AY 2004/2005 SEC meeting minutes: 04 Sep 08

Faculty Senate
SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MEETING
September 8, 2004

Present: Michael Barber, Glen Besterfield, Elizabeth Bird, Ellis Blanton, Susan Greenbaum, Carnot Nelson, Steve Permuth, Christopher Phelps, Philip Reeder, Gregory Teague, Thomas Terrell, John Ward

Provost’s Office: Robert Chang, Renu Khator, Phil Smith, Ralph Wilcox

Guests: Robert Nelson, Chair, Academic Computing Committee
        Gregory McColm, Member, United Faculty of Florida

This was the first meeting of the 2004-2005 Senate Executive Committee (SEC). Therefore, before the meeting began, introductions were made.

REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT SUSAN GREENBAUM

President Greenbaum began her report by first thanking Past President Elizabeth Bird for the wonderful job that she did last year. She was a good role model in the way she articulated the basic values upon which the Senators agreed and helped redefine the importance of the Senate.
President Greenbaum specifically commended her leadership in promoting better faculty salaries, shared governance, more productive inter-campus operations, and the reorganization of the Senate Bylaws and Constitution. The Senate became more self-consciously proactive during Past President Bird’s tenure, a stance that was entirely appropriate for the challenges the faculty have been and still are facing.

President Greenbaum announced that her own priorities for the coming year include pressing forward with shared governance. The voice of the faculty needs to be heard at all levels of this institution. It is good for us, as faculty, and it is good for USF. The tension over whether USF is a seat of knowledge of higher learning, or a factory for the production of highly skilled workers, continues to engage us. Shared faculty governance is essential for the conduct of that debate. Senator Gregory McColm has been asked to chair an ad hoc committee to take the statement of principles that the Senate adopted last year and organize a process of inquiry into how USF departments are governing themselves now, and how it is done at other institutions.

USF made headlines this summer, not all of them felicitous. Problems in the English Department point up the need for more effective governance, as well as some new procedures for avoiding inter-personal and financial problems. Part of the notoriety was centered on a report by the Office of the Inspector General. President Greenbaum and Vice President Permuth met with Director Marie Hunniecutt to discuss her desire to have more faculty input and coordination with their operation. In addition, the newly created Senate Council on Educational Policy and Issues (CEPI) will address the question of romantic relationships between faculty and students.
Hurricane Frances cancelled the first meeting of that Council, but Professor Reeder will be reporting on its general aims.

Other news items of the summer described the painful process of collective bargaining, which has still not concluded. Vice President Permuth, who is a member of the United Faculty of Florida (UFF) team, will discuss the status of that effort.

President Greenbaum has two new initiatives to bring before the Senate this year. The first is the growing involvement of USF faculty in community-based research and service learning activities.

Summer facilities utilization is the other area she would like to explore within the Senate this year. USF has new prerogatives to retain the tuition revenue that summer classes can earn. Currently, USF air conditions empty classrooms, while faculty go without salary and students are stalled in getting the classes they need. The conflict over rate of summer pay in the bargaining process brings to the fore the anachronistic and uneconomical practice of essentially shutting down for the summer. Hardly anyone is needed to plant and cultivate summer crops anymore. Why do we still do this?

REPORT FROM PROVOST RENU KHATOR

Provost Khator’s report consisted of the following:
• She thanked Past President Bird for her outstanding work last year. Her hard work was greatly appreciated.

• The units of Advising, Admissions, Registrar, and Financial Aid have been reassigned from Student Affairs to Academic Affairs. This means there will be increased responsibility upon the Faculty Senate as the chief academic body. Provost Khator will need some help from the Senate in telling her how it wants to integrate its voice into this area. The reassignment takes place September the 20th.

• In terms of graduate education, the task force for Graduate Studies has submitted their report. Any thoughts on it would be appreciated. A search committee will be created for the position of dean that has been vacated for some time. One of the suggestions from the task force is to elevate that position to the Vice Provost level. The task force felt that title would make a difference in terms of whom we attract and what this person is able to accomplish.

