, Christine Probes, Dewey Rundus, Steve Tauber, Graham Tobin, John Ward, Linda Whiteford

Provost's Office: Renu Khator, Michael Moore, Ralph Wilcox

Guests: Emanuel Donchin, Neset Hikmet (Sarasota College Council)

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m. The Minutes from the May 9, 2007, meeting were approved as amended.

Comments from Faculty Senate President Michael Barber

President Barber received a request for nominations for the Board of Trustees (BOT) workgroups. Senate nominees for representation on the all the workgroups were forwarded to President Genshaft.

Two Senate Executive Committee (SEC) members and President Barber met with the Strategic Planning Council.

The October 3rd SEC meeting will take place after President Genshaft's Address to the University.

Budget Reduction Discussion with Provost Renu Khator

Due to the recent mandate from the Governor's office for a 4 percent base E&G budget reduction and a request for a plan for an additional 6 percent reduction, Provost Khator attended today's meeting to discuss with the SEC what this means for Academic Affairs. It has been determined that the cuts will be taken strategically. Categories from where funds will be generated are: new revenue increasing strategies, university-wide savings, spending restrictions, and program consolidation/reduction/elimination. Provost Khator requested assistance from the SEC leadership with program assessment by the faculty. She pointed out two parameters: (1) the Board will keep fiscal responsibility and (2) the president of the management team has the management responsibility given by Florida law. USF needs to start an assessment of academic programs and a decision needs to be made whether or not the Faculty Senate (with the aid of other faculty members and university groups) is interested in taking on the role of faculty evaluating academic programs (which includes service/departments/institutes/centers).

Provost Khator invited Senator Emanuel Donchin to today's meeting to share his experience with a similar situation when he was at the University of Illinois (UI) in 1981. The UI committee appointed by the vice chancellor consisted of approximately thirty faculty members

with several staff members. Staff support was provided by the Office of the Provost. The committee's charge was to find 6 percent to cut from the base budget. The criterion used was quality-centrality-demand. The committee was broken down into subcommittees that were assigned to different areas. No one who evaluated an area was on a subcommittee representing that same area. It was an open process, consulting with deans and most of the department heads, with input from everyone. The process took one semester and was handled in a collegial manner. Senator Donchin pointed out that data are readily available at UI which is not the case at USF. In addition, statutorily, the administration at UI cannot do anything that has policy implications without Senate approval. Whatever plan the committee prepared had to go to the Senate for approval. In summary, the UI committee was shaped by the quality-centrality-demand criterion and that it was free to look at all the data needed and had good staff support. Senator Donchin pointed out that because the process worked well it was used more than once to address budget cuts.

At this time, the floor was opened for discussion. One question was whether or not a policy would be developed that would be implemented system-wide. Provost Khator commented that President Genshaft has stated that cuts will be strategically done on the Tampa campus and the regional campuses will need to decide how to make their own cuts. In answer to the question about whether there will be variations with some colleges being asked to cut more than others, the Provost replied that because it is unknown how this situation will actually turn out, a central escrow account needs to be created. All units will be asked to return 3.0 percent with a differential reduction for credit generating and non-credit generating units with that money put into a central escrow account. This money would, in turn, be used to support those units which the committee feels meets the quality-centrality-demand criterion.

At this time, President Barber asked the SEC members whether or not the Faculty Senate should be involved in a program assessment. The general consensus was that the Faculty Senate has an obligation to participate in this process provided it can help and play a role as an example of shared governance. At this time, the SEC conveyed to Provost Khator a unified interest in undertaking a university-wide program evaluation of Academic Affairs.

Provost Khator stated that she will turn over everything her office has to the faculty committee in terms of budget and data. She will ask all the vice presidential areas to create their lists of programs that they think should be eliminated because they are not central to the core mission. Then the faculty committee can review these lists to determine whether or not to delve deeper. The Provost reiterated that the first thing to be done is to have the vice presidential areas take the reductions and put that into escrow. Second, ask the same areas what programs will be eliminated. After that, faculty can be brought to the table to determine if there are items that can be reduced, for example, telephone services.

Discussion was held regarding the composition of the committee. President Barber indicated this could be suggested as a model for faculty involvement on the regional campuses as well. Vice President John Ward recommended that the Faculty Senate be involved in this process and whatever committee is formed that the chairs of the subcommittees be Senators which would allow them to report to the Faculty Senate on different activities and give a certain degree of control of information. It was agreed that there should be a working committee with

subcommittees. In addition, the Faculty Senate should have control over the process, the policies, the structure of the committee, and selection of committee composition. Staff and students should also have representation on the committee. The following main committee composition will be proposed to the Provost:

Arts and Sciences	12	-	3 from physical sciences 3 from social sciences 3 from humanities 3 from professional
Education	8		
Engineering	3		
Business	3		
VPA	3		
Architecture	1		
FMHI	2		
Library	1		

Neither the regional campuses nor the Health Sciences will be represented on this committee. The other campus groups (staff, students) will be asked to nominate their own representatives. It was decided that 5 from each of these two groups be added, bringing the total to 43. President Barber will suggest to the Provost that as many Senators as possible be involved and invite the regular Senate membership to fill the remainder. If that does not work, then go to the faculty at large. Senators must be in leadership positions on the main steering committee as well as on the subcommittees. The breakdown of representation will be 50 percent from the Faculty Senate and 50 percent from the faculty at large. President Barber will prepare a draft memo to be circulated to SEC members with comments to be returned to him by the end of the day on Thursday.

Old Business

- a. Revisiting Work of Ad Hoc Constitution and Senate Restructuring Committees
(Susan Greenbaum)

Past President Greenbaum feels that this issue should be taken care of during this coming academic year. The topic will be resurrected for discussion in September.

- b. New Senator Orientation

President Barber announced that a New Senator Orientation will be held in September. He would like to create a Senate handbook to include: the Bylaws, a meeting absence policy (with examples of an excused absence), list of all Faculty Senate Standing Committees and Councils and their charges, role of all officers, information on release time for Senate president, a synopsis of Senate meeting rules, a page on the election process and guidelines, a membership directory with terms, and meeting calendar with informed dates. President Barber asked that the requested information be submitted to him by mid-August so that the handbook can be presented to the new Senators early September.

New Business

a. Lakeland Campus Issues

Lakeland campus Senator Lersch was asked to find out from the faculty what kinds of things for the SEC to ask CEO Marshall Goodman and AVP Judith Ponticell should they attend a future SEC meeting.

b. COIA White Paper “Framing the Future: Reforming Intercollegiate Athletics”

President Barber asked everyone to read this paper for future reference.

c. Future of USF Talk

Past President Susan Greenbaum was asked to draft a response to Dr. Carlucci stating that the SEC agrees the USF Talk list serv should be left as is.

d. August Meeting

A SEC meeting will be scheduled in August. Agenda items include a discussion of the reorganization of research and Vice Provost Wilcox to discuss the benchmarks matrix. A message will be circulated for availability to meet.

e. Graduate Assistantships

Graduate Council Chair Roger Brindley announced that Graduate School Dean Delcie Durham has asked for a July meeting with the Graduate Council to discuss graduate assistantship budget. The dean has placed a freeze at 2006-07 levels. It is possible that conversations will circulate around notions of cutting the graduate assistantship tuition waivers to graduate assistants in their fourth, fifth and sixth year and to those who only have a .25 FTE. Any opinions on the issue should be expressed to Graduate Council representatives.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.