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FACULTY SENATE MEETING
MINUTES
April 16, 2003

The meeting was called to order at 3:12 p.m.

COMMENTS AND REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT GREGORY PAVEZA

Before giving his report, President Paveza made two revisions to the agenda. One was to strike the report from President Genshaft as she had prior commitments and could not attend today’s meeting. The second revision was to strike Provost Stamps’ report due to illness. The Minutes from the meeting of March 19, 2003, were approved as submitted.

President Paveza announced that barring any unforeseen circumstances, this would be the last meeting of the Faculty Senate over which he would preside. He added that it had truly been his privilege to serve as President of the Senate for the past two years. President Paveza then congratulated Senator Elizabeth Bird on her election as the next President of the Faculty Senate, and he looked forward to working with her over the summer to transition the presidencies.

A big thank you was extended to the officers of the Senate Executive Committee during his two years as President, i.e., Vice Presidents Marion Becker and Susan Greenbaum, Parliamentarians Elizabeth Larkin and John Richmond, Members-at-Large, Sara Mandell and Elizabeth Bird, Sergeants-at-Arm Jacob Caflisch and Julian Dwornik, and Secretary Jana Futch Martin for her dedication to her role as Secretary. President Paveza thanked Past President Nancy Jane Tyson for her unwavering involvement and support of the Senate and its process. He also extended his thanks to President Genshaft and Provost Stamps for their consistent willingness to meet and discuss critical issues and to always be prepared to engage in a frank and open exchange of ideas.

President Paveza extended a special thanks to Administrative Assistant Ann Pipkins for her expert handling of the day-to-day operations of the Faculty Senate. She consistently made his job easier by allowing him to concentrate on the issues rather than operations.

Last but not least, President Paveza thanked the members of the Faculty Senate, all of the committee and council chairs and the members of those committees and councils. He pointed out that whatever measure of success he experienced these past two years was due to their willingness to be involved in the governance process.

He then paraphrased General Douglas MacArthur by saying “old Faculty Senate Presidents don’t die, they simply fade away.” With the close of this meeting, President Paveza will begin the process “fading away” by embarking on his one year ACE Fellowship. Upon his return at the end of next year, he is confident that he will find that faculty governance has continued to grow and flourish and that it is more vital than ever.
REPORT FROM PRESIDENT JUDY GENSHAFT

The President was absent from the meeting due to family responsibilities, therefore, no report was given.

REPORT FROM PROVOST DAVID STAMPS

The Provost was absent from the meeting due to illness, therefore, no report was given.

REPORT FROM USF UNITED FACULTY OF FLORIDA PRESIDENT ROY WEATHERFORD

President Weatherford thanked the Senators who served throughout this recent year. He thought they rose to the highest traditions of academic, collegial governance. They were not afraid of anything whether they agreed or disagreed with the university, they rose and debated honestly, rationally, and courageously. By and large, the values for which they spoke are values he shares deeply and very much appreciate all that they have done in furthering those values. President Weatherford thanked President Paveza for doing a wonderful job of guiding and encouraging the Senators and helping the faculty throughout this difficult time. President Weatherford pointed out that President Paveza maintained good relations with the administration and never wavered in his advocacy for faculty rights and privileges. He has been congenial and cooperative to the union and has shared most of its values.

At this time, President Weatherford touched briefly on the changes that have occurred since the last time he addressed the Senate. USF did continue dues deduction and the summer paid salary formula that is in the contract. The administration also agreed to voluntary recognition instead of opposing the union and requiring election. For those things, USF deserves credit. However, there is still this problem.

In the PERC ruling, they mention the status quo condition that is sometimes a requirement of law. The university believes it is not a requirement of law and eventually PERC is going to have to decide whether or not it is. In that ruling they did not decide whether or not it is. What they said was we hope and urge that all parties in this process will maintain the status quo until they achieve a resolution. The university is not changing its position. It has not recognized the status quo and, therefore, it will not negotiate the rules of the union. It has expressed the desire to consult with faculty on important matters. They have, however, agreed to consult with the Faculty Union on the rules. In explaining why, the university has agreed to consult with the Faculty Senate on the rules and the official university spokesman said the Faculty Senate represents the faculty.

The rules in question govern the terms and conditions of employment. As a matter of law, when there is a collective bargaining agreement it is subordinate to the laws of the Constitution of the State of Florida. All the rules affecting that class of employees are subordinate to the contract. In cases where they conflict, the contract applies and the rules do not. If the university is right and the contract does not currently apply, then clearly the university needs rules with respect to the terms and conditions of employment for everybody. For reasons that are organizationally
obvious, the contract is more supportive and protective of employee rights than the rules are. The rules are imposed unilaterally, and the contract is negotiated by collective bargaining. The contract is required to take into consideration the views of both parties. The rules are only legally obligated to take into consideration the needs of management.