• The title Associate Vice President of Planning has been reclassified as Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research. This is not an IT position, but is more academically sensitive. The recruitment process will begin shortly. She asked that suggested names for the search committee be sent to her.

• Associate Vice President for Diversity and Equal Opportunity, Deborah Love, is leaving to accept a position at Tulane University. This is the first year USF has made more
progress in terms of recruiting a more diverse pool of students to the university. The
good news is a better job was done of retaining students from minority backgrounds.
However, after all the years of minority enrichment programs, USF is where it was five
years ago. In addition, nothing has really been done to change the profile of the faculty.
Provost Khator would appreciate receiving any thoughts on that, as well as what can be
done to recruit diverse faculty.

- The 50th Anniversary of USF is December of 2006. The students are starting to talk
about ways to celebrate. The Provost wants to make sure that academic celebration is
represented and would like to know what activities the faculty would like to have take
place.

- Emeritus Professor Richard Taylor will be working to pull together in one place the
policies and procedures regarding faculty. If SEC members have somebody who can
work with him, please let the Provost know.

- The enrollment profile will be sent to everyone. Provost Khator pointed out that for the
first time USF reduced the number of freshmen or FTIC this year by taking in at least 350
fewer. However, all of these are critical to USF’s revenue. She requested that names be
sent to her of people who might be interested in working on this.

- Provost Khator announced that doctoral student numbers are up this year. The minority
student enrollment is down, the intake is down but the output is good.
REPORTS BY OFFICERS AND COUNCIL CHAIRS

a. Committee on Committees (Ellis Blanton)

Committee on Committees Chair Blanton announced that the COC is currently soliciting for nominations to fill committee and council vacancies. The deadline for receipt of nominations is Thursday, September 9th. The COC will then meet to review the nominations and make recommendations at the next SEC meeting.

The Graduate Council has nine vacancies this year which makes it difficult to conduct its business. Chair Blanton stated that he will review Graduate Council nominations to determine eligibility and then notify them as a group to suggest that they attend the first meeting of the Council on September 20th. The nominations will then go through the normal process with the COC and if there are any discrepancies, he will contact the nominees.

The Commencement and Convocation Committee will be submitting minor changes to its charge. These should be ready for the October SEC meeting.

President Greenbaum announced that she has received a request from the Marshall Center Board for a Senator to serve as a representative. There has traditionally been a Senator
representative on the board, but that individual’s term has expired. She will solicit the Faculty Senate to find out if anyone is interested in serving in this capacity.

b. **Graduate Council Vision Task Force** (Carnot Nelson)

Graduate Council Chair Nelson announced that the Graduate Studies Vision Task Force was appointed by the Provost to look at the Office of Graduate Studies. Over the years it has become a service institution, and Chair Nelson stated that if USF is to become a major player, it needs a strong graduate school. That means someone with vision, elevating the position so it really has visibility within the university. Right now it is totally invisible. It is called Graduate Studies now and one of the things the Graduate Council wants to do is call it a Graduate School which has a very important connotation. Chair Nelson asked that the SEC members read the report from the task force and send any comments to him. The report has been submitted to Provost Khator but the Council has not received any feedback as to what she plans to do.

c. **Research Council** (Gregory Teague)

Research Council Chair Teague commented on the following three items going forward from the Council:

(1) The internal awards process has a mechanism set up that is very similar to the National Science Foundation whereby there are panels that are outside the council that
review the proposals and the panel makes recommendations from a much stronger knowledge base than just the council members could do. Targeted in that is a feedback process that gives advice to the researcher about how to craft a proposal and to improve the quality. It has been deemed to be very successful by both the reviewers and panel members who participated and by people who received the feedback stating it was very helpful. The Research Council will move forward and tighten up the process and continue it, which will take additional support which Ian Phillips, the Vice President of Research, has agreed to provide. Part of what this does is allows the Research Council to do something other than review proposals for internal awards.

