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The meeting was called to order at 3:07 p.m. The Minutes of the February 19, 2003, meeting were approved as presented. President Paveza announced that the presentation from Parking and Transportation Services would be postponed. With that correction, the Agenda for today’s meeting was approved.

**COMMENTS AND REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT GREGORY PAVEZA**

President Paveza reported that, at the request of Student Government, both the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils revisited the issue of the plus/minus grading system. Both councils reported to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee that it is their opinion there should be no changes to the plus/minus grading system. Based upon those recommendations, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee considered the resolution from the Student Government Senate a dead issue. At this point, unless members of the Senate wanted to bring this issue before the full Senate, the Senate Executive Committee would report back to the Student Government Senate that the recommendation of the two councils to change the plus/minus grading system died in committee.

Today was the first meeting to which the new members of the Senate were invited. President Paveza welcomed all of them. He reminded everyone of the procedures for running for the various Faculty Senate officers. Interested faculty may self-nominate or be nominated by colleagues. More information on the officer election procedures would be forthcoming from the Faculty Senate Secretary later in the meeting.

President Paveza announced that the Senate would be reviewing the revised academic grievance procedure. He pointed out that one of the individuals that has been working on this issue on a consistent basis is Associate Vice Provost Phil Smith. President Paveza would like to make sure the procedure is sufficiently strong, and that it covers the issues for which it is intended and can be implemented and action can be taken.

**REPORT FROM PRESIDENT JUDY GENSHAFT**

President Genshaft welcomed the new Senators and hoped that everyone had a good spring break. Her report consisted of the following three items:

A web site has been created that addresses emergency preparedness and response. President Genshaft reiterated the different response levels: Low condition is green. Guarded condition is blue. Elevated condition is yellow. High condition is orange. Severe condition is red. She pointed out that the country is now in high condition, which is orange and this means there is a high risk of terrorist attacks. Some preventative measures include:

- Coordinating the necessary security efforts with law enforcement agencies.
• Taking additional precaution at public events.
• Preparing to work at an alternative site or with a dispersed work force and restricting access to essential personnel only.
• Advise and coordinate efforts with environmental health and safety.
• Maximize the number of officers on duty and on the street.
• Special watch on critical labs.
• Help lab critical infrastructure area.
• Hire staffing levels at public events.

She reported that some vandalism occurred the previous weekend in the science area. Someone entered the chemistry building and turned on the emergency shower and let it run throughout the weekend. The other problem that occurred involved using super glue in locks. Someone left the doors open to the building, and they used super glue in all the locks. This is a different type of vandalism than what happened to the Martin Luther King statute. President Genshaft emphasized that security and personal safety are important issues, and all of us must be responsible to ourselves as well as to one another. The new web site will be up and running tomorrow. The address is [www.usf.edu/ready](http://www.usf.edu/ready). It will monitor the national threat level. The section on preparing for an emergency lists a number of places to go and keeps everyone informed about the government and USF’s emergency responses. President Genshaft added that the administration is not permitted to close the university, only the governor and/or the chancellor can close the universities. The administration decides whether or not classes are cancelled, but cannot close the university on its own accord.

One day a year the administration goes to Tallahassee to participate in “USF Day in Tallahassee.” It is ceremonial and to spread a message. The House and the Senate are both presenting individual budgets that are very different from one another, and they are very different from the governor’s. The main themes in Tallahassee for USF are getting money for enrollment and access for any new students, to continue our matching gifts program, and to make sure that if there are new buildings constructed on campus that operating monies are given also. The heart of USF’s operation is instruction and it needs to be paid for. USF cannot support instruction and enrollment that are not paid for.

President Genshaft announced that instead of giving a budget address this year she will be holding a Spring Address on April 21, 2003, either in the Ballroom or the Theatre. The address will center on where the university has been in the past, where it is now, and where it is going. It will be more of a full-fledged communication speech to the full faculty instead of a budget speech. Although the outcome of the budget will not be known by April 21, President Genshaft still wants to address the faculty because this has already been a very important and momentous year.

