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Faculty Senate President Susan Greenbaum called the meeting to order at 3:08 p.m. The Minutes from the meeting of September 22, 2004, were approved as presented.

REPORT FROM FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT SUSAN GREENBAUM

President Greenbaum announced that except for the ink on the paper there is a collective bargaining agreement for the faculty. She commended members of both the bargaining teams for their hard work, constructive compromising and perseverance during the hundreds of hours devoted to this process.

At the last meeting, the Senate voted to send a resolution about the Academic Learning Compacts (ALC) to the Advisory Council for Faculty Senates (ACFS) which is the statewide body of all of the Senate presidents and vice presidents of the Faculty senates. The message sent was parallel to the one sent by the provost that the ALCs are a source of concern for both the administrators and faculty. Everyone is very concerned that there be ample consultation and adequate thought given to the development of procedures and measures. The resolution which was sent to the ACFS was included in today’s meeting packet. However, the ACFS had their own resolution. The resolution passed was basically an adoption of the provost’s memo. Although President Greenbaum was pleased with the way the ACFS proceeded, it is somewhat misleading to look at the resolution impact because that is not exactly what was passed. It is not known whether the chancellor was willing to respond to that request, but she expects there will be more to say.

The Board of Governors (BOG) will meet on Thursday, October 21, in Sarasota starting at 8:00 a.m. President Greenbaum urged anyone who can attend to do so.

President Greenbaum mentioned the disturbing action taken by President William Merwin of Florida Gulf Coast University who recently cancelled the major speaker on environmental issues who had criticized President Bush’s policies. Matters assigned to talk about the integrity of research findings and the honesty of scholars opinions must be protected. It is very troubling that the president of a public university in Florida would so actively fail to do so in this case.

Shared faculty governance is on the agenda for today’s meeting. This is a hold over from the last meeting, and will be held over until the November meeting. However, in the meantime, a charge was written which President Greenbaum will distribute via e-mail. Past President Elizabeth Bird and Senator Gregory McColm will present the issue at the November meeting.

The brochure titled “Faculty Resource Tool on Top 10 Compliance Topics” has been drafted by the Office of University Audit and Compliance. That office handles difficult and delicate problems that arise involving faculty conduct. Director Marie Hunniecutt has asked for the Senate’s help to insure that their communications and procedures are appropriate. Her office would like suggestions about the contents of this brochure. Senators were asked to review the
brochure and to send any comments to Administrative Assistant Ann Pipkins to be forwarded to Ms. Hunniecutt and Dr. Philip Reeder, chair of the Council on Educational Policy and Issues (CEPI). Responses should be received by November 15th. CEPI is a new council that has established a more or less formal liaison with the Office of University Audit and Compliance to provide broader and more ongoing input by the faculty. Presently the committee is working on a policy related to consensual amorous relationships between students and faculty. CEPI is also working with Associate Provost Philip Smith and Dr. Richard Taylor to review and reconcile all the USF policies that pertain to faculty.

President Greenbaum was directed at the last Senate meeting to write a letter to George Ellis, the supervisor of Instructional Technology who has been helping with the online voting project. She wrote a letter thanking him for the assistance asked for the support to be continued until the process is complete. Senate Secretary Kathy Whitley has been working with Ms. Carole Dann and things seem to be on track to get the voting online by February.

REPORT FROM PRESIDENT JUDY GENSHAFT

President Genshaft first introduced Dr. Matthew Buyu who is at USF from the American Council on Education in Washington, D.C. as an ACE fellow. Dr. Buyu will be spending 9 months here. He is from the International University in Nairobi, Kenya which also has a home institution in California. His doctorate comes from England in English literature. He resides in Nairobi and is the Chief academic officer there. Dr. Buyu will be working with Academic Affairs and the President’s Office. President Genshaft encouraged Senators to get to know him. He is a great contact for future student and faculty exchange and for providing information to some of your classes on what is happening in similar situations in Africa and Kenya. He is very versatile, bright and USF is delighted to have him.

President Genshaft expressed her appreciation of everyone’s hard work on the Inter-Campus Academic Relations Committee

The November 13th USF- East Carolina football game is faculty and staff, family and friends appreciation night. There will be an unBULLievable tailgate party across from the Hillsborough Community College parking lot. Tickets for the game are $11 per ticket for faculty, staff, family and friends. Additional information will be on the web. She encouraged everyone to attend and to bring their friends and family.

President Genshaft asked for input on starting a search committee for the head of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity. Any information and feedback would be appreciated.

