

1-1-2014

# AY 2013/2014 SEC meeting minutes: 08 Jan 14

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 2013/2014 SEC meeting minutes: 08 Jan 14" (2014). *Faculty Senate Archives*. Paper 367.  
[http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fs\\_pubs/367](http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fs_pubs/367)

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 Archives by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact [scholarcommons@usf.edu](mailto:scholarcommons@usf.edu).



**USF FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING  
AGENDA**

January 8, 2014

3:00-5:00 p.m., Student Services (SVC) 5012

1. Call to Order, Review of Agenda
2. Approval of Minutes from December 4, 2013 Meeting
3. Reports by Officers and Council/Committee Chairs (30 minutes)
  - a. Approval of Election Documents: Schedule, Apportionment, Vacancies – Barbara Lewis
  - b. Other Reports from Councils (Chairs) and Initiatives
4. Old Business
  - a. Update on and Discussion of Resumption of Budget Re-Engineering Process – Greg Teague (10 minutes)
5. New Business
  - a. Policy RE: Shared Governance – Dwayne Smith, Greg Teague (15 minutes)
  - b. Senate Agenda (5 minutes)
6. Report from Senior Vice Provost & Dean Dwayne Smith (25 minutes)
7. Report from Faculty Senate President and USF System Faculty Council Vice President – Gregory Teague (10 minutes)
8. Other

Adjourn - Next Scheduled Meeting – February 5, 2014

**Tampa Faculty Senate Office**

University of South Florida • 4202 East Fowler Avenue, FAO 226 • Tampa, FL 33620-6100  
(813) 974-2889 • FAX (813) 974-5914 • fsenate@usf.edu

**USF FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING  
MINUTES  
January 8, 2014**

Present: Ellis Blanton, Karla Davis-Salazar, Russell Kirby, Barbara Lewis, Wendy Nembhard, Steve Permuth, Scott Rimbey, Andrew Smith, Gregory Teague, Marzenna Wiranowska

Provost's  
Office: Paul Dosal, Kofi Glover, Dwayne Smith

Guests: Roger Brindley (USF World), Arthur Shapiro (UFF)

President Teague called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. The agenda was accepted as presented. The Minutes from the meeting of December 4, 2013, were approved as amended.

**REPORTS BY OFFICERS AND COUNCIL/COMMITTEE CHAIRS**

In preparation for giving reports today, President Teague had asked that the chairs use this time to look ahead and consider the goals each group might have for the remainder of the academic year.

- a. Honors and Awards Council (HAC) – Marzenna Wiranowska  
With the recently approved operational procedures, the HAC will be able to more efficiently conduct its award review process. The Council will be meeting on January 23 to review nominations for honorary degree and Kosove awards. A second meeting to review the remaining three awards under the auspices of the Faculty Senate will be held in March.

Chair Wiranowska and Chair-Elect Michael Teng attended the December 12, 2013 meeting of the System Faculty Council (SFC) to participate in a discussion about whether the process of awarding honorary degrees should be changed to include all USF System institutions. Currently, the three USF institutions each grant institutional awards, such as for research or teaching, with the process determined at institution level. Honorary degree nominations are usually considered by the HAC, which reports to the Tampa Senate. However, the System President would like all three institutions in the System to be included or have their own honorary degree process. It was agreed at the SFC meeting that each campus would create its own criteria, but it would be procedurally consistent across the system with a local award process. A final decision has not been made. President Teague will present the model to President Genshaft on Monday, January 13 during the SEC lunch with her and the senior leadership. Chair Wiranowska would also like the idea of having one name for the honorary degree discussed at the luncheon.

b. Council on Faculty Issues (CFI) – Steve Permut

1. A discussion is scheduled on January 15 to flesh out some of the remaining issues on lecture capture.
2. Secretary Lewis and CFI Chair Permut will be meeting with Vice President Michael Pearce regarding assessments for President Genshaft and Provost Wilcox. Information is being collected on issues of climate to be added to the assessment forms. It is anticipated to have them ready for implementation by April.
3. CFI is pursuing an upfront, simple explanation on the budget.
4. Chair Permut would like to see a subcommittee created that would work with the Office of Student Success and the role of faculty in international affairs to make it more vibrant by having a topic of structure that would lead to the strategic competencies USF is striving to achieve and making it real.
5. The Council is working on a statement of faculty shared governance. It is anticipated that the Council on Educational Policy and Issues will also be involved in these issues.

