

1-1-2008

# AY 2007/2008 SEC meeting minutes: 07 Nov 28

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fs\\_pubs](http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fs_pubs)

---

## Scholar Commons Citation

Faculty Senate, "AY 2007/2008 SEC meeting minutes: 07 Nov 28" (2008). *Faculty Senate Publications*. Paper 224.  
[http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fs\\_pubs/224](http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fs_pubs/224)

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](mailto:scholarcommons@usf.edu).

**FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
MINUTES**

November 28, 2008

Present: Michael Barber, Laurence Branch, Jennifer Cainas, Emanuel Donchin, Dale Johnson, Gene Ness, Christine Probes, Philip Shenefelt, James Strange, Paul Terry, Larry Thompson, Graham Tobin, John Ward

Provost's  
Office: Dwayne Smith, Ralph Wilcox

Guests: Garin Flowers, Stephen Portch, Christine Gibson (*Oracle* reporter)

Faculty Senate President Michael Barber called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m. The Minutes from the meeting of October 31, 2007, were accepted as corrected.

**SPECIAL REPORT FROM DR. STEPHEN PORTCH ON THE USF STRATEGIC PLAN**

In order to move the USF Strategic Plan 2007-2012 forward, the University engaged Dr. Portch, the primary author of the Pappas Report, as a consultant to review the infrastructure and overall operations and to make an assessment of the University's progress toward its goal of positioning itself for AAU status. He was invited to today's meeting to talk about some of the insights he has gained about USF and also give the SEC an opportunity to share their views and engage in discussion about the Strategic Plan (SP). After a brief introduction, President Barber turned the floor over to Dr. Portch.

Dr. Portch first reported that his basic conclusion on the SP is that it is among the very best he has seen for a number of reasons: The SP has an ambitious, single goal, is committed to accountability metrics, and the Board of Trustees and faculty leadership have a good basic understanding of the contents of the SP, with a good level of shared ownership of the plan. Based upon these observations, Dr. Portch gives the university very high marks.

He commented that the easy part of the SP had been done which is the writing of it; the implementation always is the challenge, and this particular SP has multiple challenges. This institution has clearly grown very quickly; it has a substantial, but fragile, research productivity profile. It has put itself on the map in a number of ways and done so in a state with limited resources. With the level of ambition, the external environment and the competitiveness of where USF wants to go, it will not be able to continue doing business as usual. Budget allocations must be aligned with strategic priorities, and it is not apparent that this has been the way for this institution historically. There is a lack of focus and discipline.

A second area is the seriously inadequate infrastructure to get USF to where its ambitions are. It was pointed out that the infrastructure is so weak that it leads to inefficiencies and to daily frustrations for faculty in the conduct of their business. It is important for the university to pay attention to things like making sure every area of operations has policy and procedures that are implemented, that the technology support systems are adequate for the complexity of the

institution, and that certain elements of contracts and grants work properly. Dr. Portch is not sure the university can do a level of financial analysis and projections which will be necessary to align resources for the SP. He is not sure the technology or financial systems are adequate. If USF can get its infrastructure well tuned, there would be resources to be reapplied to the core goal and mission of the SP. This would also decrease the amount of faculty frustration which impedes their effort and ability to do the things called for in the plan.

Another area Dr. Portch touched upon is the stockpiling of future faculty talent that appears to be lacking at USF. He pointed out that USF has a very respected faculty, but to reach the goals of the plan, the stockpiling and the acquisition of future faculty talent is going to be a very important priority. The gap between where the university is today and where it needs to be is very significant in this regards.

On the positive side, there is an energy and sense of momentum at USF. In addition, there is a new generation of faculty attracted to metropolitan and urban areas. This university is in an identifiable region which is experiencing growth and vibrancy and that should be capitalized upon.

In all the data he has looked at on the building of the quality of the faculty and the infrastructure, everything indicates that being AAU eligible is a reachable goal, although in some areas it is a stretch. There are demonstrable, early wins from the last plan. The changed fiscal environment in Florida since the plan was in its early stages should not mean that some things should be put on hold. Dr. Portch feels that the behaviors, disciplines and strategic priorities established and funded in a downturn are equally important in an upturn. Budget processes put in place and that work during tight times should work in good budget times. However, for the creditability of the plan, it is going to be very important that one, two, or three areas be identified that are significantly altered as a result of the plan. Accomplishing globalization would be most beneficial and would make USF distinguishable. Lack of integration academically and in the research orientation of the medical and the other disciplinary areas is not unique, but to reach its aspirations USF will have to do things better than the other universities have. Overall, the university needs to change its fundamental behaviors and make cultural shifts over time.

### **Comments/Discussion**

Vice President Larry Branch questioned the way in which Interim Vice President for Research and Innovation Karen Holbrook was hired, without consultation with the faculty. Dr. Portch replied that otherwise it would have been a long process, high risk, and USF would not have been able to get the quality candidate that it did. Secretary Johnson noted that USF is very fortunate to have someone of Dr. Holbrook's experience and perspective to contribute in this critical area until the search of a permanent Vice President for Research is conducted.

