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USF FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
AGENDA
May 8, 2013
3:00-5:00 p.m., Student Services (SVC) 5012

1. Call to Order – Review of Agenda, Introductions

2. Approval of Minutes from April 3, 2013 Meeting

3. Reports by Officers and Council Chairs (45 minutes)
   a. General Council Matters; Leadership Transitions; Annual Reports
   b. CTIR Matters – Drew Smith
   c. Tenure & Promotion Guidelines Initiative – Greg Teague, et. al.
   d. Reports from Councils (Chairs) and Initiatives (various)
   e. Classroom Capture, Legal Considerations – Steve Permuth, Phil Levy, 
      Drew Smith

4. Old Business
   a. Report on Faculty Senate Resolution RE: Proposed School of Geology, 
      Geography and Environment
   b. Ad Hoc Committee on Emeritus Professor Criteria – Dwayne Smith and 
      Greg Teague (5 minutes) (see http://files.acad.usf.edu/facprogdev/27309.pdf)
   c. Other Outstanding Items

5. New Business
   a. Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics – Michael Bowen (20 minutes)
   b. Summer SEC Schedule

6. Report from Provost Ralph Wilcox (20 minutes)

7. USF System Faculty Council Vice President – Gregory Teague (5 minutes)

8. Report from Faculty Senate President Gregory Teague (5 minutes)

8. Other

Faculty Senate President Gregory Teague called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. Before proceeding with the meeting, introductions were made. With the notation that the discussion on classroom capture would be held later in the meeting, the agenda was approved. The Minutes from the April 3, 2013 meeting were approved with 1 abstention.

**REPORTS BY OFFICERS AND COUNCIL CHAIRS**

a. **General Council Matters; Leadership Transitions; Annual Reports**
   - Graduate Council – Russell Kirby will be new chair; Alex Levine will be the vice chair next year.
   - Annual Reports – President Teague would like each chair to produce an annual report for their respective council. He will prepare one for both the Faculty Senate and the Senate Executive Committee (SEC).

b. **CTIR Matters – Andrew Smith**
   1. How will the Faculty Senate reconfigure its web site when it transitions to the new web system? Mr. Smith clarified that this was not a CTIR matter, but more of an administrative one. The University Webmaster has not contacted either him or the Faculty Senate Office to say they are ready to help with transition to the new system. At a previous meeting, the SEC agreed that the archival documents of the Faculty Senate should be placed in Scholar Commons. The coordinator of Scholar Commons is setting this up. A meeting will be arranged for the coordinator, Mr. Smith and Ms. Pipkins to discuss the plan to move the archival materials to Scholar Commons. This can be done without waiting for a new web site. The Provost will share a copy of the detailed schedule of when departments are scheduled to undergo the website transition.

   2. One of the council nominees recently approved by the Faculty Senate for CTIR membership has already served 2 terms, and according to the charge members
cannot serve more than two terms without taking a one year break. Discussions have taken place between Mr. Smith, COC Chair Ellis Blanton and President Teague about how best to handle the situation since the nominee has been notified of her appointment for next year. A compromise would be to inform the individual that she will get a year’s term and that a replacement will be solicited to come in at the end of that year. President Teague commented that this is a question of balancing strict adherence to the rules versus the fact that the nominee was approved and has laid out her plans. A mechanism to avoid this happening in the future will be worked on by COC Chair Blanton and Ms. Pipkins. Either COC Chair Blanton or Mr. Smith will contact the nominee and explain the decision.

c. **Tenure & Promotion Guidelines Initiative – Greg Teague**

The general strategy that the committee is following has already been reported. Two town hall type meetings have been held to give faculty the opportunity to ask questions and discuss the issues. One was held on the west side of campus and the other on the east side of campus. The committee met on Tuesday, May 7th. The plan is to proceed, having absorbed ideas and information from committee members and the outside community, by drafting revisions to the text of the existing guidelines. The committee is continuing to think in terms of a relatively lean policy with one or two formats of guidelines and/or guidance to be linked to that policy.

