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Faculty Senate President Susan Greenbaum called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. She requested a change in the sequence of the agenda to accommodate United Faculty of Florida President Roy Weatherford who is scheduled to teach a class and had to leave early.

REPORT FROM UNITED FACULTY OF FLORIDA PRESIDENT ROY WEATHERFORD

United Faculty of Florida (UFF) President Weatherford expressed his appreciation for the work that the Faculty Senate does, which he feels is largely not in the limelight and not understood and appreciated as much as it deserves. He hopes the Senate will not give up and give in.

He reported that the bargaining process is nearly concluded. There will either be a successful conclusion in the next few weeks or there will be an impasse, perhaps followed by unfair labor practice charges and court cases. This point has been reached solely because of the administration’s determination to limit effectiveness in representing faculty, not because of any militant actions of the union, pursuing good advantages, trying to change things, or adopting new programs. All the union said was “give us our contract back” and all the administration said was “no.” Specifically, the administration has violated, is violating, and seeks to continue violating some of the most basic principles of collective bargaining.

First of all, it should be clear that bargaining could not work if management could deprive employees of their rights merely by reorganizing management. Although faculty will all do the exact same work, under exactly the same supervision, at exactly the same location, they nevertheless lost their contractual rights and decent representation just because management reorganized. This is still being fought through the courts because UFF thinks it is deeply important for negotiations and bargaining rights everywhere. Here at USF, UFF would rather be bargaining a new contract than delaying the reimplementation of faculty’s contractual rights.

Secondly, the administration has violated the doctrine of the status quo by claiming that faculty contractual rights ended when the contract reached its expiration date with no successor agreement negotiated. However, clearly, management cannot end employee’s contractual rights, just by refusing to negotiate.

The Board of Education (BOE) was the legal employer during the transition to local university rule. This is after the Board of Regents (BOR) was replaced by the Board of Trustees (BOT). The BOE refused to negotiate a contract for the period after the expiration date of the existing contract on the grounds that they would not then be the employer. The BOT refused to negotiate such a contract on the grounds that they were not yet the employer. They both conveniently agreed that the transfer of power would coincide with the contract’s expiration date so that both bodies could evade the responsibility of negotiating a contract. Then when the date appeared, faculty had lost their contractual rights because a successful agreement had not been negotiated.
UFF President Weatherford pointed out that a year and a half ago President Genshaft assured this Senate that they were only doing these things because of rules and legal requirements and that it was not their intention to harm the faculty or faculty union in any way. He disputed that claim, and said that they must be trying to harm faculty. If not, they could meet and immediately reinstate the contract and begin to negotiate a successor in good faith. Instead, he predicted to try first to establish the principle that faculty had lost all contractual rights, then they would quickly and generously restore almost everything including the especially “hot button items” of tenure and academic freedom. The parts they would not restore would be a few things like the relatively generous summer salary article that they have been trying to get rid of for years along with procedures, rights, and privileges that make the union more effective when representing faculty. He was wrong. They didn’t do it quickly, but that is what they did. An agreement has been reached a year and a half later that the new contract will be 80 to 90 percent essentially unchanged. The parts that the administration most wanted to change were to weaken agreements and arbitration provisions, reduce or eliminate release time for union work, eliminate summer salary positions, and guarantee unlimited discretionary salary increases. They have backed off from some of those proposals, but clearly it was their intention to harm the faculty if they could, despite what President Genshaft told the Senate.

Finally, it is the basic principle that unions negotiate salaries. He added that even this administration would not be so shameless as to try to violate that principle. Yet, they have and are trying to do so again, and they evidently hope to impose an agreement that would establish a principle that they could do so forever. UFF President Weatherford was speaking specifically about discretionary salary increases. Unlike most unions, there has to be negotiated merit pay provisions as well as across-the-board provisions that are more typical of union contracts. Unlike any other union of which he is aware, UFF has also agreed in the negotiations that the administration should have at a least little bit of discretionary salary money, because it understands management. There cannot be rules that fit everything and it seems appropriate, so UFF agreed to Article 23.9 that said they could have a little bit of money for those purposes.