President Genshaft added that most of the information about events that occurred before spring break and in the paper concerning Dr. Al Arian’s arrest and the termination has been presented, and she felt that she did not need to say anything more about this issue.

The President announced that Academic Policy 10-048 on Academic Freedom and Responsibility and Academic Policy 10-049 on Peer Advisory Committee on Faculty
Termination which were both unanimously passed at last month’s Senate meeting, have been endorsed by herself and the Provost. The proposals will go forward as policy and are now in the Office of the General Counsel. They are ready to be set up as policy exactly as the Senate asked them to be.

REPORT FROM PROVOST DAVID STAMPS

Provost Stamps gave an update on the new and proposed Ph. D. programs. The Ph. D. in Music has received a positive recommendation from the Chancellor’s office and is pending approval from the Board of Governors (BOG). The proposals for the Ph. D. programs in Liberal Studies, Environmental and Geographic Studies, Social Work, and Biomedical Engineering are moving ahead in their development. This is the second year of reviews for all Ph. D. programs. Last year the Ph. D. programs in engineering and in the sciences were reviewed. This year, reviews have taken place for Applied Anthropology, Aging Studies, Communication, English, Philosophy, and Criminology. These reviews were commissioned by the Provost’s Office and the rationale was to see how the Ph. D. programs at USF compared with those nationally and also to see how these programs align in the future. Top-level scholars and researchers from around the country were recruited to perform the review, and USF has received some very positive reviews of its Ph. D. programs. The reviewers also gave some indication as to the undergraduate programs; particularly, in paired relationship to the Ph. D. programs, which has been beneficial. Some of the programs last year in engineering received a lot of feedback concerning offering undergraduate and Ph. D. programs. As a Research I university, it is important that USF’s Ph. D. programs are in-line with those nationally and with the future directions of the university.

A committee has been established to review USF’s Institute on Aging. This committee is charged with reviewing the Institute to see if it is carrying out its original mission, and to look at the relationship between the Institute and the Ph. D. program on Aging Studies. The review resulted from the recommendation from the consultant who reviewed the Ph. D. program in Aging. It was also felt this was the appropriate time for a review because USF is in the process of hiring a new director of the Ph. D. program in Aging. In addition, this is the first major review since the inception of the Institute.

USF’s plan and preparation for the SACS reaffirmation, which will take place in 2005, is moving forward. SACS has changed its guidelines significantly. There were eight universities selected around the country to be pilots for the new criteria set up by SACS. Provost Stamps was on the team that visited Texas A & M which was selected as a Research I university. There were eight reviews of eight different institutions. Some were community colleges, some were small liberal arts colleges, and some were comprehensive, etc. He pointed out that he now has a good perception of the process by being on this team, as well as attending meetings that have been held by SACS concerning the re-accreditation process.

The Provost explained that in the past, SACS had 460 plus “must” statements. Universities had to show how they were complying with the “must” statements in the past, but this has changed significantly. Part of the current review includes approximately 160 plus compliance statements. There are now two committees, one of which is an External Committee, which will
not visit the campus. The External Committee requires all data be electronically submitted. The External Committee reviews the electronic submission and decides if the university has complied with the 160 plus statements. They will then make their recommendations to the Internal Committee which will visit the campus. If the External Committee finds any problems with the electronic submission, the Internal Committee then visits the campus and more closely investigates the university.

A second part of the SACS reaffirmation is the quality enhancement plan, which every university must develop. This plan is monitored over a ten-year period between accreditations. In the past, other universities have developed a SACS report and after its completion, it is shelved and never looked at again. In contrast, the university is forced to implement the quality enhancement plan over the ten-year period. USF has created a Quality Enhancement Steering Committee that is chaired by Dean Renu Khator. This large group has set up a web site that contains the charge to the committee and the dates and notes of all the meetings. All faculty and staff are invited to attend any of the meetings, and anyone can visit the web site at any time for updates and information concerning the Quality Enhancement Steering Committee and the development of the plan.