One of the concerns that came up, given that the charge had come from Provost Wilcox, was that the committee not go forward too far without communicating with him because he may have clear ideas about what he wants. The committee wants to avoid getting to the end only to find out that their outcome is not what the Provost wants. The Provost responded that he is confident that the committee is headed in the right direction, given that the laying out of the landscape at the beginning of the activity was reasonably extensive, and there has been ongoing communication between President Teague and himself and others. The Provost would appreciate having the draft documents are shared with him at the same time they are shared with the broader academic community. He added that he has no particular sense of what the specific outcome should be. As long as the series of questions are adequately and openly addressed that would be satisfactory.

At this time, CEPI Chair Mason asked the Provost that if it is to be policy how to articulate the rules and responsibilities and the ways in which to follow up – how does one do that looking at the full complement of all the disciplines? There are issues in the Strategic Plan that faculty want accommodated in T&P, and therefore, how faculty are informed and evaluated on community outreach and engagement, global and multidisciplinary research is an aspect of the chairs’ responsibilities. President Teague offered a possible rephrasing of the question as: “How will it be that the chairs do their job in fostering the openness and acceptance of the kinds of activities that are featured?” The Provost responded that this is just a starting point and once an overarching set of values for the university has been established, then the college and department documents will need to align with those values. He added that the primary question is “How does
the university ensure that faculty members are rewarded for work that aligns with its strategic priorities?” President Teague commented that it is not the job of the T&P committee to ensure that chairs do their job in a particular way. The committee is articulating the language that provides the basis on which chairs could take actions they might not currently feel are supported. Vice President Levy added that the committee is not reinventing the whole system or trying to look at it and use this position to try and fix any and all perceived problems within the system. It is really about creating a middle tier of policy that gets the university from rock-solid, system/university-wide regulation to university policy down to guidelines. President Teague stated that the intent is clear and is consistent with what has been agreed to.

d. Reports from Councils (Chairs) and Initiatives (various)

- Council on Educational Policy & Issues (CEPI) – Tom Mason
  At its June meeting, CEPI will finish its final recommendations on instructor-published course materials to address egregious violations of conflict of interests by unnamed faculty charging exorbitant fees for what used to be called course packs.

- Honors and Awards Council (HAC) – Marzenna Wiranowska
  The Council has completed its cycle of faculty awards for this year. During the summer it will review its rules for the next cycle. She and Research Council Chair Lisa Brown will be working on importing language into the HAC charge (regarding members applying for awards), as well as identifying a central location for information on faculty awards.

- General Education Council – Karla Davis-Salazar
  The bill to increase Gen Ed to 36 hours passed. The Gen Ed Steering Committee is putting together a survey to send to the faculty disciplinary committees regarding the original recommended courses and learning outcomes to confirm their original selection of courses.

- Graduate Council – Sherman Dorn
  Most of the policy work is focused on issues about doctoral education, generally approving catalog language on a number of issues. There will be language in the catalog about co-authorship principles. Other issues: instituted general policy on maximum load; a nominal statement about advisor/student relationship; whether or not the university needs to define a program core in ways other than what it currently does; follow-up formative reviews of programs at the masters level that have been out up to 5 years; and the state-wide course numbering system lost a full-time staff member, which has put a crimp on turnaround on new courses.

e. Classroom Lecture Capture, Legal Considerations – Steve Permuth, Phil Levy, Andrew Smith

The Senate has had two to three years of discussion on lecture capture – about what it means and what it does not mean. Dr. Permuth offered the following contexts for his
report: (1) There is the question of how lecture capture is done that makes it viable. (2) An ad hoc committee was appointed in an attempt to try and bring some sense of coherent summary to what may be perceived as possible legal issues in the context of what is being done. The document presented at today’s meeting was a compilation of where the committee concerns lie. At this time, Dr. Permuth read the document from the ad hoc committee entitled “Lecture Capture: A Draft View of Possible Legal Issues.” He added that there is room for discussion on this list of possible legal issues. The committee does not offer answers, but presents the questions.