Things were fine until the last few years. Whereas the BOR had bargained in good faith on that issue, and adhered to the principle that it was the exception rather than the rule, the BOT saw it as a loophole and exploited it as much as possible to subvert the bargaining process. They began forwarding increased amounts of money into that provision of the contract instead of using it for the purposes of the main contract. Discretionary salary increases are the least popular items in the contract so far as our constituents are concerned, as is shown by repeated surveys of the entire bargaining unit and union membership. UFF said that it no longer agreed on the issue of discretionary increases. Management was committing unfair labor practices by trying to force the unions the way it prescribed to bargain all salaries. The labor commission agrees with UFF and upheld the unfair labor practice charge and everyone received an across-the-board salary increase last year. Yet once again, the administration is trying to violate this basic principle and weaken the union’s rights.

At this point, the administration’s insistence is to have the unlimited right to give any rates they wish to any employee they wish without negotiating or being held accountable. UFF will never agree to give up the basic right to negotiate salaries. The faculty that does not wish to negotiate salaries can vote the union out. They tried that at West Florida and FSU and by margins of 90%
and 96% respectively, the faculty voted no – they will not voluntarily give up their contractual bargaining rights. If there is an impasse, and if the Board tries to impose this, UFF will file unfair labor practice charges. If the commissioners appointed by Governor Jeb Bush again vote by two to one majority state management, then we will sue. This will slow things down, but basic rights are not subject to management and UFF will never give in on that principle.

Giving more flexibility to the university administrations, the current administration in Tallahassee made it possible for the administration to hold money back from the bargaining process, and then bring it forward after the process was over. What is at issue is should the union agree that an amount of money that could give a $1,000 increase to everybody in the bargaining unit and still have a few hundred thousand left over for merit increases should instead be turned over to an obscure process that most of us know nothing about, and that none of the faculty participate in, and that is so unaccountable that they cannot even tell who got it and why. UFF President Weatherford does not think that is reasonable. His concern is with the fact that it is against the law for an administration to give any salary increases that are not negotiated, if collective bargaining has been elected. The administration’s position is that UFF was not a collective bargaining agent until they volunteered to recognize it in May. Even if that is so, what about the raises that have gone into effect since May of last year? Are they illegal and if so what should be done by UFF? What would you do if it turned out that the president’s 37 percent salary increase was illegal? Would she be expected to give it back? Are fellow being required to give back raises because they were illegal? Is the union going to be blamed? What should be done if a substantial number of faculty have received illegal raises? What should be done to keep that from happening in the future? The only thing UFF will not do is say “well, let them do what they want to do.”

UFF President Weatherford wished everyone the best in their serious efforts to make USF a better place and not let these corporate outsiders divide the faculty. If UFF decides to take more militant action, he hopes everyone will stick with them, because they are the faculty of the University of South Florida.

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR DECEASED FACULTY

At this time, President Greenbaum asked to have a moment of silence for the following faculty members who passed away during the 2003-2004 academic year: Dr. James Halsted, Department of Criminology, November 20, 2003; Dr. David E. Stenmark, Department of Psychology, December 17, 2003; Dr. Mitchell Silverman, Department of Criminology, December 19, 2003; Dr. Jack R. Britton, Department of Mathematics, January 23, 2004; Dr. Tanja Zigova, College of Medicine, February 6, 2004; Dr. Amy Sparks, Department of Humanities and American Studies, March 9, 2004; Dr. Marson Johnson, Department of Criminology, June 11, 2004; Dr. Harold N. Schnitzlein, Department of Anatomy, July 7, 2004; Dr. Maxine MacKay, Department of Humanities and American Studies, August 25, 2004; and Dr. Alan R. Murry, Undergraduate Admissions, September 11, 2004
REPORT FROM FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT SUSAN GREENBAUM