c. General Education Council – Karla Davis-Salazar

The main issue for the Council will be the impact of the State-mandated courses on general education in terms of what that does to enrollment and the remaining course offerings. QEP will come into play with that. Dr. Davis-Salazar recapped that last semester the focus for the QEP process was on selecting a topic, beginning to get the word out to everyone, and soliciting feedback through the Canvas survey. Focus was also on fleshing out the learning outcomes, global context and human/cultural diversity. Meetings took place with faculty to get input on how to start defining the learning outcomes. Looking forward for this semester, the QEP Steering Committee will work on solidifying student learning outcomes and developing the specific strategies to be implemented. To this end, a QEP curriculum development team and a co-curriculum development team have been formed. Feedback will continue to be solicited from across the university community. Campaign marketing for students to inform them about the QEP will be developed.

d. Sergeant-at-Arms – Scott Rimbey

President Teague asked Senator Rimbey to compile attendance data to determine if there is a problem with Senators attending meetings. The recommendation was made by Senator-at-Large Nembhard to add to the nomination form what the responsibilities are of being a Senator. Secretary Lewis added that it could also be included in the appointment letter, as well as in the solicitation message.

The issue of communicating about what the Senate does was raised. It was suggested that some kind of communique be produced that would include a list of major Senate accomplishments during the past 5 years.

e. On-Line Evaluation of Instruction – Wendy Nembhard

An e-mail will be going out to faculty within the next few days with information on how to access their fall evaluations.

President Teague distributed the last version of the statement that would be proposed to go in the syllabus. It not only needs to be reviewed by the Senate but by councils (Graduate, Undergraduate) and other entities of the university before it is initiated. President Teague commented that there needs to be a plan on how to either supplement or change the questions on the evaluation. In addition, it needs to be determined how to put this into the *eXplorance Blue* system. The topic should come up again this spring.

f. Graduate Council – Russell Kirby

The Council continues to do its regular work, plus approving courses for the catalog.

g. Committee on Committees (COC) – Ellis Blanton

The COC will soon be beginning the spring process to fill current and upcoming vacancies on Faculty Senate standing councils. He asked that any communication from the SEC to their colleagues to serve would be appreciated.

h. Council on Technology for Instruction and Research (CTIR) – Andrew Smith

1. CTIR has not met since the last SEC meeting, but a meeting is scheduled for later in January. He anticipates that the main work of the Council will be addressing the issue of the transition to Canvas. No information on the technology fee is available at this time.

2. The Bylaws subcommittee will resume its work next week.

i. Secretary Report – Barbara Lewis

Secretary Lewis presented the election documents (Schedule, Apportionment, Vacancies) for review. The documents were accepted and will go forward to the full Senate for a vote at its January meeting.

j. Tenure and Promotion Guidelines Update – Gregory Teague

- The chief action item is scheduling a meeting with the lead people (or their representatives) from the areas that need to be represented in the workshops to be facilitated by the T&P committee to help departmental and college committees develop their criteria appropriately to fit the guidelines. A strategy needs to be created for how the T&P committee will communicate what needs to be communicated to those committees.
- There are two remaining pieces to the process: appointing a committee that will look at developing an online T&P form, and abstracting from the guidelines the key elements that need to go into a draft policy to be promulgated in the spring.
- The College of Arts and Sciences had a generally positive approval of the work that had been done. There was one question that did not get completely resolved by the committee. How is this going to affect the situation of a department that would like to retain or promote a professor who is an outstanding researcher but mediocre teacher? In a case like this, deans may ask for exceptions to whatever criteria are proposed.

## OLD BUSINESS

a. Update on and Discussion of Resumption of Budget Re-Engineering Process – Greg Teague

The leaders of the budget re-engineering process would like to speak to the Senate at the January meeting. They could not attend today's meeting, so President Teague has agreed to meet with them to find out what it is they would like to present at the Senate, and what it is they intend to have going forward. The SEC members offered the following questions:

- How is this budget re-engineering going to fit into the current budgetary situation? How is it interfacing with the current process?
- What is the timeline now?
- What does the model look like?
- Where is a simple explanation of the budget?
- How do the committees plan to communicate?

President Teague will share these issues with the budget re-engineering group.