At this time, General Counsel Steve Prevaux was invited to comment. The supplemental documents provided with the draft conclude that it is not a bargaining right, but in Florida the collective bargaining team has a long history of providing reasonable middle ground for inventions and works that could provide a launch pad to solve some of the issues listed in the document. For example, if there is a reasoned difference of opinion, the process is for the faculty member and the chair to sit down and reduce that and talk about the apportioning of intellectual property rights. This is already on the shelf and may help in lecture capture. There is also a copyright policy on inventions and works that would be a good framing for a stable starting point. Mr. Prevaux suggested that the ad hoc committee look at the College of Medicine policy statement on lecture capture. It takes it one step further in that it says that USF will not use lectures for purposes other than for educational use of students during a specified course except with the permission of faculty, and they hold to a delete requirement of a semester. Mr. Prevaux embraces the dialogue. Mr. Colin Mailloux, in the Office of General Counsel, has expertise in copyright laws and has dealt with lecture capture issues in the past.

Provost Wilcox added that the USF faculty should rest assured that there is no intent on the part of the university leadership to utilize the captured materials in any way other than to enhance student learning outcomes. He commented that something that was discussed before but was lost in recent dialogue and that is the importance of full disclosure to students in the syllabus. There is a responsibility to let students know whether a lecture is being recorded or not. The SEC agreed that a statement should be included in the syllabus that covers the existence of lecture capture and additionally indicates whether students are permitted to record a class for personal use. Mr. Prevaux added that the collective bargaining agreement and the works policy both state that USF does not assert any rights intended to “disseminate results for research or scholarly study.”

President Teague asked the committee to formulate how it is the SEC might need to discuss any further those things which have been highlighted in the document and return to them in due course. In the interim, it is his impression that the process will be moving ahead to do whatever has been technically prepared for and these are refinements around the improvement of understanding of what the limits are as the process moves forward. Dr. Permuth responded that a middle thing to do is invite anyone interested in working with Drs. Permuth, Levy and Mr. Smith to operationalize the items listed in the document distributed today. This also includes staff from the Office of General Counsel and the Provost’s Office. The Provost would like to make available a statement reminding faculty and students of their responsibilities in the classroom for instructors to insert into
their syllabi effective no later than Fall 2013. President Teague suggested including Mr. Kevin Yee in the conversation, because he is developing syllabus templates to cover various issues. Mr. Permuth will be in contact with the College of Medicine for their lecture capture policy statement. The committee will also look into whether or not students need to be notified ahead of time, via Oasis, that their course will be recorded.

OLD BUSINESS

a. **Report on Faculty Senate Resolution RE: Proposed School of Geology, Geography and Environment (SGGE) – Gregory Teague**

A draft report was disseminated to the SEC before today’s meeting. Ms. Pipkins was asked to look into the question of what Dean Eisenberg actually said in response to one of the questions about the name of the proposed unit, specifically with concern over the term “environment.” With that one modification, President Teague invited approval of the document. Vice Provost Graham Tobin reported that the name had been changed to School of Geosciences. This, therefore, makes the issue a moot point. A motion was made and seconded to accept the document with the modification proposed. The motion unanimously passed. The document will be modified and forwarded to Provost Wilcox.

b. **Ad Hoc Committee on Emeritus Professor Criteria – Dwayne Smith and Gregory Teague**

Action on this policy would potentially change a motion approved by the Faculty Senate ten years ago. Senior Vice Provost Smith clarified that the administration is looking for a revisitation of the modifications to the Emeritus guidelines that were made ten years ago. The effect of the previous changes made the process swing from a cumbersome and prescriptive one to one that is guidelines-less. Departments are struggling with the fundamental questions of what is Professor Emeritus, what does that title actually entail, and what does it signify. President Teague stated that with appreciation of what is involved, a small group will be convened that would include some Emeritus professors as well as some regular faculty, to make recommendations to the Faculty Senate about new language. Dr. Smith added that it should not entail a wholesale revision of the existing policy, but the addition of clarifying language.

c. **Other Outstanding Items – Gregory Teague**

All of the items were addressed during today’s meeting; therefore, all of them will be eliminated.