Faculty Senate President Greenbaum welcomed everyone to the first Faculty Senate Meeting of the 2004-2005 academic year. The beginning of the semester has been difficult due to the hurricanes causing missed days of class. However, the Tampa area was extremely lucky during this season. Colleagues in Pensacola were far less lucky, and it will be at least a month before the University of West Florida will resume classes. President Greenbaum asked the Senators to think about what it is that this group might do to help their colleagues during this challenging period.

President Greenbaum began her report by thanking Past President Elizabeth Bird for the great job that she did last year. She serves as a very good role model in the way she unflinchingly stood up for the basic values that all faculty believe in and helped redefine the importance of the Senate. President Greenbaum specifically commended Past President Bird’s leadership in promoting better faculty salaries, more shared government, productive intercampus relations, and the reorganization of the Senate Bylaws and Constitution. The Senate became much more self-consciously proactive during Past President Bird’s tenure of stance that was entirely appropriate to the challenges that the faculty have been and still face. At this time, President Greenbaum presented Past President Bird with a small gift of appreciation for her stellar contributions to this august body.

President Greenbaum shared her priorities for the coming year which include pressing forward with shared faculty governance. The voice of the faculty needs to be heard at all levels of this institution. 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 faculty. Shared faculty governance is essential for the conduct of that debate. She has asked Senator Greg McColm from Arts and Sciences to chair an ad hoc committee to pursue this goal. He will talk about his ideas along with Past President Bird who will talk about departmental governance. A lot of progress was made last year in adopting the statement of principles which the Provost circulated for discussion in departments, many of whom responded in writing. From those responses, Past President Bird drafted a document on principles for departmental shared governance. This document was included in today’s meeting materials. One of the next steps is to organize an inquiry into how USF departments are governing themselves now and to assess the extent to which their practices and/or documents align with the principles in Past President Bird’s document. The ad hoc committee would like to get a sense of how things are being done in order to assess where to go next in strengthening the process.

USF made headlines this summer and not all of them were felicitious. Problems in the English department only underscored the need for more effective governance, as well as some new procedures for avoiding interpersonal and financial problems. Part of the notoriety was centered on a report by the Office of University Audit and Compliance which is an entity that oversees financial and other kinds of accountability. Vice President Steve Permuth and President Greenbaum met with Ms. Marie Hunniecutt, Director of the Office of University Audit and Compliance, to discuss her desire to have more faculty input and coordination with that operation. In addition, the newly created Senate Council on Educational Policy and Issues
(CEPI) will address the question of consensual romantic relationships between faculty and students among other things. CEPI chair Philip 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 UFF team, will talk about that later in today’s meeting.

President Greenbaum announced that there are two new initiatives she would like to raise in the Senate this year. First, is the growing involvement of USF faculty in community-based research and service learning activities. Community engagement is a very difficult enterprise that needs more university-wide coordination and support. Many new faculty are interested in doing this kind of research, but it may be at their peril. If faculty believe in this work, then they need to insure that it is valued in tenure and promotion considerations. Faculty also have a responsibility to exercise some kind of oversight in research and service learning activities that could jeopardize students, members of the community, or both. IRB does not usually come into play for these projects. Something needs to fill that gap. She will put together a more detailed proposal for the next Senate meeting of other issues that should be addressed. If anyone shares this interest and would like to get involved they should contact her directly.

Summer facilities utilization is the other area that 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 empty classrooms are air conditioned, 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 the university down for the summer. Maybe several of these problems could be solved by expanding summer classes. This is also an idea, not a plan. To the extent it makes sense to do so, she will pursue this further and report back at the next meeting.

