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SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES
February 5, 2003

Present: Glen Besterfield, Jesse Binford, Elizabeth Bird, Julian Dwornik, Melinda Forthofer, Susan Greenbaum, William Kealy, Jana Futch Martin, Cheryl McCoy, Gregory Paveza, John Richmond, Nancy Jane Tyson

Provost’s Office: Phil Smith, David Stamps

Student Government: Gregory Sanderson

Guests: Sara Mandell

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. The Minutes of January 8, 2003, were approved as presented.

PRESIDENT’S REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS (Gregory Paveza)

President Paveza thanked all those who attended the General Faculty Meeting on January 29, 2003. He also thanked Vice President Susan Greenbaum, Senator-at-Large Elizabeth Bird, and Secretary Jana Futch Martin for their efforts in getting the newsletter out prior to the meeting. President Paveza felt that the information on some of the shared governance issues was particularly helpful for the discussion. He hopes that this serves as a beginning point for a continued series of both discussions and actions related to seeking the kind of balance that faculty talked about in terms of the relationship between faculty, administration, and the Board of Trustees (BOT). President Paveza has received both verbal and e-mail that, in general, was positive.

Vice President Carl Carlucci has established a Budget Advisory Council, and President Paveza was asked to appoint three people from the Senate to that Council. Senator Andrew Hoff from the College of Engineering and Senator John Richmond from the College of Visual and Performing Arts were asked to serve. Somebody is still needed from the Health Science Centers to serve on that Advisory Council, not only the Medical School, but Nursing and Public Health. A motion was made and seconded to approve these two appointments. The motion was unanimously passed.

President Paveza was contacted by Provost Stamps to appoint an on-going workgroup committee on work structure to continue the dialog and to move the dialog forward into action. President Paveza has been asked to serve and to appoint two other members from the Senate or the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) to serve on that work group. At this time he asked Vice President Greenbaum and Senator-at-Large Bird to join him on this committee. Provost Stamps explained
that this is the first group to make plans on how to strategize and to proceed. Both individuals agreed to serve. A motion was made and seconded to approve the appointment of these two Senators to the workgroup. The motion was unanimously passed.

President Paveza raised the issue of having the Health Sciences Vice President attend SEC and Faculty Senate meetings on a regular basis. After a brief discussion, it was the consensus of the SEC that the Vice President should be asked to attend both meetings. President Paveza will contact the current Vice President to make these arrangements.

**PROVOST’S REPORT** (David Stamps)

The first issue that Provost Stamps discussed was the budget. Board of Education Secretary Horne and the Governor have come up with different budgets. Right now, things are on hold until the Senate and the House of Representatives release their budgets. The Governor is proposing a $148.8 million cut from higher education. A $16.6 million budget reduction will be made from USF, and a $4.8 million reduction from Health Sciences; however, this does not include all of the reductions. USF over enrolled last year by approximately 1,200 students with the idea that it would receive enrollment funds for the next year, which equates to $5 million. This year there will be no enrollment enhancement funds for USF. If this figure is included, it equates to a $21 million reduction. The Bright Futures Scholarship Fund is receiving the same level as last year, but if there is a 12.5 percent increase in tuition, they have to assume the additional cost for Bright Futures for USF. This would be another $2.2 million cut from the budget. Provost Stamps commented that things do not look good right now. President Paveza added it gets worse because of the other piece that was cut out. That is, if all the new buildings come on-line, USF would have to absorb the $1.6 million in maintenance costs for those buildings as well. This would bring the total budget reduction to $23 to $30 million overall. President Paveza added that the Advisory Council of Faculty Senates recommended at its meeting last week to the president of the Council, who is a member of the Board of Governors (BOG), to take the appropriate steps to ask the BOG to meet in emergency session to deal with the Governor’s budget and to act as an advocate on behalf of the university system. No one knows what the procedure is for a member of the Board calling an emergency session, but the leadership of the Advisory Council was asked to take an active role.