If in this rule making process, the Senate takes the position that the administration’s desires as expressed in the previous rules are what the faculty also desires, then that is what the administration will probably do. If, on the other hand, the Senate expresses the view that the rules should incorporate those desirable features of the contract, then at least the administration, if it agrees, will incorporate those and if it does not agree will not put us into a divide and conquer operation. The new Rules Committee has been very sensitive to this possibility. The proper thing to do is to see that the rules proposed by the Faculty Senate mirror where appropriate the provisions of the contract.

President Weatherford explained that UFF will be going to the table to negotiate the next contract. UFF may start with the existing contract if its position prevails in the next several PERC rulings. If a ruling is not made, UFF will charge the university with unfair labor practices and force them to rule on USF’s particular situation, but one way or another it will eventually be resolved in the legal form. This is a procedure that will affect the terms and conditions of employment of the faculty at USF. It is inevitable that the union will be bargaining for the terms and conditions of employment. Whenever the Senate speaks of the terms and conditions of employment and whenever the university says (and it has said) that the Senate represents the faculty, if the Senate’s position is less than the position than the union adopts in the next negotiations, it will be a negative factor. This is where USF is with respect to negotiating the next contract.

President Weatherford added that he deeply appreciates the serious concerns of what UFF received from the Senate generally and from the Rules Committee in particular and the situation is not of its making. He asked that the faculty realize what they do is important, and their decisions do have consequences, and they are not all as immediate and obvious as one might think.

REPORT FROM STUDENT GOVERNMENT LIAISON GREGORY SANDERSON

Student Government Liaison Sanderson announced that elections took place during the past two weeks. In the first elections, none of the candidates received 50 percent of the vote. A runoff election was held, but both candidates were disqualified. The election was then turned over to the Supreme Court where a mistrial occurred. Therefore, the decision was made to return to the final vote, and the vote turned out to be won by two. Voting turnout for this election was the second highest at USF, and the closest vote.

COMMITTEE REPORTS AND ACTIONS

a. Officer Elections (Jana Futch Martin)
Secretary Martin announced the officer election results as follows: Senator Elizabeth Bird for President, Senator Susan Greenbaum for Vice President, Senator Jana Futch Martin for Secretary, Senator Michael Barber for Sergeant-at-Arms, and Senator Fraser Ottanelli for Senator-at-Large.

b. Nomination Recommendations from Committee on Committees (Cheryl McCoy)

Committee on Committees Chair McCoy presented the following nominations for the Faculty Senate Standing Committees and Councils and the President’s Committees and Councils:

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES NOMINATIONS FOR FACULTY SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS
Spring Semester 2003

Academic Computing Committee
Nancy Anderson (EDU)
David Frankel (VPA)
Uday Murthy (BUS)
Ivan Oleynik (CAS)
Elaine Slocumb (NUR)
Sonia Wohlmuth (CAS)

Commencement and Convocation Committee
Geoffrey Okogbaa (ENG)
Barbara Redding (NUR)
Paula Webster (LKLD)

Faculty Committee on Student Admissions
Jian Lu (ENG)
Randy Miller (CAS)
Miriam Stamps (BUS)

Graduate Council
Mary Krisman-Scott (NUR)
Philip Porter (BUS)
Mary Webb (NUR)

Honors and Awards
Brook Sadler (CAS)
Eric Winsberg (CAS)

Instructional Technology & Distance Learning Council
Linda Alexander (CAS)
Naomi Boyer (LKLD)
S. Srinivasan (COPH)
These nominations came to the Faculty Senate as a motion made and seconded by the Committee on Committees.

Senator Sara Mandell raised a problem with the nomination of Dr. Sandra Schneider for membership on the Research Council. She pointed out that the laws of the Senate and the university state that administrators who are faculty can be nominated for various committees. Although it is legal for an administrator to have been nominated for one of the Senate committees, it does not mean that the Senate has to approve it. Senator Mandell made the motion that the Faculty Senate not support Dr. Schneider’s nomination to the Research Council. The motion failed. At this time the vote was taken to accept the committee and council nominations from the Committee on Committees as submitted.
The motion passed and the nominations will be forwarded to the Provost and President as recommendations from the Faculty Senate.

Chair McCoy presented a late nomination for Dr. Carol Steele from the College of Marine Science for membership on the Library Council. A motion was made and seconded to accept Dr. Steele’s nomination to serve on the Library Council on behalf of the College of Marine Science. The motion was unanimously passed.

c. Selection of Members for Committee on Committees for 2003/2004: (Cheryl McCoy)

Chair McCoy announced that at the end of this meeting Senators from each of the colleges would convene and decide who from their colleges would serve on the Committee on Committees next year.

d. New Graduate Admission Standards (Sara Mandell)

On behalf of the Graduate Council, Senator Mandell presented the following proposal which came as a motion made and seconded by the Graduate Council:

DRAFT – FOR FINAL APPROVAL
Preliminary Approval by the Graduate Council (05/20/02)

Graduate Admission Standards
The University of South Florida

Statement of Principles

In graduate admission decisions, multiple sources of information should be used to ensure fairness, promote diversity and balance the limitations of any single measure of knowledge, skills, or abilities. The sources may include: undergraduate grade point average, letters of recommendation, personal statements, samples of academic work, portfolios, auditions, professional experience related to proposed graduate study, as well as nationally normed, standardized test scores. It is the responsibility of each graduate program to select admissions criteria that best predict success in their specific field and to determine the weight given to each measure.