REPORT FROM FACULTY PRESIDENT JUDY GENSHAFT

President Genshaft stated that the administration looks forward to working with President Greenbaum on the new initiatives, as well as continuing on the shared governance initiatives. She appreciates everyone’s hard work, both throughout this past summer and this fall.

At this time, President Genshaft gave the following updates:

• As of September 28th, there will be a new Vice President for Health Sciences and Dean of Medicine, Steve Klasko. He comes from Drexel University where he was the Dean and holds a MD degree and MBA.

• A new Dean of Public Health, Donna Peterson, who is coming from University of Alabama at Birmingham, will begin October 1st.

• The other large search taking place is for the Vice President of Student Affairs. After consultation with Senate President Greenbaum, there are Senate representatives on the search committee. The head of the search committee is Dr. Ted Williams from the
School of Medicine. She added that the section that comprises enrollment management will be moved from Student Affairs over to Academic Affairs on September 20th. This is being done at the recommendation of a consultant from a national firm on enrollment management. This is the structure that 80 percent of the institutions around the country already have and is something she believes will be more of a seamless structure for the students. Therefore, the portfolio of the new Vice President for Student Affairs will be one that will solidly focus on student life, student wellness, and student activities.

President Genshaft invited everyone to attend her Annual Fall Address on October 6 at 3:00 p.m. She will be talking about the mission that she has for the university; in particular, a strategic process or plan from the Board. One of the plans is that there be at least two Florida universities in the top 50 of the research universities in the country. Currently, the State of Florida has one university that is in the top 50 and that is the University of Florida. There are no other universities from the State of Florida in the top 50. However, within the next 5 years, there will be a push to see if there is one more university and she believes USF is the right university to move into that position. It is not a matter of the Board of Governor’s saying so; it is a matter of how USF structures itself which she will be talking more about in her remarks on October 6th.

Another important item with which she has asked President Greenbaum and the full Senate for help is the area of diversity, particularly in the area of diversity of faculty. When search committees are created to hire faculty members this year, she believes it is very important for everyone to keep in mind that USF has a 28-30 percent diverse student body but the number of faculty members that are diverse is much lower than that. President Genshaft believes it is everyone’s responsibility and it enriches the educational experience to have more diverse faculty members.

It is time for recommendations to be sent forward for honorary degree recipients. Honorary degree recipients are recognized at graduation ceremonies. On behalf of the Honors and Awards Council, she welcomes names of people from everyone.

REPORT FROM PROVOST RENU KHATOR

Provost Khator focused on the issue of academic learning compacts. She explained that this is part of the BOG initiatives where they are asking that for every single undergraduate degree program there be a specific outcome that the student is supposed to learn by the time they graduate. Those will be the areas of content, critical thinking and communication. At the point of completion of the degree each and every student has to be certified individually that he or she has completed the requirements that were supposed to be developed for a particular program. This is the fallout from the standardized tests last year. This year it is about students having to go through another assessment mechanism. There are no clear definitions right now as to what they mean exactly and what is supposed to be done. There is a deadline of December. Provost Khator thinks it is a very serious academic issue. She thinks the students ought to be equally concerned about this as the faculty because it is not known exactly what kind of extra work on the students will come.
The issue will be on the Board of Governor’s agenda for its October 21st meeting in Sarasota. Provost Khator pointed out that if the faculty believes that this is something that is so centrally academic the time has come that faculty may need to express their opinion or viewpoint.

Although the Faculty Senate President is a member of the Board of Governor’s, she strongly encouraged faculty to attend the Board meeting if at all possible to voice their concerns. The administration will be sending a letter a copy of which will be shared with Senate President Greenbaum. It outlines and highlights all the areas of concern.

REPORT FROM STUDENT GOVERNMENT LIAISON DAVID HOFFMAN

Mr. Hoffman will be the Student Government Liaison to the Faculty Senate for the 2004-2005 academic year. He stated that his job is not only to bring concerns of the students to the faculty, but also to bring the concerns of the faculty to student government and to put faculty causes into action any way that he can. He guaranteed that the students will support the faculty in their fight against the academic learning compacts, as well as support faculty efforts in making shared governance a reality at USF.