## NEW BUSINESS

a. Policy RE: Shared Governance – Dwayne Smith, Greg Teague

The shared governance document approved by the Faculty Senate on September 17, 2003 was on the table for discussion due to a SACS requirement that faculty will be in charge of development of new academic programs, courses, and curriculum. President Teague has been asked to provide a response to this requirement and has discovered that there is no USF policy that addresses it. It has been tentatively proposed that the Faculty Senate consider the question, recommend that a Senate committee and administrators get together and articulate the language to either create a new policy or fit it into existing policies. Prior to bringing this to the Senate, President Teague wanted to bring this historic document forward and find out how the SEC wants to deal with it. Senior Vice Provost Smith added there are several policies which exist which make clear that faculty are involved in the process, but it is not stated as such. The practice is clearly there, but the statement that confirms the practice is absent. CFI Chair Permuth commented that as a Senate body, a letter has not been received that these are going to be the principles of the university. Therefore, they are considered principles of the Faculty Senate. He asked the SEC that before this goes to the floor of the Senate to carefully read every statement in the document, because it is important in playing roles of what the faculty should do when it says faculty members have the principal responsibility for originating policy. He explained that principal responsibility is different than having voice. Dr. Permuth feels this document should be a statement of principle of USF and see it in writing. President Teague added that this situation has been modified by Dr. Smith's comments of needing to appropriately establish faculty responsibilities in policy around the academic programs, but in the same process dealing with the question of examining it in the light with the shared governance concept.

Senator-at-Large Nembhard felt these were two separate issues. Faculty already initiate, and are responsible for, curriculum, etc., so creating a policy would not be difficult. In

addition, in practice these principles are already being done but there is no policy. In Dr. Permuth's issue, there is a pseudo policy that is not being followed. Since a practice already exists, Dr. Nembhard felt these were different issues and should be tackled separately. Secretary Lewis commented that if this is a document on shared government, it only identifies the responsibilities of the faculty and not for the administration. Delineation of responsibilities should be looked at. Parliamentarian Smith read the document as a statement of position by the Faculty Senate calling upon the administration to agree to these principles and to initiate a process to implement them through USF policies and procedures. It may be simply that the Faculty Senate, today, needs to look at this and say does it still agree with what is being asked (that it would like the administration to respond favorably toward this statement of direction). Based upon that response, initiate looking at all existing USF policies, reviewing them to see what has already been accommodated and what needs to be done beyond that. Senator-at-Large Nembhard commented that the discussion about the way things operate is a completely separate issue and more time is needed. President Teague summarized that the issue definitely needs to be done expeditiously that is easy and necessary to do. The question is in the process of thinking about these matters (allocation of responsibility) invoke the broader discussion. He observed that there was not much enthusiasm for pushing that precisely at the same moment.

b. Senate Agenda – Greg Teague

It is anticipated that there may be a report from USF Health. SEC members were asked to think about people to recruit to fill the key officer positions for next year.

**REPORT FROM SENIOR VICE PROVOST & DEAN DWAYNE SMITH, VICE PROVOST PAUL DOSAL AND VICE PROVOST ROGER BRINDLEY**

Dr. Smith's report consisted of the following items:

- Regretfully, there was a student death over the holiday break.
- The existing gun policy for campus was amended to allow for anyone to have guns in their cars as long as the guns were locked up. This change was done in accordance with state law.
- Professor Charles Owen, College of The Arts, has received two Grammy nominations. Results of the nominations will be announced at the award ceremony on January 26.

Budget

There are two foci – expenditure reductions and trying to increase revenues: (1) enrollment becomes important as a tuition-generating enterprise, and (2) change the mix of students.

Enrollment Update – Paul Dosal

Vice Provost Dosal presented the latest e-profiles on the first round of enrollment figures for the spring semester.

USF World – Roger Brindley

Dr. Brindley, Vice Provost and USF System Associate Vice President of USF World, presented documentation on how the mission, goals, and model of USF World fit into the goals of USF's

Strategic Plan. He also shared future projects with which USF World will be involved, i.e. creating a more global campus and having study abroad experience become a sequential part of a program. Dr. Brindley was invited to attend a future Senate meeting to present this information.

**REPORT FROM FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT AND USF SYSTEM FACULTY COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT – Greg Teague**

Dr. Teague reported that the main issue discussed at the December meeting was the honorary degree. Secretary Lewis reported that there has been no dialogue between the libraries about the Taylor & Francis issue, nor any responses from other librarians. Dr. Teague plans to engage the Library Council in a meeting of the SFC.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.