(2) The Research Council would like to survey the faculty and find out what kind of issues with which they need assistance.

(3) The third item was the request from the SEC for the creation of a subcommittee to look at the question of whether the research in the hard sciences model was overwhelming the general sense of what is important about scholarship and research and creative activity of other sorts. There was a committee that looked at the issue and thought it made sense to do more if agreement could be reached as to the criteria for excellence in these other areas and make that more visible in the process of deciding who gets awards. That has been subsumed, at least temporarily, in another initiative which was carried out in conjunction with the Associate Dean of Research which was to develop an alternative plan to the one that failed four years ago to provide a research salary incentive or rather a monetary incentive for achievement in various areas. A report
was prepared over the summer, which Vice President Ian Phillips presented to the President’s Cabinet. There are some questions going back and forth about it.

The report proposed a plan in which there is a scholarship and external funding incentive stipend which has two components. One is a stipend that would reward accomplishments whether or not they have anything to do with external funding. The other component would reward external funding in various ways. The criteria for evaluating the scholarship aspect would be generated by faculty within the departments or colleges, that is, externally, so they become objective criteria for accomplishments in whatever area and can be equivalent across different fields. There would be some way of acknowledging the accomplishment at various levels but it would be a national stipend involved. The other piece would be driven by accomplishment in obtaining external funding with three subcomponents: one for salary savings, one for indirect costs, and one for total funding. A proposal to integrate those pieces as part of a broad incentive to encourage both scholarship and research that obtains external funding has been offered for discussion as a joint effort of the Research Council and the Associate Dean for Research.

President Greenbaum asked if there was anything the SEC can do to help the Research Council with the survey. Chair Teague replied that at the next meeting of the Research Council he will ask a few of the members to draft something that would begin that process.
d. **Senate Membership; Web Site Layout** (Kathy Whitley)

Secretary Whitley was not at today’s meeting, so Administrative Assistant Ann Pipkins reported that in the past month there have been two College of Medicine Senators that have resigned due to course load. One of those vacancies has been filled. Secretary Whitley is waiting to hear from a second individual as to whether or not he will accept the second vacancy. There still is a College of Marine Science vacancy which is being pursued.

President Greenbaum announced that the Faculty Senate web site is being updated, but did not have any further information.

e. **Undergraduate Council Initiatives on Student Tracking, Retention and Advising** (Glen Besterfield)

Undergraduate Council Chair Besterfield announced that along with the usual business of course curriculum items, the other major initiative is QEP Gen Ed. It is scheduled to take effect Fall 2006 which means that the concept has to be approved by the Undergraduate Council. Then all 400 courses have to be approved before September 15th. There will still be a Gen Ed committee that will do preliminary course approval, then it will also have to go through the Undergraduate Council.
Although Chair Besterfield plans to make a formal presentation to the Faculty Senate later this semester, he gave a summary of the proposed new tracking system. This new initiative would track students in an attempt to get them to graduate in a timelier manner. There is some discussion of block tuition, four year guarantees. Advising is the key issue. There are other issues such as financial aid and undeclared students. FSU is now going to a tracking system in a pilot mode this semester. UCF is planning to start tracking next year. A task force has been set up and USF will be trying to pilot the system soon with FTIC students from eight majors. It is anticipated to expand tracking to the entire university by fall 2006. It has not yet been determined what happens when a student gets off track. An implementation committee and a planning committee have also been set up with representatives from all the colleges.