President Genshaft announced that USF had just received its PECO list (distributed at today’s meeting) which is a list of construction items for the university. She explained that this money comes from gasoline tax for construction of buildings at universities and cannot be used for anything else but buildings, renovations and infrastructure. Every year each university turns in what is called a PECO list to the BOG who then make their own recommendations to the governor and then to the legislature. However, this year USF received only infrastructure money. Referring to the list, she pointed out that it shows USF as falling close to last in the needs on this
campus in terms of classrooms, teaching labs, research labs, etc. She added that, however, when they construct the PECO list, they put other universities forward instead of Tampa. President Genshaft wrote a letter to the BOG and copied the governor and chancellor expressing her concerns. It makes a clear statement in terms of research labs. USF is listed as the lowest in labs and highest in need and yet when it comes to putting it on the list for PECO it is not there.

She wanted the Senators to see what is being dealt with and how USF is trying to position itself and show the BOG does not follow the charts when they make out their PECO list. At the graduate level the Tampa campus is looking to its masters and doctoral programs. An item on the last page mentions an article in the *Tampa Tribune* about how the BOG is linking money to the universities. One of the ways world class schools are measured is by such things as research dollars. USF is one of the fastest growing universities in the country, and yet when it comes to dollars for building laboratories, classrooms, and instructional buildings it is not even on the list. President Genshaft and Provost Khator will be attending the BOG on Thursday to voice their concerns on this and other academic issues.

**REPORT FROM PROVOST RENU KHATOR**

Provost Khator distributed a copy of the “Tuition and Fee Policies Summary” which will be on the BOG agenda the following day. The six policies are:

1. Ceiling on Combined Tuition and Fees for Resident Undergraduates
2. Discretion Over Mix of Tuition and Fees Below Ceiling
3. 25% Tuition and Fee Surcharge for Hours Beyond 110% of Requirements
4. Block Tuition and Fees (block rate of 9 credit hours will be charged for 15; students who take fewer than 15 in fall can make up at no cost in summer)
5. Discretion to Set Tuition and Fees for Many Students
6. Accountability for Tuition Policy

In addition to the Tuition and Fee Summary, the proposal regarding Academic Learning Compacts will also be on the BOG agenda.

Provost Khator announced that five candidates for the position of College and Arts Dean have been interviewed and a final decision will be made within the next weeks. The Dean of Architecture advertisement has been sent out. The search committee for the Associate Provost and Dean of Graduate School has been put together and will meet October 25th for the first time. The two other search committees are working on Assistant Vice President of Institutional Research and Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management and Planning. Any assistance in getting the right people and the best people would be greatly appreciated.

**REPORT FROM USF UNITED FACULTY OF FLORIDA PRESIDENT ROY WEATHERFORD**

United Faculty of Florida (UFF) member and Senate Vice President Steve Permuth gave a report on behalf of UFF President Roy Weatherford. He reiterated that there was a verbal agreement on the collective bargaining agreement. The contract agreement verbally agreed is 80 to 85 percent
of what the old agreement contained. The next necessary step will be a meeting of members of the USF union and administrative teams to make sure the text everyone is working from is the same. Vice President Permuth explained that by definition a collective bargaining agreement does not mean one side has won and one side lost. He does think that both teams were looking at the definition of impasse as not acceptable and the desire to get a bargaining agreement everyone could live with was the essential goal. Of the thirty articles, twenty-five have been tentatively agreed to, some items need further affirmation. On the assumption that there is agreement to those section items, UFF will articulate a plan for dissemination of information. After that, the assumption is that the Board of Trustees (BOT) will ratify the contract at which point and time, the contract is in place and active.

There are two important statements regarding the interaction of the senate and the union as well as the administration:

- The statement passed last year by the Senate on academic freedom is now part of the collective bargaining agreement.
- The good faith agreement of the Senate and the administration regarding summer salaries has now been held valid by both parties.

President Genshaft stated that as soon as the contract is ratified there will be a special Board meeting. It will be implemented immediately and will be retroactive to August. She added that raises will be implemented prior to the holidays.

Senator Gregory McColm announced that there would be a special UFF meeting where members of the bargaining team would be there to talk to all members who have questions.

At this time, Senator Bochner raised the issue of the process used to send out questionnaires to faculty via electronic mail referring to a recent questionnaire that was disseminated to faculty asking for instant responses. He was unclear about the origination of that and how such questionnaires get produced and disseminated apparently on behalf of the faculty without any kind of review. In a university that has so much scientific and research expertise to send out a questionnaire like that seemed to not be in the best interest of the administration and faculty. Senator Bochner asked if President Greenbaum or UFF knew the origin of the questionnaire, through what body did it pass, on whose behalf was it represented and how that process can be endorsed?