Vice President Branch asked how Dr. Portch would characterize the relationship between faculty leadership and the administration compared to what he has seen at other universities. Dr. Portch replied that he has not spent enough time here to characterize it.

Senator Emanuel Donchin, Chair of the Council on Educational Policy and Issues, asked at how many AAU universities is the person in charge of business affairs the executive vice president? Given everything Dr. Portch said about the infrastructure, Chair Donchin asked him to what extent is due to the fact that instead of serving the academic enterprise, USF is employed by the business enterprise? Dr. Portch replied that USF has the worst of both worlds. It has a highly decentralized budget, but it does not have corresponding decentralized budget autonomy and authority.

Dr. Portch commented there were some things about USF's communication to external audiences that needed to be done differently: For example, it should stop comparing itself to other Florida universities. Being "one of the top three research universities in Florida" sets its sights too low. The metrics are great, but USF also needs four or five measures that can be reviewed each year to determine whether or not progress is being made.

Sergeant-at-Arms Gene Ness asked Dr. Portch for advice on recruiting quality faculty, how to grow the faculty, place more emphasis on faculty, and how to shift some of the money from the administration to the faculty. Dr. Portch replied that in terms of the faculty, a dual strategy is needed which is the identification of existing faculty who have not yet realized their full potential for a host of reasons. Another part of the strategy is the identification of future and existing talented faculty.

Secretary Dale Johnson asked if the institution is sufficiently focused on peer-reviewed federal funding as a key metric. The reply was that USF needs to focus on that measure, but from a public relations and a building momentum point of view, the largest research dollar amount has been used. However, the current heavy dependence on Congressional appropriations is a fragile one.

Senator John Ward asked if there are functional models for infrastructure, technology including software system, tracking systems, etc., that would allow the university in progressing toward solving these issues. Dr. Portch replied that this is the only institution of this size, complexity, and ambition that he knows of that does not have a Chief Information Officer (CIO), A CIO is needed to lead USF in this important area.

Parliamentarian Graham Tobin asked what the role of the Faculty Senate plays and do other universities have a constitution? Dr. Portch did not know about the existence of constitutions. On the role of the Senate, it varies enormously. It does seem that there will be academic policy matters which, if the Senate could focus its attention on, would be very important. One of the hardest would be the tenure and promotion criteria. Leadership from the Senate in this area would be a very important policy initiative in support of the plan.

Parliamentarian Tobin asked should the Faculty Senate at USF be taking a stronger role in terms of shared governance? Dr. Portch has not looked at this closely enough since there is a union environment at USF. However, a faculty role in shared governance depends upon the willingness of the faculty to take on responsibility for their role. If the faculty could show strong leadership on a few key issues of the SP, it would be helpful to the institution and faculty, and it

would be a demonstration to the administration that the faculty is going to be part in what is agreed.

Vice Provost Ralph Wilcox summarized by stating the easy part of the SP is done with the hard work just beginning and business as usual is not going to get USF where it needs to be. The focus should be on the journey. Rather than focusing on the destination, the focus should be on identifying the path. He stated that the faculty and students have a responsibility to hold the leadership of the university accountable toward that continuing focus and discipline.

## **REPORT FROM VICE PROVOST RALPH WILCOX**

Vice Provost Wilcox presented an update from the Revenue Estimating Conference on the current and future general revenue forecast. There is another predicted budget reduction in the range of 4 percent off the base which could occur as early as January, 2008. Revenues have been readjusted downward in the amount of one billion dollars in the current fiscal year, and the estimates have been readjusted downward for another billion dollars for the next fiscal year beginning July 1, 2008. That amounts to another 8 percent base budget reduction which would take place in January unless the State Legislature makes the decision to dip into their various funds to cover those declining revenues. If that should occur, it is only a temporary solution because the institution will face an 8 percent reduction beginning July 1 with a need to replenish these funds.

With the forecast of USF looking at a base budget reduction of \$24 million dollars over the next six to nine months, Vice Provost Wilcox pointed out that this reinforces the importance of the work of the Budget Priority Task Force. Vice President Branch commented that shared governance concerning the budget reduction applies only to Academic Affairs; there is not anything comparable on the USF Health side. Dr. Portch added that because of these budget reductions the SP may have to slow down but should not be abandoned during this challenge.

Committee on Faculty Issues Chair Paul Terry asked Vice Provost Wilcox if the Senate could expect a to do list of challenges to address the issue of a weak infrastructure. Faculty Senate President Barber commented that if the university is to move forward, it is faculty working with the administration in identifying these areas. He felt shared governance should be done in such a way that the changes are acceptable to everybody. The Senate should review the SP to identify areas it feels are the most important ones to work on, as well as the Cabinet.

## **REPORTS BY OFFICERS AND COUNCIL CHAIRS**

There were no reports for today's meeting.