Chair Besterfield pointed out that there is no goal to get rid of academic advising and that there is money in the budget for increased department-level advising. The success models out there suggest that these students have to be advised at the department level immediately. This all plays into the reorganization of Student Affairs.

f. Intercampus Operating Procedures and Collective Bargaining (Steve Permuth)

Vice President Permuth gave a brief history of the Intercampus Academic Operating Procedures (IAOP). As a result of the procedures, a report was developed. President Genshaft created a subcommittee which did a redraft and it has been disseminated.
Vice President Permuth added that President Genshaft intends to release the report and to visit other campuses to hear responses. The essential nature is to talk about one faculty, one President, one Provost. It drew attention to the fact that there can only be one of each. He added that this is not a minor issue. USF faculty are one faculty regardless of what the campus where they work at. It was articulated to assume that if a person seeks a tenure promotion, the expectations are the same, regardless of campus.

In addition, the Faculty Senate approved the document that listed five or six recommendations. Vice President Permuth thinks that the vision of how well this will be received will be how well it addresses a number of those recommendations, not the least of which was there can only be the concept of one President, one Provost and one faculty.

Vice President Permuth reiterated that this policy is written for Tampa, Lakeland, and Sarasota. If AAACS does not approve St. Petersburg, they will fall back into jurisdiction. This document deals with the issue of academic consistency across campuses where faculty will be treated alike. The expectations will be the same.

g. Collective Bargaining (Steve Permuth)

Vice President Permuth announced that twenty-nine of the thirty articles have been agreed upon. The issues in terms of disagreement are not many but the depth of disagreement is substantial. They include issues of salary, summer salary, and discretionary dollars available to the administration to distribute. They are not minor
issues. If agreement at the table occurred, it would still take three to four months beyond
that for ratification. So the likelihood of moving to a quick vote and securing contractual
agreement is 50/50 before the summer. It could happen but the strategies on both sides
are not the same. At the September Faculty Senate meeting, Vice President Permuth will
share where UFF is on those issues.

h. **Council on Educational Policy and Issues** (Philip Reeder)

Chair Reeder announced that due to Hurricane Frances, the first meeting of the Council
on Educational Policy and Issues (CEPI) will need to be rescheduled. At its first
meeting, CEPI members will elect a vice chair, as well as review its charge to be certain
it does not have too much overlap with the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils. A
summary of the CEPI charge is as follows: The Council on Educational Policy and
Issues is concerned with all matters that influence the quality of education at the
university. It deals with issues, policies, and procedures that affect academic quality and
environment, on a university wide basis.

Chair Reeder added that a policy does not exist about relationships between faculty and
students, so such a policy/document needs to be established. Past President Bird
commented that CEPI needs to be proactive and report to the Senate on policies being
created and get the Senate involved. Chair Reeder stated that if CEPI is to work on a
relationship policy, it needs to review the academic grievance procedures as well. Past
President Bird added that the grievance policy still needs to be presented to the Senate for a vote. It should be done at the October meeting at the very latest. CEPI will also be looking at the policy of the exploitation of students which is a carry-over from last year.

i. Instructional Technology and Distance Learning Council (Thomas Terrell)

Chair Terrell announced that due to Hurricane Frances, a new system was set up to allow students to get their assignments through Blackboard. Instructor Diane Austin is writing an article for a presentation to share with other departments on how this works.

OLD BUSINESS

a. Senate Reorganization

President Greenbaum announced that the issue of the Senate reorganization will continue this semester. Vice President Steve Permuth will replace President Greenbaum on the committee. The committee will reconvene and reassess its goals.

b. Online Voting
President Greenbaum announced that an attempt will be made to set up on-line voting for this year’s election process. The Senate will have assistance from Ms. Carole Dann in the Instructional Technology Department. This will bring the Senate into the 21st century. It is hoped that there will be no voter irregularities or suppression.

NEW BUSINESS

a. Shared Governance Initiative (Gregory McColm)

President Greenbaum announced that Senator McColm will chair the Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Governance. She asked him to attend today’s meeting to present an update on that issue. Before turning the floor over to Senator McColm, President Greenbaum added that the committee needs members and a sense of direction.