Mr. Hoffman distributed a list of key student government key issues for which they are asking for faculty support. The plus/minus grading system is being brought up again because Student Government feels strongly about it. There are people in the Student Government Cabinet that are taking time to evaluate the effectiveness of doing research, comparing how it is used in other schools, and how it affects graduation and applications into graduate and law schools. Mr. Hoffman will be doing a statement later in the semester to show what they have been doing and how the effectiveness of the plus/minus grading system affects students.

No matter what enrollment plans are set into motion students are still going to have problems finding the classes they want, especially upper level. USF has a lot of fifth year seniors that really do not want to be in that situation, and a large number of freshman that are looking for basic classes that fill up too quickly. A lot of time has been spent looking into the fact that between 3-4 pm, USF is air conditioning empty rooms, where students would actually want to take a class during those times.

One issue that has been recently brought to light is that professors have told students that there are not enough Scantron grading machines. Mr. Hoffman commented that he does not know how serious a problem this is, but if professors have taken the time to tell students that it is a problem for them then he thought it would be enough of an issue to bring it up to the Senate. He encouraged Senators to contact him if they have any comments and/or feedback on this or any other issues.

COMMITTEE REPORTS AND ACTIONS

a. **Honorary Degree Nominations** (Merilyn Burke)

   As a member of the Honors and Awards Council and past chair, Ms. Burke presented three Honorary Degree nominations at today’s meeting for discussion and vote by the Faculty Senate. She explained that the Council met to review the materials on each
nominee which were included in today’s meeting materials. The nominees approved and forwarded to the Senate were Dr. Mario Molina, Dr. William Smith and Mr. Don Wallace.

The floor was opened for discussion. Senator Tauber raised the question of the qualifications of Mr. Wallace, particularly as they pertain to “the awarding of an honorary degree in recognition of eminent accomplishments in scholarship or high distinction that demonstrates the purposes and ideals of the University of South Florida.” Senator Tauber felt that he did not see any of that with Mr. Wallace’s nomination. He asked to see what else Mr. Wallace has done for USF besides donate money and run a successful business. In addition, his nomination packet is not as complete as the others. Ms. Burke responded that the Council extrapolates from the information provided. Also, Mr. Wallace’s contributions were humanitarian. She also explained that the Council is only making recommendations. It is up to the Senate to make a decision as to whether or not to approve or disapprove these nominations. At this time, at the request from the Senate Ms. Burke read the criteria for the Honorary Degree.

A motion was made and seconded to vote on each of the nominees separately. The floor was opened for discussion of this motion. There was no discussion with a call to question. The motion passed unanimously.

Past President Gregory Paveza made the motion to move discussion of all three nominations until the next meeting so that all Senators have ample opportunity to review the dossiers. The motion was seconded and opened for discussion. A request was made to re-send the materials on the nominees. The question was asked that if discussion of the nominations is extended, does it create any problems for the administration in terms of deadlines for commencement. President Genshaft replied that as soon as she receives the information from the Senate, it will be taken under consideration with the Provost and the Board of Trustees. Her main concern was having enough lead time to contact the nominee(s) to extend an invitation. However, she did point out that a recipient could be honored at whichever ceremony he/she could attend. Another request was made from the floor for evidence of Mr. Wallace’s scholarly achievements. Ms. Burke will pass these requests to Ms. Darlene Bruner, Chair of the Honors and Awards Council.

Senator Arthur Bochner reminded everyone that there was a lengthy discussion during the spring about the criteria and the process which is why the Faculty Senate has the designated role in the approval of honorary degrees. The Faculty Senate wanted this award to be a mark of true distinction and eminence, so these should be looked at in a very “tough-minded” way. He added that this is not just ceremonial or giving money to the university, it is a mark of what kind of university USF is and a symbol of distinction. Everyone should keep this in mind while reviewing these nominations.