The quality enhancement plan is centered on integrating research into the undergraduate curriculum. Research will be defined very broadly in terms of creative scholarships, which will include Humanities, Visual and Performing Arts, etc. A lot of criteria came out of the Boynton Commission Report, which recommended that Research I universities should integrate research into their undergraduate curriculum. This will be a developmental process where undergraduate students will start in their freshman year as a part of their general education requirements. Many students will not go to graduate school, but they will receive an added educational benefit as a result of the experience. The curriculum will be developed along with the developmental process that from the freshman year through to the senior year, the student will be prepared at different levels for a research experience. This concept is considered cutting edge amongst universities nationwide.

The search for a dean in the College of Education is moving along, and candidates are now being interviewed. One candidate has been interviewed, and another will be interviewing on Friday. Unfortunately, one candidate withdrew to pursue other employment opportunities; however, there is still a strong group of candidates yet to bring in.

The sabbatical application process has been completed, and the Sabbatical Committee has made its recommendations to the Provost’s Office. The recommendations have signed been off on and have been mailed to all the deans. Faculty have either been informed of their status or will be informed in the near future.

Provost Stamps announced that things are moving ahead with all of the initiatives that have come from the Faculty Senate Rules Committee chaired by Senator Graham Tobin. The administration is meeting with the Shared Governance Committee. A list-serv has been set up.
The Provost distributed a few copies of the new Strategic Plan for 2003-2007. He asked everyone to keep in mind that a strategic plan is a dynamic and living document which is constantly being reviewed and upgraded.

President Paveza reiterated that this document allows the faculty to make its arguments with the Legislature. It is a well-crafted plan that clearly sets a vision and goals for this university, and it allows the faculty to argue with the Legislature in a much more effective manner in the sense that faculty have a clear idea of where they want to go.

REPORT FROM USF UNITED FACULTY OF FLORIDA PRESIDENT ROY WEATHERFORD

President Weatherford pointed out that some of the faculty are beginning to think that it may not be a sufficient resolution for the university just to decide to stop trying to break the contract and give back to the faculty what they had a year ago. It certainly will not be a sufficient resolution if the university hangs on to the bitter end until the courts force them to do what is right. It is getting close to what is called “payback time” in collective bargaining.

President Weatherford thanked Senate President Paveza for his efforts on behalf of the faculty at the Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting. He also thanked the BOT for taking the step of authorizing the General Counsel at the university to talk to the union’s lawyer.

President Weatherford praised Senator Gregory McColm for doing an excellent job in presenting the union’s position at the February Faculty Senate meeting and answering questions, except Senator McColm was uncertain about the status of salaries now that USF employees are no longer state employees. Legally, the answer is that salaries are no longer tied to the salaries of state employees. Legally, USF employees are now the employees of the BOT. The State University System will be funded by a lump sum appropriation to be administered by the BOG, which has essentially advocated its responsibility but will have to decide how much money each university will receive. The BOT, as the employer, has the legal obligation to administer the salary package.