NEW BUSINESS

a. **Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) – Michael Bowen**

As chair of the COIA, Dr. Bowen attended today’s meeting to bring awareness that in order for COIA to do its work more faculty need to be involved. USF became involved with COIA in 2010, but faculty are not responding to any of the issues surrounding
intercollegiate athletics. During a task force held on campus in February, Dr. Bowen prepared a white paper proposing a faculty summit to talk about the importance of athletic groups on campus. Faculty involvement means faculty athletic representatives need to be involved. President Teague commented that the Faculty Senate may want to rethink how relationships among faculty bodies are described and structured at USF, in addition to having a conversation with the faculty council involved. Comments were invited from the SEC. The Provost added that Dr. Bowen was making a call for a sense of broader institutional control. He pointed out that one difference at USF is that students have a significant voice, but that does not suggest faculty should not have a voice. There is nothing preventing the faculty athletic representative from meeting with the Faculty Senate.

President Teague proposed that the white paper be circulated to the SEC after which the SEC could have a conversation with the Athletics Council and ask that group to talk to the Senate. He added that more information is needed from the Athletics Council about how they are doing their job. Other stakeholders will be also be involved in the conversation along the way. Since Dr. Bowen is COIA chair, there needs to be a separate COIA representative from the Senate. Dr. Bowen will also forward to President Teague for circulation to the SEC a proposal of a faculty mentor program in which faculty (and staff) become mentors for teams. Conversations about this program will begin in the fall and Dr. Bowen would like Senate involvement.

b. **Summer SEC Schedule – Gregory Teague**

Due to scheduling conflicts of the Senate leadership for the summer, President Teague would like to move the June, July and August meetings to be held one week later. He and Ms. Pipkins will work on new dates and send the proposed ones to the SEC and the Provost for consideration.

**REPORT FROM PROVOST RALPH WILCOX**

Provost Wilcox’s report consisted of the following items:

- Messages were sent out during last week’s unexpected power outage to extend the second hour of the final examination period. Disruption was minimal as were the concerns from faculty and students.
- Members of the Faculty Senate and members at large were thanked for their participation in one or more of the 5 Commencement exercises that were conducted the previous weekend on the Tampa campus. The College of Medicine will be holding its ceremony on Friday, May 10.
- Summer school begins on May 13 and enrollment looks healthy.
- Overview of Legislative and Budget Items – some highlights
  - full restoration of the one-time cut;
  - Legislature has set a base tuition rate at a particular amount if the governor vetoes the proposed 3 percent increase;
  - performance base funding breakdown;
• no increase in benefit costs, no reduction in coverage for university employees
• salary recommendations for USF employees – those earning less than $40,000 will receive a $1,400 base increase; those earning more than $40,000 will receive a $1,000 base increase; opportunity for a $600 award for a one time meritorious bonus (allocation per institution is now known as this time); base increases will go into effect October 1; $600 bonus effective January, 2014
• Reviewed spreadsheet of appropriations from the House, Senate, Governor’s recommendation, Conference and the Legislature approval. Capital commitments are proposed to be funded by non-recurring revenue.

An abbreviated presentation to be made to the BOG workgroup in 2 weeks on tuition and fee pricing was distributed. The governor’s decision has yet to be made on the 3 percent base tuition increase and the BOT’s approval of this recommendation on June 6, assuming the governor has signed the general appropriations into law at that time.

REPORT FROM USF SYSTEM FACULTY COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT AND FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT GREGORY TEAGUE

President Teague reported the following:

• Dr. Christopher Davis will be continuing for a second term as President of the USF System Faculty Council. It was noted that the student trustee will be from the St. Petersburg campus as well.
• Reiterated the issues discussed during the Bricks and Mortar in a Digital Age symposium at UF – esp. the challenges and opportunities presented by the rapidly expanding presence of online methods and venues in higher education – which all faculty should be mindful of.
• Suggested it might be helpful in USF’s evolution if faculty came to have more of a sense of a shared institutional identity than they have right now – perhaps an issue to consider in the interval between now and articulation of the next five year plan.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:25 p.m.