Provost Stamps announced that the tenure and promotion process is taking place. There are total of 79 nominees which includes the entire university as well as the College of Medicine. Excluding the College of Medicine, there are 3 people who are up for tenure only. There are 14 people up for promotion only and 25 people up for both tenure and promotion for a total of 42. From the College of Medicine there are 5 for tenure, 25 for promotion, and 7 for both tenure and promotion. Under the new governance structure, the Academic and Student Life Subcommittee will review all the tenure recommendations prior to being presented to the BOT. Last year after the BOT approved the tenure nominations, they went to the BOE for final approval. According to the Legislation, they should go to the BOG. Right now, the procedure is in limbo because it is not known whether the nominations go back to the BOE, whether they go to the BOG, or whether the BOG is going to devolve and pass that all down to the BOT.
The College of Education’s dean search includes 28 applicants, and 10 have been advanced to telephone interviews. Those interviews are being carried out right now to reduce the pool to five candidates for campus interviews. The search committee will meet on February 17, 2003. To address the retention problem at USF, Provost Stamps announced that he has appointed a Provost Faculty Retention Committee. At the next SEC meeting, he would like to bring in a report from this Retention Committee and to ask members of the SEC for comments.

Provost Stamps announced that USF has begun to address SACS accreditation. SACS has changed significantly. He explained that in previous years, USF had 463 “must” statements. This year SACS accreditation is broken up into two parts, the compliance and the development of a quality enhancement plan. USF is in the process of setting up a committee to look at the quality enhancement plan, as well as general education requirements. USF wants to look at the undergraduate education overall concerning the quality enhancement plan. The idea is that the general education courses should be designed in such a way that they enhance the rest of the undergraduate experience. USF is looking at what a lot of other colleges and universities around the country are doing in terms of developing a research-based undergraduate curriculum. USF is a research university, and it should be training all of its undergraduate students to go back to school. USF is looking at active learning rather than passive learning in terms of our program. Provost Stamps will be reporting committee outcomes back to the SEC as they become available.

Sergeant-at-Arms Julian Dwornik asked Provost Stamps the status of the biomedical program, and what is the projected enrollment going to be in the year 2003. Provost Stamps replied that the Vice President of Health Sciences would need to answer his first question. The direction that the university is going in terms of biotechnology, life sciences and biomedical has been folded into a broader look at biotechnology and life sciences. USF has put together a proposal to apply for one of the grants from the $30 million that was set aside by the State Legislature for colleges and universities. The idea behind it was to increase economic development in the state of Florida. Although USF developed a proposal, it did not get one. The University of Florida, the University of Central Florida, and Florida Atlantic University all received a grant. USF is going to move ahead with its center, because it is an integral part of the university. It would be a combination of health sciences, all sciences and engineering.

The Provost announced that USF received a telephone call from Texas A&M. In the last budget, the federal government granted $10 billion to Texas A&M for Homeland Security. It was discovered after the budget was passed but no money was put forth. Through the encouragement of Representative Young, who is in charge of the Appropriations Committee, Texas A&M would like for USF to be a partner with them in terms of Homeland Security. USF has a bioterrorism center, so it certainly is poised to go in that direction.

REPORTS BY OFFICERS AND COUNCIL CHAIRS

a. Senate Elections (Jana Futch Martin)

Secretary Martin announced that the nomination forms for the 2003/2004 Senate elections had been mailed, and are due in the Faculty Senate Office by February 12, 2003. She has received several comments through e-mail, telephone, and in person that
the numbers used for Senate election apportionment were incorrect. Secretary Martin’s reply was that those numbers come from GEMS and if the numbers are incorrect, then GEMS in incorrect.

b. **Plus/Minus Grading System**

President Paveza asked that the Undergraduate and Graduate Council chairs discuss this issue during their February meetings, and bring the results of their discussions to the SEC at its March meeting.

c. **Instructional Technology & Distance Learning Council (William Kealy)**

Chair Kealy announced that Adobe Systems had misplaced the contract with USF. However, USF could become the Macromedia sales point for the entire state of Florida. As things evolve, he will be able to report more on the specifics.