The Public Employers Relations Commission (PERC) recently issued a ruling that the BOT is, in fact, the public employer of the faculty. This was not in response to our request, but in response to a request by the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, which represents our employee staff. It argues that clearly the BOG was a successor employer to the BOE and so all contracts should continue in effect with only that change. Since the BOG voted to delegate the authority of collective bargaining to the BOT, PERC rules state, therefore, that the BOT does have that power now. They did not address the question as to whether or not the Boards are successor employers, and that is the critical question with our relations in the university. In the normal course of bargaining when the employer does not change, neither does the contract. When the contract expires, its terms and conditions remain in effect until it is replaced by a successor agreement. The university is claiming that they are not the successor employer, therefore, they no longer have any obligation to the contract that has been worked out over 25 years of collective bargaining, and they have no obligation to recognize the union. They say they are willing to recognize the union, providing the union first give up its claim that the
contract is still binding. The union says it will not do that because it will not be prudent to put the rights of the people it represents at the whim of an administration that has not been hugely forthcoming in most respects. What the Board has done so far has not violated the contract nearly as much as what the administration has done. Several decisions that have been made clearly violate the contract. The union has refrained from filing unfair labor practice charges because its attorney believes that the pending unfair labor practice charges at the University of West Florida and Florida State University will require PERC to finally address the issue of whether or not the university is the successor employer. If it does not resolve that, or if the union starts running out of time on pending grievances and other problems, or if the university starts unilaterally deciding salaries without bargaining as law requires, the union may yet be forced to file unfair labor practice charges. Union lawyers will be talking with their lawyers and, in general, the union tries not to comment on the progress of negotiations, even when the other side tries to deny the negotiations and do not admit that the union represents the faculty. President Weatherford commented that perhaps this time next month there will be something better to say or perhaps not.

When asked how many members does the union at this university have, President Weatherford replied that it requires a certain percentage of faculty to sign authorization to allow the union to represent them, and over 60 percent of faculty have done this.

REPORT FROM STUDENT GOVERNMENT LIAISON GREGORY SANDERSON

Mr. Gregory Sanderson was absent from today’s meeting, therefore, no report was given.

COMMITTEE REPORTS AND ACTIONS

a. Senate Elections (Jana Futch Martin)

Secretary Martin reported the following Faculty Senate election results for the 2003-2004 academic year:

College of Arts and Sciences
Art Bochner (two-year term)
Emanuel Donchin
Michael Gibbons
Anna Perrault (one-year term)
James Strange
Harry Vanden

College of Education
John Angell
Deirdre Cobb Roberts

College of Engineering
Ashok Kumar
Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute  
John Ward

Libraries  
Mark Dibble

College of Medicine  
Michael Barber  
Douglas Calvin  
Nils Diaz  
Martine Extermann  
Pamela Munster

College of Nursing  
Cecilia Jevitt

College of Public Health  
Martha Coulter

St. Petersburg Campus  
Margaret Hewitt  
Ellen Hufnagel (two-year term)

There are one three-year vacancies remaining for the College of Business, the Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, and one one-year term for the St. Petersburg campus. There were no vacant seats in the 2003-2004 academic year for the School of Architecture, College of Marine Science, College of Visual and Performing Arts, Lakeland and Sarasota campuses.

b. Nomination of Senate Officers (Jana Futch Martin)

Secretary Martin congratulated all newly elected members. She reminded everyone that campus mail is still used for the elections, but progress is being made on setting up online voting. The Faculty Senate Office is not responsible for lost mail. Secretary Martin asked that Senators please keep in mind if ballots get lost in the mail, there is not too much the Faculty Senate Office can do about it, and this is in the rules. Also, only certain people are eligible to become Senators, and this is outlined in the Bylaws. Secretary Martin asked that Senate members turn in their nomination forms for Faculty Senate Officers by the end of today’s meeting. If an election is necessary for any of the officer vacancies, ballots will be mailed on Thursday, March 20th. She pointed out that only newly elected and continuing Senators are eligible to vote.
c. Governmental Relations Committee (Hector Vila)

Before turning the floor over to Senator Vila, President Paveza thanked Past President Nancy Jane Tyson for her work getting the Governmental Relations Committee up and running. She has worked on this project for the better part of three years, and the Senate finally has an operational Governmental Relations Committee.