At this time there was a call to question. The motion to delay deliberation of the Honorary Degree nominations until the October meeting was unanimously passed.
b. **Council on Educational Policy and Issues** (Philip Reeder)

Chair Reeder was not at today’s meeting. President Greenbaum announced that the Council on Educational Policy and Issues (CEPI) is a new standing committee of the Faculty Senate. The purpose of the council is to look at issues that have to do with academic policies that affect faculty. There are several issues that CEPI will be working on, particularly some of the questions that have been raised about consensual relationships between faculty and students and what guidelines USF has covering those issues.

c. **On-line Voting** (Kathy Whitley)

Senate Secretary Whitley announced that the issue of on-line voting for the Faculty Senate has fallen by the wayside on the priority list for Information Technology (IT). There is a group within IT who has figured out how to identify who faculty are and who of those faculty are eligible to vote by using their employee ID numbers in GEMS. There is more that needs to be done to be able to make the voting system work with those numbers and that is where the issue stands at this time.

Ms. Whitley asked for a motion that would empower President Greenbaum to send a letter to the supervisor of Ms. Carole Dann in IT that would commend Ms. Dann for her assistance in this work and encourage him to give her the support that is necessary to get it completed. A motion was made and seconded for President Greenbaum to write and send such a letter. The motion was passed unanimously.

**OLD BUSINESS**

a. **Structure and Function of the Faculty Senate** (Emanuel Donchin)

This Ad Hoc Committee on the Structure and Function of the Senate has not had an opportunity to meet this year and a report will be given at the October Senate meeting.

b. **Inter-Campus Academic Operating Guidelines** (Steve Permuth)

As Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on Inter-Campus Operating Procedures, Vice President Permuth reviewed some of the leading principles involved in the intercampus operating guidelines that are academic only. To aid in his discussion he distributed copies of the letter, with committee recommendations, that was sent to then Senate President Elizabeth Bird in November, 2003. He explained that the items delineated with arrows have been acted upon at this time. Those bracketed items are issues that have yet to be dealt with. Chair Permuth then focused on the following recommendations noted on pages 17-18 of his handout, along with specific portions of the report. A full discussion will take place at the October meeting.
Recommendations from handout (Refer to letter dated November 3, 2003, to President Bird from the Ad Hoc Committee on Inter-Campus Operating Procedures which was distributed at today’s meeting.):

- **Page 17, Item 1**
  The Ad Hoc Committee recommends the re-writing and substantive revision of the IOP consistent with the 1991 document on Intercampus Academic/Administrative Operating Guidelines, Memoranda of Understandings between the Tampa and regional campuses, and current Practices of the University of South Florida. Particular focus of the new document should be working within the framework of criteria established to assure full compliance with all relevant accreditation agencies. [Further direction of this new document is the inclusion of the Principles of Shared Governance (or Senate agreed-to successor)] and the perspective that we are “one-faculty community” within the “one-university, geographically dispersed” doctrine.

- **Page 17, Item 1b**
  The Ad Hoc Committee recommends that any new document drafting committee contain Senate-appointed faculty representations, democratically chosen academic chairs involved with regional campus operations, relevant academic deans and CEO’s and/or other administrative designees from the regional campuses.

- **Page 17, Item 1c**
  The Ad Hoc Committee recommends that any new document be presented to the Senate of the University of South Florida for review, critique and commentary before any attempt to implement such policy.

- **Page 17, Item 3**
  The Ad Hoc Committee recommends that until SACS accreditation is received by a regional campus or absent other legal agreements that the University of South Florida articulate and implement policy consistent with the view of “one-faculty community,” not of four campuses, with different faculties.