## **REQUEST FROM STUDENT GOVERNMENT PRESIDENT GARIN FLOWERS**

President Flowers attended today's meeting to obtain feedback from the SEC on a proposal from Student Government (SG) to place results of the official, university faculty evaluations back on-line for access by students to review before registering for classes. He pointed out that the purpose was not to criticize or provide additional critiques on the faculty, but to improve

communications between students and faculty. In addition, SG would like the evaluations to be available on Blackboard at an easy accessible location, possibly on the SG web site. Currently, archived evaluations are in the library, but are difficult to access. This is one of the many projects SG is working on and would like to see this come to fruition. The proposal was discussed, specifically the evaluative instrument. It was clarified that just the results of numerical evaluations, in a pdf file, would be posted on-line. Faculty Senate President Barber ended the discussion by informing SG President Flowers that the SEC would discuss the topic further and let him know its decision.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### a. Institutional Reviews

Based upon how other universities have developed their procedures for review of administrators, President Barber would like the SEC to spend more time on the design of the reviews for the President, Provost and Vice President for Health, as well as to how and when the reviews are to be conducted. For example, the University of Michigan conducts a review of every senior administrator every three years on a rolling cycle. A committee of six faculty is set up to conduct the review, and administrators are invited to submit a portfolio (including annual reports, etc.). It is meant to be a growth experience, not a penalizing process. Results of the reviews are made available on a web site. President Barber stated that administrators from vice presidents and above should be evaluated. He requested, and everyone agreed, that the question asking for a vote of no confidence be deleted from each of the proposed reviews.

President Barber felt that the evaluation of only the three administrators (President, Provost, and Vice President of Health) is limiting and that regional administrators should also be reviewed. Committee on Faculty Issues (CFI) Chair Terry clarified that that was not the intent of the committee. He added that the President's evaluation would go to all faculty; the one for the Provost would go to all faculty in Academic Affairs; and the Vice President's evaluation would go to faculty in USF Health. President Barber stated this is the way it should be done.

CFI Chair Terry proposed that this be a pilot project. He added that CFI is willing to do the work to send out the reviews. The results could be used as a professional growth and development tool. CEPI Chair Donchin stated that his opinion and that of his colleagues of the Vice President for Health is not irrelevant because of the Vice President's relationship with the interdisciplinary network on campus. CFI Chair Terry commented that this is a technicality that needs to be discussed and worked out. He then proposed that the next step he would like the SEC to consider would be to use these reviews to generically design a version that could be used for all deans and vice presidents. President Barber stated it would be good to use a tested and valid review as a template from one of the universities that have been conducting reviews for the past five years rather than starting from scratch.

By way of contrast, the current process used by the Board of Trustees to include faculty input in the evaluation of the university president does not include a survey instrument. Rather, it is a discussion in which the Faculty Senate President is contacted via telephone for his or her opinion.

It was agreed that the target date for conducting the reviews will be at the end of spring semester. This will allow for the results to be tabulated in time for the university President's annual evaluation conducted by the Board of Trustees.

President Barber has an appointment the following week with President Genshaft to discuss this item. He will report back to the SEC after this meeting. Referring to a previous agreement, Vice President Branch commented that the chair of CFI should be present at this meeting because that was where the reviews originated. However, since he is no longer CFI chair Vice President Branch felt he should be present as the architect of the reviews. CFI Chair Terry recommended that the Faculty Senate President and the Vice President meet with President Genshaft and inform her that this will be done. Secretary Johnson suggested that the meeting remain as scheduled as one between President Genshaft and President Barber. Due to a lack of quorum, no action was taken on this issue.

b. Board of Governors Green Initiatives

In the interest of time, this topic was tabled.

**NEW BUSINESS**

a. California Higher Education Compact – Information Item Only

In the interest of time, this topic was tabled.

b. Discussion of the Relationship between the Faculty Senate and United Faculty of Florida

President Barber distributed an e-mail from United Faculty of Florida (UFF) President Sherman Dorn regarding the Code of Conduct for Financial Affairs (CoCFA) and collective bargaining. It was intended as an information item but also to allow the SEC to express any comments regarding the Faculty Senate's role in discussing the revised CoCFA and potentially circumventing the collective bargaining process. Secretary Johnson read from the Constitution that states "The Senate may discuss and take a position on any subject of University concern." Secretary Johnson also noted that according to the Constitution, the Senate actually has the responsibility to review and make recommendations to the President and Provost "concerning decisions of the University on all matters pertaining to the welfare of the University, focusing particularly on those related to the academic mission." It was agreed to invite UFF President Dorn to a future SEC meeting to discuss the role of the Faculty Senate in discussing and making recommendations on topics of academic importance.

c. Appointment Terminology

This issue was referred to the Committee on Faculty Issues to review and make recommendations to the SEC.

d. Use of Courtesy Appointments

The motion was made that the Faculty Senate recommends that any courtesy or joint appointment be at the same rank as the primary appointment. The motion was seconded and unanimously passed. A second motion was made and seconded to refer the issue of courtesy appointments to the Council on Educational Policy and Issues to review all the policies and report its recommendations to the SEC. The motion was unanimously passed.

e. Use of Emeriti/Emerita Titles

The use of these titles already exists in the policy on Emeritus. The SEC recommends that faculty can use whichever title they choose.

f. USF Policy on Emeritus Status

Due to a lack of quorum, this issue was not discussed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:25 p.m.