At this time Senator Vila, as Chair of the Governmental Relations Committee, reported on the activities of that committee. Their first meeting was held on March 7, 2003, with Nancy Jane Tyson, Joseph Kools, Robert Snyder, Cheryl McCoy, Gene Ness, Brent Weisman, and himself in attendance. The first order of business was to elect a new chairman. There was a general discussion about the committee’s activities and legislative priorities. A rudimentary set of priorities was developed to help assist and educate the Legislatures as to the value of the University of South Florida, and its role in several issues not only in education of the community but also its role in bio-defense. Secondly, the Governmental Relations Committee will participate in educating the Legislature as to the need for a safe government to ensure a guaranteed revenue base. To that end, the committee will use examples such as funding for students. Chair Vila stated that funding has returned to the levels that existed 20 years ago. It is appropriate for everyone to be austere and tighten their belts, but at some point it will affect the quality and access of education if funding is continuously cut in this way. The committee will gather the data and assist the Office of the President and lobbyists in any way possible. A Legislative Breakfast is planned for April and all interested Senators and faculty members are invited to participate. In this regard, Chair Vila asked that if any of the Senators present today have a personal relationship with any of the Legislatures either in the House of Representatives or the Senate, to let him know as soon as possible.

Chair Vila announced that he had traveled to Tallahassee the previous week and met with Representatives Holmes and Enriquez and the aids of Senators Lee and Crist. They entered into an early discussion about the importance of the University of South Florida, and Chair Vila was pleased with the responses he received from each one of them. Lastly, the committee brought up for consideration whether or not this body wanted to discuss the impact of several very important issues: Two of them would be the recent vote for lower education class sizes and for the bullet train. These two pieces of legislation passed, but the governor is considering readdressing them because of the impact they would have statewide and the potential, measured impact they could have on the University of South Florida. The Governmental Relations Committee wants to know if these are issues that the Senate wants to discuss and send up a recommendation that may assist in addressing Legislatures for funding problems.

d. Rules Committee (Graham Tobin)

As Chair of the Rules Committee, Senator Tobin announced that the members are Marion Becker, Elizabeth Bird, Sang-Hie Lee, Trudie Frecker, R. B. Friedlander, Jana Futch Martin, Fraser Ottanelli, Christopher Phelps, Steve Permut, Noreen Segrest, Phil Smith, and himself. Senator Bird will be the representative from the Shared Governance
Committee so there will be some relationship between those developing the policy and those developing the rules. Chair Tobin reiterated that the Rules Committee would be addressing only those rules that apply to faculty issues. The committee has started rewriting the rules. It is trying to link them to the new parts of the policy, but trying to avoid the collective bargaining agreement. The committee anticipates having the rules rewritten by Friday, March 21st and will share them with the Faculty Senate, as well as post them on-line for discussion. After the rules go to the Senate Executive Committee, they will be presented to the full Faculty Senate. From there, the rules will go back to the administration for formal approval. According to the timeline, Chair Tobin pointed out that these rules would probably not be approved until next fall.

e. Shared Governance Committee (Gregory Paveza)

President Paveza announced that the Shared Governance Committee is comprised of Associate Vice Provost Smith, Provost Stamps, Noreen Segrest from the General Counsel’s Office, Vice President Greenbaum, Senator Bird and himself. The committee is in the process of looking at faculty issues related to faculty governance, as well as different faculty governance systems in place at other universities. Discussion will begin on those issues and be brought back to the Faculty Senate over the course of next year.

f. Commencement and Convocation Committee (Joan Kaywell)

Chair Kaywell personally invited the Senators to attend the May 3, 2003, commencement. The Commencement and Convocation Committee will be sending out notices as to when colleges will go through individual commencements. She reminded everyone that USF would now be holding three ceremonies. In terms of marshaling, the Committee would like to have ten people to serve as marshals for each ceremony. The Provost has agreed to feed each marshal at all three ceremonies which includes breakfast, lunch, and dinner. Faculty members who marshal at two ceremonies, will be fed plus receive an umbrella. A faculty member who participates in all three ceremonies will be fed, receive an umbrella, a fern, and their name put into a drawing for a weekend getaway at Saddlebrook. Chair Kaywell encouraged everyone to attend commencement ceremonies in support of all students.