- **Page 17, Item 4**
  The Ad Hoc Committee recommends the immediate drafting of an understandable operational organization chart of the University to clarify what is widely perceived to be confusion regarding reporting relationship in and among central administration, campus CEO’s, and academic deans. Further, the Committee recommends a clear and distinct message as to whether or not the Provost serves as the Chief Academic Officer (CAO) of the University through whose office all matters of academic
probity, save for legally drafted exceptions to regional campus CEO’s, are carried. The Ad Hoc Committee strongly advises that the Provost is the CAO for all faculty, regardless of campus affiliation.

- Page 18, Item 5a
  The Committee recommends that the University President and/or Senate President take actions to:

  a. convene a meeting of CEO’s, academic deans, relevant chairs and the Ad Hoc Committee to fully discuss this report as presented to the Senate. Academic deans and CEO’s should be encouraged to continually meet as a Group to diminish ill will and improve communications.

Important Issues Located Within the Document (Refer to document titled “Inter-Campus Academic Relations among USF Tampa, USF Sarasota/Manatee, USF Lakeland, September 2, 2004 – Draft” which was included with today’s meeting materials):

- Page 5, II. Purpose
- Page 6, III. Guiding Principles; 2 principles at bottom of page
- Page 7, top bullet
- Page 9, Item 4. University Provost
- Page 10, Item 7. Regional Campus Associate Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs, paragraphs 4 and 5
- Page 11, Item 8. University Department Chairs, paragraph 2
- Page 12, Item 2. Professional Accreditation
- Page 13, Item 4. Academic Planning; first paragraph, last sentence
- Page 17, Item 4. Faculty Recruiting and Appointment
- Page 19, Item 6. Instructional Assignment and Credentialing (ii, iii, iv)

Vice President Permuth reiterated that this is not a document to be looked at and tossed aside. It is a very important document and should be read with some intensity. He asked that the Senators be prepared for an open and full discussion at the October meeting. He added that there will be open meetings on Lakeland, Sarasota and Tampa campuses. Vice Provost Ralph Wilcox will be coordinating the meetings. Any specific questions regarding this document should be directed to Vice President Permuth.

c. Shared Faculty Governance Proposal (Elizabeth Bird/Greg McColm)

This issue was postponed until the October meeting. Past President Bird and Senator McColm are both working on this and they are available for comments and suggestions on the two documents.
d. **Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics** (Susan Greenbaum)

The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics is a national body that is developing a document on academic integrity. The Coalition has requested that a member of the Faculty Senate have representation in that process. President Greenbaum has been in contact with Professor Jack Romeo, Chair of the Athletics Council, who has suggested someone who might be a good member of this group. Dr. Romeo also requested that he or a representative from the Athletics Council speak about athletic issues at a future Faculty Senate meeting.

**NEW BUSINESS**


This issue was covered by UFF President Weatherford, so no report was given.

b. **Diversity Policy #0-007: Diversity and Equal Opportunity**

A minor change was made in the policy that is highly consistent with the rules the Senate adopted last year. The change is the addition of sexual orientation as a protective category. The Senate was asked to be consulted on the development of this policy. A motion was made and seconded that the Senate recommends adoption of Policy #0-007: Diversity and Equal Opportunity as revised. The motion was passed unanimously.

c. **Academic Learning Compacts**

President Greenbaum asked for a motion that she express the opinion of the Senate on academic learning compacts to the BOG at its October meeting. She has contacted the Advisory Council of Faculty Senates (ACFS) and suggested that there be a broader mobilization of concern and presence at the BOG meeting. President Greenbaum encouraged everyone to attend the BOG meeting and to urge their students to do so also. A motion was made and seconded that President Greenbaum send a letter to the BOG from the USF Faculty Senate that it expresses deep concerns about the issue of academic learning compacts. The motion was passed unanimously.

**ISSUES FROM THE FLOOR**

There were no issues from the floor.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Due to the time limitation reached, the meeting was adjourned at 5:08 p.m.