None of the sources of information, particularly standardized test scores, should be used in isolation nor should such scores be used in combination or separately to establish minimum or “cut off” scores. Program specific guidelines for the use of standardized test scores should be developed based on the experience of a given department with its pool of applicants.  

Admission Requirements

Each applicant to a graduate program at the University of South Florida is required to meet the following minimum qualifications:
1. A bachelor’s degree from a regionally accredited institution and satisfying at least one of the following three following criteria:

   a. a “B” average or better in all work attempted while registered as an undergraduate student working for a degree, or
   b. a “B” or better average in all work attempted while registered as an upper division undergraduate student working for a baccalaureate degree, or
   c. a previous graduate degree from a regionally accredited institution.

   or the equivalent bachelors and/or graduate degrees from a foreign institution.

2. All specific and additional requirements of the graduate program to which admission is sought (including requirements to submit standardized test scores) consistent with the above Statement of Principles.

   The Program Chair and College Dean must approve any exceptions to these requirements with information copies to the Office of Graduate Studies.

1 Adapted from the GRE “Guide to the Use of Scores” 2002-2003.

After a brief discussion, the motion to accept the admission requirements proposed by the Graduate Council was unanimously passed. President Paveza will forward the proposal to the Provost.

e. Permanent Rules Committee (Graham Tobin)

Before turning the floor over to Senator Tobin, Chair of the Permanent Rules Committee to lead the Senate in the review of the proposed faculty rules, President Paveza asked the Senators when debating a particular rule that they focus on the substance of the rule, rather than issues of grammar or wording. The focus from his perspective needs to be does the substance of the rule seem reasonable and fair, not should this word be “a” instead of “the.” Before beginning Chair Tobin reminded the Senators that faculty would have its own set of rules separate from the other groups.

1. 6C4-ER03-27 Purpose of Chapter 6C4-ER03

A motion was made and seconded to replace #5 on page 3 with the following:

A term or provision of these Permanent Faculty Personnel Rules that conflicts with a term or provision of a Collective Bargaining Agreement shall not apply to any person covered by said Collective Bargaining Agreement.
The motion to amend the rule was passed. The motion to approve the rule as amended was seconded and unanimously passed.

2. 6C4-ER03-28 Presidential Search, Selection, Appointment and Evaluation

A motion was made and seconded to replace the word “significance” in #1, line 3, with “50 percent.” The motion failed.

The motion to approve the rule as presented was seconded and passed.

3. 6C4-ER-3-29 Recruitment, Selection, Appointment

The motion was made and seconded to approve the rule as proposed. The motion unanimously passed.

4. 6C4-ER03-30 Faculty Compensation

A motion was made and seconded to add to the end of #3.a. the words “in coordination with the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Union.” A friendly amendment was made to add “in coordination with the Faculty Senate.” The friendly amendment was passed. A motion to approve the proposed rule as amended was seconded and unanimously passed.

5. 6C4-ER03-31 Benefits and Hours of Work

A motion was made and seconded to delete in #2, line 2 the words “office hours, and other duties and responsibilities.” There was a motion made, seconded and passed to call to question. The motion to amend the rule failed. A motion was made, seconded and passed to approve the proposed rule as presented.

6. 6C4-ER03-32 Tenure and Permanent Status

A motion was made and seconded to insert in #2.d., third line, the word “campus” after the word college. The motion failed. The motion to approve the proposed rule as presented was seconded and passed.

7. 6C4-ER03.33 Promotion and Change in Assignment

A motion was made and seconded to approve the proposed rule as presented. The motion was unanimously passed.

8. 6C4-ER03.34 Employee Ethical Obligations: Conflicts of Interest and Outside Employment; Employment of Relatives; Seeking or Holding Public Office
A motion was made and seconded to remove from the last line of #11 a. the word “natural.” The motion was unanimously passed. A motion was made and seconded to approve the proposed rule as amended. The motion unanimously passed.

Due to the time limit, a motion was made and seconded to end discussion of the proposed rules at this time and to schedule an emergency meeting of the Faculty Senate to resume the discussion. The motion was unanimously passed to call an emergency meeting of the Faculty Senate for Wednesday, April 23, 2003, from 3:00-5:00 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 p.m.