OLD BUSINESS

a. Revised Student Academic Grievance Procedures (Gregory Paveza)

President Paveza announced that this issue comes before the Senate as a motion previously made and seconded which was sent back for further refinement based upon comments at the February Senate meeting. Those comments and suggestions from other faculty were incorporated and are in bold print. The floor was opened for discussion.

A motion was made and seconded to strike on page 2, under II. Definitions, “in the view of the student.” President Paveza reiterated that this document is an attempt to put in place a procedure across all colleges. The College of Arts and Sciences has an existing
procedure in which this language is already included. There being no further comments on the motion to amend the procedures to strike “in the view of the student,” a vote was taken and the motion passed.

A motion was made to strike the word “instruction” from the Definitions section of the procedures. Due to a lack of a second, the motion died.

A motion was made and seconded to insert on Line 2 of the Definitions section in front of the word advising and performance the word “academic.” The motion passed.

A motion was made and seconded to insert the word “or designee” after campus CEO in all places where it appears in the document. The motion passed.

Commencement and Convocation Chair Kaywell asked for clarification if this document is intended to supersede all internal documents. President Paveza replied that it is his understanding from the intent and purpose from the outset of pulling this committee together and developing the procedure that it was to supersede those individual college documents, and to put in place a single procedure across the university so that students taking courses across colleges would know that they had the same procedure regardless in which college they were taking a course. Chair Kaywell asked if this becomes a usable document, would there be an appeals process for making modifications? President Paveza responded that it would be perfectly legitimate for members of the Senate to make suggestive changes with accuracy in the procedure. There would certainly be a call for that. There being no further discussion on the Student Academic Grievance Procedure as amended, a vote was taken to adopt them. The motion was unanimously passed.

NEW BUSINESS

a. Parking and Transportation Services Update (Gregory Sylvester)

The presentation by Director Sylvester was postponed until another meeting.

ISSUES FROM THE FLOOR

a. Proposed Committee on the Development of the Campuses (Alexander Ratensky)

On behalf of Senator Sape Zylstra and the School of Architecture, Professor Ratensky presented the following proposal on the development of the campuses:

Architecture Faculty Proposal to the Faculty Senate, 19 March 2003
A Committee on the Development of the Campuses

The faculty of the School of Architecture proposes creation of a Faculty Senate Committee on the Development of the Campuses, to be provided with expert advice by the architecture faculty and to be concerned with the total physical environment of the USF campuses.
Background: In recent years great strides have been made in the development of the several USF campuses as environments for learning. These have included the development of master plans that for the first time place people at the center instead of automobiles, a rescaling of new buildings to people and not simply to building efficiencies, a provision of amenities in the form of campus landscaping, street lighting, parking aggregated at the edges (in the main) and in structures, the provision of pedestrian precincts, and the adoption of a more permissive palette of materials and colors for buildings.

An instrument for this change has been the Office of Facility Planning under increasingly strong leadership over the past twenty years and more. With the recent departure of Steven Gift, perhaps the most effective University Architect for several decades, the architecture faculty is concerned that the leadership needed to ensure the orderly and planned development of the campuses as whole units, subject to overall vision and goals, may be diminished. Accordingly the Architecture faculty proposes the Committee described above to participate with the administration in decisions affecting new building and to act as a watchdog to keep in view the orderly evolution of the campuses.

Note: Other universities have created such committees. A description of the equivalent committee at another research university is attached.

For the record: The architecture faculty have participated actively for the past eighteen years in every phase of campus master planning, as faculty representatives to building committees (under Provost Gerry Meisels), as members of Facilities Planning's Design Review Committee, and on ad hoc bases as campus-wide or university-wide planning/design issues have arisen. We have reason to believe that such participation has been an integral part of the positive evolution of the campuses described above, and our experience forms a part of the basis for the above proposal.