Senator McColm replied that particular questionnaire was produced by the American Federation of Teachers (AFT). He thought the AFT membership committee was trying to find out how to get people to join so they could attempt to organize on campus. Senator Bochner felt that when things like that get disseminated to the whole university there should be a process by which someone reviews how that data is going to be used, what is the validity of the questions, and the purpose of doing the survey. He added that it was not well explained and has heard faculty and others who know better how to judge a questionnaire like that being very upset by it and antagonistic about it against the folks who composed the questionnaire. Senators also concerned about the results indicating some very bad things about the faculty and administration at a time when we are trying to build those relationships. It was suggested that it could be something that
either the Faculty Senate or Senate Executive Committee may need to look into. President Greenbaum suggested someone bring the issue to the Executive Committee for discussion.

REPORT FROM STUDENT GOVERNMENT LIAISON DAVID HOFFMAN

Mr. Hoffman announced that the Student Government Senate passed a resolution to increase the student activity fees by $.79 per credit hour for students. He explained that this is the main fund which Student Government uses to fund money to all student organizations and services on campus. The increase would generate approximately $500,000.

A petition, with an information sheet regarding the Academic Learning Compacts (ALC), was distributed by Mr. Hoffman. The petition stated that the students at USF are opposed to ALCs. Mr. Hoffman hopes that it will also get students thinking more about the idea of government controlling their education and turning their college into corporations.

Mr. Hoffman stated that a resolution on the plus/minus grading system will be forthcoming from Student Government.

COMMITTEE REPORTS AND ACTIONS

a. Recommendations from Committee on Committees (Ellis Blanton)

COC Chair Blanton presented the following slate of nominees of faculty to fill committee and council vacancies. It had been reviewed and approved by the SEC.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR FACULTY SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS
Fall Semester 2004

Academic Computing Committee
Don Hilbelink (COM)
Gabor Legradi (COM)

Committee on Faculty Issues
Annette Christy (FMHI)
Martine Extermann (COM)
Laurence Branch (COPH)
Clare Hite (Regional)

Faculty Committee on Student Admissions
Mel Pace (CAS)
David Williams (VPA)

Governmental Relations Committee
Tapas Das (ENG)
Robert Snyder (CAS)
Graduate Council
Kenneth Christianson (ENG)
Pamela Muller (MARS)
Wenlong Bai (COM)
Paul Gottschall (COM)
Stephen Schreiber (ARCH)

Honors and Awards Council
Narayan Halder (CAS)
Karen Perrin (COPH)

Instructional Technology and Distance Learning Council
Nancy Anderson (EDU)
Don Hilbelink (COM)
Janie Canty-Mitchell (NUR)
Murray Maitland (COM)

Library Council
Alessio Gaspar (LKLD)
Angela McBride (COM)
Catherine Page (COM)

Publications Council
Tom Massey (FMHI)

Research Council
Gaspare Genna (CAS)
Myung Kim (CAS)
Kimon Valavanis (ENG)
Jin Cheng (COM)

A motion was made and seconded to accept the full slate of nominees as presented. The motion was unanimously passed.

b. Honorary Degree Nominations (Merilyn Burke)

Consideration of the three honorary degree nominees recommended by the Honors and Awards Council to the Senate on September 22nd was postponed until today’s meeting so Senators could have an opportunity to review the dossiers. At this time, Ms. Burke presented two of the nominees for consideration and they were voted on separately.

1) Dr. Mario Molina
   He was recommended by his nominator for a Doctor of Engineering. However, The Honors and Awards Council recommended that he be considered for the Doctor of Science which is more general.
Without further discussion, a motion was made and seconded to accept Dr. Molina’s nomination for a Doctor of Science honorary degree. The motion was unanimously passed.

2) Dr. William A. Smith
Dr. Smith’s was recommended by his nominator for a Doctor of Science. The Honors and Awards Council recommended the same. There was no discussion. A motion was made and seconded to accept Dr. Smith’s nomination for a Doctor of Science honorary degree. The motion was unanimously passed.

Ms. Burke informed the Senate that the nomination for Mr. Don Wallace was tabled for further consideration by the Honors and Awards Council.

OLD BUSINESS

a. Student Academic Grievance Procedure (Elizabeth Bird)

Past President Bird announced that due to significant changes to the existing document that were recently received from the Arts and Sciences Advisory Council and the Graduate Council, this issue was tabled until the November Senate meeting. She pointed out that there would still be time to make the deadline.