c. **Research Council (Melinda Forthofer)**

Chair Forthofer announced that the Research Council has been revising the guidelines for the internal awards program and piloting that program. The Council recently decided that beginning with the spring review cycle, several of the grant opportunities categories would be reviewed by a multi-disciplinary committee from the Council rather than by sub-discipline. This makes the review process much more valid in many respects because the money will not be divided by discipline anymore. The money will be broken out into categories by type of project.

d. **Graduate Council (Sara Mandell)**

Vice Chair Mandell reported that the Graduate Council is reviewing new Ph. D. proposals and at this point there is no outcome. The Council is also talking about SACS rules and regulations and what credentials are necessary and permissible for teaching on the graduate level.

e. **Committee on Committees (Cheryl McCoy)**

Chair McCoy announced that the deadline for submission of nominations for university-wide committees and councils is February 21, 2003. Senator Mandell recommended a mechanism be put into place to replace resigning committee members as quickly as possible rather than going through the Committee on Committees (COC). President Paveza replied that one way would be to ask the Provost to notify the deans and chairs that in the occurrence of a vacancy in a position on a Senate Standing Committee that the prerogative to fill that position rests with the Senate and not with the academic unit and its administration. People need to be made aware that the prerogative does not rest with deans and chairs to fill vacancies. Senator Mandell recommended adding a statement to the committee nomination forms that if for any reason an individual is unable to serve for
either part or all of their term that they immediately notify the Faculty Senate office so that a replacement can be sought.

OLD BUSINESS

a. Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Grievance Procedure (Kelli McCormack Brown, Glen Besterfield)

The draft of the Student Academic Grievance Procedures was reviewed by both the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils. The motion was brought to the SEC to consider forwarding this policy to the Senate for its recommendation for its review and approval with the changes as noted. President Paveza summarized the changes as follows: Replace the word “faculty” with “instructors.” Instructors is defined in the broad sense as somebody responsible for teaching a course. Strike the term “department head” in all places where authority is delegated to the department chair to, in essence, change a grade if it was arbitrary and capricious leaving that decision solely to the dean’s office or above. Those are the two principle issues and some wording issues having to do with making sure the appropriate people are notified. One footnote change was to change the timelines to reflect academic time. Normal academic breaks are not considered as part of the clock. In some respects, it actually lengthens the amount of time that a grievance might take to resolve.

For the first time, this policy standardizes academic grievances across the undergraduate and graduate divisions and across all colleges within the Provost’s Office. The procedures also cover Health Sciences with the exception of medicine which has its own procedures. President Paveza indicated that the issue would go to the full Senate for discussion. Members will receive copies beforehand to review before the February meeting.

Additional changes included: clarification of what a director is; add administrative vice president reference (Health Sciences or Academic Affairs). On page 3, item 4, Resolution at the College Level, first paragraph, deletion of “or the absence of a grade change initiated by the department chairperson/director.” On page 6, item 4, the chairperson of which committee needs to be specified. President Paveza will make these changes before it is sent via e-mail to all Senators. At this time a call to question was made and seconded. The motion to cease debate on this item and to move to a vote was passed. The motion was passed to accept the proposed grievance procedures as amended and present the procedures to the full Senate at its February meeting.

b. Board of Trustees Workgroup Guidelines (Cheryl McCoy)

Discussion continued on the workgroup guidelines that were tabled at the January SEC meeting. COC Chair McCoy reiterated that at last month’s meeting the SEC wanted to have some structured guidelines for recommendations to go through the regular nomination process and the COC. At the last meeting it was undecided as far as additional elements that the SEC believes should be in this particular set of guidelines, as
well as recommendations for whom the four people should be. The subcommittee thought this list should include people from the Faculty Senate and people from the seemingly appropriate committees as part of the recommended membership for the BOT workgroups. The SEC had stated it needed to be structured so that all of these positions are defined as far as the numbers. Chair McCoy asked if there were any additional recommendations.