President Paveza entertained this as a motion that the School of Architecture proposes the Faculty Senate create a Committee on the Development of the Campuses. The motion was seconded. President Paveza added that should the Senate pass this motion, it would be referred to the Committee on Committees to work with the proposal group to develop the charge for the committee, to develop the membership of the committee, and bring the charge and committee membership back to the Senate for its consideration.

Senator Faust commented that the Sarasota campus has such a committee. She suggested that the relationship of other such committees be defined in the charge for this committee. There being no further discussion, the motion that the Senate proposes a creation of a Faculty Senate Committee on the Development of Campuses to provide expert advice by architects, faculty, and other members of the committee and to be concerned with the physical environments of the USF campuses was unanimously passed. It will be referred to the Committee on Committees to work out the details of the proposal.
b. Peer Advisory Committee on Faculty Termination

At the February Senate meeting, the Senate passed by a unanimous vote a policy on a Peer Advisory Committee on Faculty Termination. Senator Ottanelli pointed out that one of the provisions of the fundamental principles is that faculty appear without a significant role in judging the circumstances in which administration is justified in terminating the employment of tenured faculty members. Two days after the Senate passed this policy, Professor Al Arian was fired, and faculty were informed (or misinformed) that in fact this had been done in consultation with the Faculty Senate. It was Senator Ottanelli’s understanding from the President of the Senate that consultation was conducted with a few, selected members. He thinks these statements, as they have been reported both by the administration and the press, really make it very clear that this decision was not made in consultation with the Faculty Senate. President Paveza responded that this issue was discussed with the President of the Faculty Senate, the members of the department affected, and the Senators from the College of Engineering. He clarified this with a reporter who talked to him later and indicated that it had not been discussed with the full Senate nor had the full Senate been involved in that discussion. President Genshaft clarified that in her statement she made it clear as to whom was consulted, and she never said the full Faculty Senate. However, the media has not printed retractions.

At this time, Senator Ottanelli proposed a resolution that stated for clarification purposes that it is made clear that the full Senate was not consulted concerning the decision to fire Professor Al Arian, but that the consultation took place with the Faculty Senate President, Department of Computer Sciences, the College of Engineering, and the members of the Faculty Senate from the College of Engineering. The resolution was seconded and passed without discussion. The resolution will be transmitted to the Oracle at the earliest, possible convenience.

c. Resolution on Due Process

Senator Gregory McColm brought up another area of controversy to discuss. He commented that although it appears to be somewhat mute because it is now going through the justice system, Senator McColm was concerned by the fact that Professor Al-Arian was summarily dismissed, and the university did dismiss him apparently without the kind of process that has been discussed. The Senate has been talking for over a year on how a faculty member should be terminated. Senator McColm was not sure if the Faculty Senate should remain silent on this, and if they should consider whether or not it is appropriate to make a statement about whether or not a professor should be hired because they are indicted. It does not reflect on whether or not the Senate believes the charges are correct. To this effect, Senator McColm read the following resolution on due process:

Whereas, the USF President announced the dismissal of Professor Al-Arian six days after his indictment, and
Whereas, the USF Administration refused to investigate charges against
Al-Arian, or to enable the Faculty Senate to do so, and

Whereas, a university has the duty to serve as a public example of proper
conduct to the community, and

Whereas, in the USA, under law, all persons have the right to be presumed
innocent by government authorities unless proven guilty, regardless of
political pressures to prejudge them,

Be it resolved, that the Faculty Senate concludes that it was *not*
appropriate for USF to summarily dismiss Al-Arian without due process
including an investigation, and presentation of evidence, and therefore

Be it resolved, that the Faculty Senate condemns the summary dismissal of
Professor Al-Arian.

The motion was seconded and the floor opened for discussion. It was apparent that
members of the Senate were divided about the resolution. Therefore, Vice President
Greenbaum made the motion to table the resolution and send it to committee. The
motion was passed.

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