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

Before discussion of the guidelines took place, Past President Bird gave some additional background information. The initiative to do this stems from two things: (1) the Senate’s strong objection to the proposed operating guidelines that were introduced last year that would have had the effectiveness of placing faculty under the control of the administration on regional campuses as opposed to being colleagues in departments. (2) USF’s realization that if such a development did occur then SACS accreditation would be jeopardized. SACS accreditation makes it clear that if an institution is to be accredited as one university then it cannot have what amounts to three presidents, three provosts, and faculty with no rights in their academic departments.

Last year there was a summit meeting of faculty members and administrators from Tampa, Lakeland and Sarasota. They agreed on some basic principles which the president and the provost endorsed. Essentially these basic principles state that USF is one university, has one president, has one provost, and has one faculty. As long as this is so, faculty remain members of their departments with all rights and responsibilities and identical expectations of tenure, promotion, evaluation and so on. The President then charged a small committee to develop these guidelines to ensure that the principles are maintained. This report is the result.

She added the report stresses that the goals should be to move toward separate accreditation as St. Petersburg is doing. Once that happens, USF would have to face another choice which is whether to argue that all campuses are, indeed, part of the same
mission or whether it should move to a more common distinct mission. That can only happen when the campuses are mature enough to have their own departmental and administrative structures.

The following motion was passed by the Senate Executive Committee at its October meeting: “The Senate Executive Committee approves the document on “Inter-Campus Academic Relations among USF Tampa, USF Sarasota/Manatee, USF Lakeland” dated September 2, 2004, as a statement of the Faculty Senate. Strong affirmation of the principles and guidelines are central to the core of faculty governance and institutional accreditation.” The ad hoc committee asked for a similar motion of approval from the Faculty Senate. This comes as a motion already proposed and seconded from the Senate Executive Committee.

Past President Bird stressed that approving this report does not constitute endorsement of everything in it. This is a working draft that will continue to evolve, but the President and the Provost have agreed that the basic principles of one university are non-negotiable as long as accreditation must be maintained. If the Faculty Senate endorses the motion of the Senate Executive Committee, it will be putting the voice of the faculty behind it and protecting the rights of USF faculty on all three campuses.

At this time, the floor was opened for discussion.

Senator Emanuel Donchin expressed his unhappiness with the process by indicating that Senator Permuth presented the report at the last Senate meeting, with no discussion. The SEC has already endorsed it without ever hearing the concerns of the Senate. Now, it is presented to be endorsed without hearing from the Senate. Past President Bird pointed out to him that now was his chance to voice his concerns.

Senator Donchin continued by stating that this report has nothing to do with the realities that faculty face, especially in terms of the teaching load that is consistent with the teaching load of a research one university. In addition, there is no laboratory space, no graduate students, and no support for research or equipment. He stated that the problem with this report is that one cannot assume academic responsibility without fiscal responsibility. For example, as chair of the Psychology Department on the Tampa campus he has no control over the research support for psychology faculty on the Sarasota campus. He cannot give any fairness in judgment to evaluate these people without being able to control the resources they are getting. Senator Donchin felt that this document is impossible for the Senate to endorse because it is based on a myth, a fiction, and a lie.

St. Petersburg Senator Ellen Hufnagel stated that endorsement of these principles is like a permanent separation for the faculty on that campus. Vice President Permuth explained that the committee was asked to look at USF as one campus defined as “Tampa, Lakeland, Sarasota” and it was the leadership of St. Petersburg that asked not to include that campus in this protocol. The agenda relates to this. This is an academic document dealing with the three campuses and one faculty. Senator Hufnagel asked if that meant
that St. Petersburg faculty are not part of the USF faculty. Vice President Permuth replied that it means nothing to that extent at all. Past President Bird explained that what it does mean is that St. Petersburg is still part of USF, but it has more of a system structure that already exists at other universities. It is a separate accredited institution with its own departmental structure which is the direction St. Petersburg is going. It means that St. Petersburg is still part of USF, but with its own system. St. Petersburg Senator Chin-Tang Liu added that there needs to be coordination between administrations to cut down on the frustrations of faculty.