At this time, Senator McColm presented the following proposal:

Proposal on Faculty Governance

To: The Senate Executive Committee
From: Greg McColm, Associate Professor of Mathematics
       Senator, CAS
Re: A Study of Faculty Governance
Date: September 6, 2004

Faculty governance has become a major issue at USF during the past few years primarily because of actions by the Administration, actions often taken without faculty involvement, input, consultation, or even communication. But the problem is older, and effects can be seen in the number of grievances over the years, as well as the almost superstitious fears of faculty about becoming involved in matters directly pertaining to their own responsibilities.
But not only is it not clear what sort of governance we want, it is also not clear what sort of governance we have now. Anecdotal reports suggest that there are a large number of guidelines and charters theoretically in force at USF, although little seems to be known about them (including whether they are actually in force in practice). Meanwhile, few faculty (including faculty on the Senate) are particularly aware of practices at other universities, and thus are not aware of the spectrum of alternatives available to USF for reform.

I propose that the USF Faculty Senate undertake to find out what the current situation at USF is, and what other systems are used at other institutions. We would want to find something of the rationales and track records of these various systems. As this information would be very useful to USF (and perhaps other universities), I propose that the USF Faculty Senate have an ad hoc committee conduct this study of faculty governance, and compose a report on it, for distribution to faculty, the Administration, and to be made available as a public document.

As a practical matter, I propose that this effort, which probably will take the entire academic year 2004 – 2005 to complete, be largely restricted to departmental governance.

1. Both anecdotal reports and grievance statistics suggest that most faculty with governance problems have those problems at the departmental level. Furthermore, as faculty have most of their day-to-day experiences with governance at the departmental level, reform at that level should have the greatest effect on (and provide the greatest experience to) the greatest number of faculty.

2. Regarding governance as an emergent or grass-roots phenomenon, identification and correction of problems at the departmental level will provide experience and support for dealing with governance issues at other levels.

3. The central Administration is less likely to be alarmed by a study of departmental governance, and a successful result there can build a foundation for, and resolve concerns about, other initiatives at other levels.

4. As a purely practical matter, departmental governance in itself is a big enough problem to take a year of study, especially since this is the first such study.

The committee of five to ten members would be drawn from faculty at colleges across the university, and deal with the widest range of departments (to get the best perspective on the diversity of governance systems). It would collect information from and about USF departments, and similar information from and about departments at other institutions. It would then compose a report to the faculty for publication by the Senate. This information would then be available to guide reform efforts, and to suggest new lines of inquiry for subsequent efforts.
Senator McColm proposed that since faculty governance is regarded as important, and there seems to be some anecdotal evidence that the quality and quantity of governance has a profound influence on everyone’s lives, the faculty needs to find out the different forms of governance and its effect. He proposes to restrict it to the departments since there are so many. One thing this report should cover is what is done at other institutions. Senator McColm thinks the committee should be comprised of five to ten people, from different colleges and backgrounds and with different views of governance. This would be a year long process. President Greenbaum added that the final result would be a report on the state of faculty governance in departments at USF.

Past President Bird pointed out that fact gathering was done last year to find out what departments are doing in regards to shared governance. The Provost sent the collection of responses out to all the departments and there was discussion about shared governance at the department level. So far, the Senate has not heard back from the Provost. President Greenbaum replied that there was much resistance to this concept; there was no intention to move ahead with it. However, the Senate should undertake this study. This is more systematic than the voluntary responses. It would be more definitive about what is the state of shared governance.
At this time, it was agreed that President Greenbaum send a written request to Provost Khator that her office committed to having a report to the Senate by this fall on the responses about shared governance received from the departments. Senator Mccolm, Past President Bird and President Greenbaum will meet to decide to whom to disseminate the information. In addition, it was agreed that the Senate proceed with a study of faculty governance as proposed by Senator Mccolm.

OTHER

President Greenbaum announced that pursuant to the revisions made to the *Bylaws* during the spring semester, the chairs of the Council on Educational Policy and Issues and Committee on Faculty Issues will be permanent, ex-officio members of the Senate Executive Committee effective with this academic year.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:28 p.m.