President Paveza replied that on another level, if it does not look like there is a particular person from the Senate, or university-wide council structure, he thinks those open seats can be filled in the same manner as on any other council. He does not think it is necessary to designate that they be specific persons. However, he added that there are some committees where recommendations in terms of specific persons makes very reasonable sense. For example, the chairs of the academic councils are automatically on the Academic and Environmental Committee. In addition, the chair of the Research Council should be on the research workgroup. President Paveza suggested that the remaining appointees on research should be one from the Health Sciences Center, one from the other colleges, and one person chosen by random assignment. It could be that broad.

At this time, Research Council Chair Melinda Forthofer suggested that the COC look at selecting people for committees and councils that have the background pertinent to the represented area. President Paveza suggested that the Research Council could recommend to the COC a change in its charge in terms of the makeup of the Council to request that from the larger colleges attention be given to discipline and that, for instance, no more than two members from Arts and Sciences be from the physical sciences or natural sciences, or no more that two persons be from the same department. President Paveza encouraged every chair, in conjunction with their committee, look at their charge and decide whether there are changes that need to be made and to make those recommendations to the COC. He thinks it is perfectly legitimate for a committee to say there is a problem that would be best addressed if the nature of the charge is changed in terms of how people are appointed to this committee.

**NEW BUSINESS**

a. **Proposed Academic Policy 10-048 (Elizabeth Bird)**

Senator Bird presented the following policy on “Academic Freedom and Responsibility” for review and discussion by the SEC:

> The University of South Florida affirms the Principles of Academic Freedom and Responsibility. These principles are rooted in a conception of the University as a community of scholars united in the pursuit of truth and wisdom in an atmosphere of tolerance and freedom.

> Academic Freedom is the freedom to discuss all relevant matters in the classroom, to explore all avenues of scholarship, research, and creative expression, to speak
freely on all matters of university governance, and to speak, write, or act as a public citizen without institutional discipline or restraint.

On the part of the faculty, Academic Responsibility implies the honest performance of academic duties and obligations, the commitment to support the responsible exercise of freedom by others, and the candor to make it clear that the individual, while he or she may be freely identified as a member of the University faculty, is not speaking as a representative of the University in matters of public interest.

On the part of the Administration, Academic Responsibility implies a commitment actively to foster within The University a climate favorable to responsible exercise of freedom by developing and maintaining academic policies and processes in which the professional judgments of faculty members are of primary importance.

Senator Bird pointed out that it has been expressed that now is the time to start discussion about shared governance and its importance. In looking at the issues of rules and policies, it becomes very clear that although there has been some confusion about rules and policies, the policies have not expired. The policies can direct different things than the rules can. Rules must go through an official procedure and policies do not. Policies speak to what the university values and does. Almost all universities have a policy on the issue of academic freedom. USF has nothing except the collective bargaining agreement and the rule that has been proposed. It is not appropriate to have a rule on academic freedom. It is not the sort of thing one rules, it is the sort of thing one has a policy on, i.e., a statement that the university has.

Senator Bird thought this might be an excellent moment to introduce a policy on academic freedom and responsibility. She pointed out that it does not conflict in anyway with the collective bargaining agreement. It would have to be renegotiated one way or the other, and what this policy offers is a broad definition of academic freedom in keeping with other universities, which also offers responsibility. An academic policy is not a policy that needs to go to everybody in the university for a comment. It is a policy that could originate anywhere. Her plan is that it would go to the full Senate for approval and then to the Provost.

Associate Vice Provost Smith pointed out that there is a policy process to make this an official policy at USF that must go through promulgation as outlined in the policy manual. It is an internal process not requiring BOT approval unlike the rule approval process. Senator Bird replied that is the difference. It seems appropriate to use the policy route to introduce some institutional statements about academic freedom that the faculty has originated. The wording is simple and basic; it is not complicated. Most policies start with reaffirming the principles and ruling on what we think the university should be. This is essentially drawn from the AAUP. Pursuing the issue of shared governance, we can say that the university believes in this, it is a statement we have made and now let’s
go from there. A motion was made and seconded to consider and propose the academic policy on academic freedom and responsibility. The floor was opened for discussion of the policy.