Vice President Permuth reiterated that there are a series of legislatively mandated changes by USF. There is a legislative mandate that St. Petersburg was going to go its own way and the university had a responsibility to effectuate that difference with accelerated speed toward accreditation. St. Petersburg looks like at first that it could handle accreditation which means it has deans of colleges (Education, Business and Arts and Sciences). The Tampa campus, the Lakeland campus and the Sarasota campus similarly have one dean for each of these colleges. They are not governed under the same set of criteria within a context of how academic decisions are being made because while being encumbered by a united collective bargaining agreement, we are not encumbered by a statement that says governance has to be all the same way on each campus. In St. Petersburg going on its own, whether or not the faculty or the administration believe it, there are some other agendas that are clearly working. This document talks about the part of USF that declares unity with St. Petersburg in that there is one president. It diverts when talking about the academics of the campus and through whom those academic powers flow. The assumption is that St. Petersburg’s academic agenda flows through the person who holds the respective power of provost regardless of what that person is called. For the three campus sites (not including St. Petersburg), there is only one chief academic officer, Provost Khator. This is a statement of academic, not economic, legitimacy.

St. Petersburg faculty are looked at differently not under a collective bargaining agreement, but as to the roles and definitions that campus may have delegated. The Tampa, Lakeland and Sarasota campuses are under law one campus, until Sarasota and Lakeland establish their own accreditation and go their own way. The agenda of this document primarily is 85 percent on behalf of faculty knowing what they do in terms of tenure and promotion and how they stand and to whom they report. This document is an attempt to say to faculty on the Tampa, Sarasota, Lakeland campus that they have only one articulated system. It works through your department chair, which is where your academic home is. It is not your academic home on a campus. Your academic home is in your department. If it is not done this way, CEO’s at regional campuses report only to the president. So there is a possibility that a faculty academic matter going to an associate regional vice president, who is academic, who reports to a CEO, who reports to a president and the provost of this one campus at three sites, never gets involved in the decision making except if it comes through the president on down. This is called backwards. This is nothing more than to say you are faculty, you are one.
Sarasota Senator Mary Cuadrado stated that she will endorse this document and that the Sarasota faculty, in general, were pleased particularly with the aspects that have to do with faculty because it really tells everyone when they are hired that they are all part of a research one university, but just happen to be housed on a different campus. The problem that arises when a faculty member starts teaching, he/she realizes that there are pretenses between administrators sending papers back and forth, signing them and pretending the campuses are one. The chairs are not really fighting for their faculty members and the administrators are using them as much as they possibly can. She is endorsing this document. Although it has not been signed, it is apparent that people need to say something. Whether it is good, bad, or indifferent it will bring to the forefront that the faculty on the regional campuses are very much ignored. This pretense of having one faculty needs to be resolved. The administrators are going to have to stop pretending that everything is fine when the brunt is really falling on the faculty.

Past President Paveza stated that the issue for him was because the document is undergoing rewrite he had difficulty with the SEC motion which says that the Faculty Senate approves a document with a specific date on it, not the principles that underlie the document, and not the general perceptual framework of the document. This motion says the Faculty Senate supports a specific document with a specific date on it. Therefore, he urged members of the group to vote no on this motion for that reason alone. He recommended that the motion be amended to state that the Faculty Senate supports the principles that underlie this document and in that case, he had no problem supporting the motion. That document is under revision and for all intents and purposes that document does not exist any more. Therefore, he proposed the following amendment to the SEC motion:

The Faculty Senate approves of the principles that underlie the “Inter-Campus Academic Relations among USF Tampa, USF Sarasota/Manatee, USF Lakeland” as stated in the document dated September 2, 2004. Strong affirmation of the principles and guidelines are central to the core of faculty governance and institutional accreditation.

The amendment was seconded and the floor was opened for discussion. Past President Paveza clarified that he was referring to the underlying principles that are listed in the document. Senator Liu brought up the question of the teaching load and how will adequate resources be addressed for every faculty member regardless of which campus they are on. President Greenbaum replied that information is supplied in the document. Senator Donchin asked to whom does he go if the teaching load and the resources made available to the Sarasota faculty are inconsistent with a research one university. Vice President Permuth replied that he would go to the provost.

At this time a vote was taken on the amendment proposed to the SEC motion. The amendment was passed. After the reading of the amended motion, a vote was taken to approve and the amended motion unanimously passed.
c. **Shared Faculty Governance Proposal** (Elizabeth Bird/Greg McColm)

Senator McColm announced that a committee will be set up to investigate faculty governance at the departmental level. President Greenbaum will send out an electronic version of the charge for this committee and a request for volunteers who are interested to please join the committee.

d. **Report on Collective Bargaining Process** (Steve Permuth)

This topic was covered under the UFF report.

**NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business to discuss.

**ISSUES FROM THE FLOOR**

There were no issues from the floor.

Due to the time limitation, the meeting was adjourned at 5:13 p.m.