A correction in the second paragraph was suggested which was to change “to speak or write,” to read “to speak or write or act” because if someone is participating in a demonstration it may not be seen as speaking or writing. Another suggested change was to have the third paragraph read “… implies a commitment “to foster actively” or “actively to foster” ….” President Paveza acknowledged these suggestions and will make the appropriate changes.

Senator Bird reiterated that it was not her intention in any way to interfere with the collective bargaining agreement. She explained it is not that it is different, it is in fact a much broader and inclusive definition than what is in the collective bargaining agreement.

There being no further discussion, a vote was taken on the motion to approve Proposed Academic Policy 10-048, with the minor changes as noted. The motion was unanimously passed.

b. Proposed Academic Policy 10-049 (Elizabeth Bird)

Senator Bird presented a second policy on “Peer Advisory Committee on Faculty Termination” for review and discussion by the SEC:

USF is committed to the principles of shared faculty governance. One of these fundamental principles is that faculty peers should have a significant role in judging the circumstances in which Administration is justified in terminating the employment of tenured faculty members.

Tenured faculty members who receive notice of actual or intended termination of employment will have the right (though not the obligation) to have the case heard before a committee of faculty peers. If they choose to use this option, they will notify the Faculty Senate President, and the Committee will meet no more than 30 days after receipt of this request.

This committee, to be constituted under the authority of the Faculty Senate, will reach a decision as to whether the termination is justified, having heard both sides of the argument. Arguments will be presented in an informal hearing by the faculty member or one designated representative, and by one designated representative of the Administration. Each may furnish the committee with written documentation. The committee’s decision, to be rendered within 10 days of the hearing, will be advisory, will not be binding, and it will not affect either the faculty member’s or the Administration’s rights and responsibilities under any existing laws or Collective Bargaining Agreements.
The policy came to the SEC as a motion for the adoption of Proposed Academic Policy 10-049. The motion was seconded and opened for discussion.

The question was raised about a similar committee that was approved last year. President Paveza replied that the offices of the Provost, the General Counsel, and he started to work on the nature and the structure of a committee that differs from this but mirrors a set of procedures much more closely to those of the Standing Committee on Scientific Misconduct. This policy takes it to a different level than the resolution that was passed because it calls for a policy implementation that actually puts something in place. It also does it in a slightly different way because it puts the committee under the purview of the Senate, and advisory to the Provost, but it really keeps it out of the Academic Affairs office

President Paveza added that the policy should contain an option of who will be on the committee and the details of how to do so. The intent is to have a peer review committee. The method on how that committee is appointed and the details need to be worked out. He has received one suggestion that USF adopt, as a policy on shared governance, the University of Colorado’s statement on shared governance. President Genshaft has raised the issue of the potential of bringing somebody from Minnesota, from both their faculty government and from their BOT to do a workshop in terms of how to possibly actualize that. This would be a chance for a retreat for both the Faculty Senate and the BOT with an outside consultant from a university that has gone through this process to see what we can do.

The question was asked as to whether or not confidentiality or personnel is an issue? Associate Provost Smith replied there is protection of records and by virtue of this being an advisory committee it is not open to Sunshine provisions.

There was a motion to call to question. The motion was passed to terminate the debate. The motion to recommend to the full Senate Proposed Academic Policy 10-049 was unanimously passed.

Both proposed academic policies will be presented to the Faculty Senate at its regular February 19th meeting.

**OTHER**

a. Secretary Martin announced that the Rules Committee will meet on Friday, February 7, 2003.

b. Student Government Liaison Sanderson announced there would be a mayoral debate that evening in the TECO room of the College of Education. A reception will be held from 6:00 to 7:00 p.m., preceding the debate from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m.
c. Senator Mandell praised the membership of the Academic Computing Committee pointing out that it is a unique committee at this university. She commented that when an individual’s term ends on this committee, they keep attending meetings and contributing even though they do not receive academic credit for it in their annual review.

d. Before adjourning the meeting, President Paveza thanked everyone for their time and energy and Senator Bird, in particular.

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