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The meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m. The Minutes from the meeting of September 5, 2007, were approved as corrected.

REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT MICHAEL BARBER

President Barber forwarded to Vice Provost Dwayne Smith a set of guidelines for a new outstanding graduate teaching award. The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) will be kept apprised of the status of this new award.

REPORT FROM PROVOST RENU KHATOR

Provost Khator distributed the latest NSF Federal Research Expenditures rankings which show that USF has moved from 66th to 63rd. She pointed out that USF is the only university of the peer institutions that has moved up in ranking each year for the past three years. This was accomplished due to the hard work of the faculty.

Information on the 2007-2008 Legislative Conference Committee Agreement – General Revenue Budget Reductions for the State University System (SUS) was presented. It showed the Educational & General (E & G) reductions recommended by the Senate (3.3 percent), the House (3.9 percent) and the Conference Agreement (3.6 percent). The SUS 2008-2009 E & G Executive Summary was also distributed and reviewed. The Conference Agreement and the Executive Summary will now be presented to Governor Crist. Once the Governor has prepared his budget, it will be compared to the budgets from the Board of Governors, the House and Senate respectively. Once the final budget is agreed upon, it will be presented to the Governor to either accept or veto.

At this time, Past President Susan Greenbaum asked that the issue of tenure and promotion (T&P) guidelines for rewarding community engagement be revisited. She pointed out that this was agreed upon during the spring, but had not been moved forward. Past President Greenbaum requested of the SEC that it be placed before the Committee on Faculty Issues (CFI), but the support of the Provost was needed before proceeding. Provost Khator responded that it may be time for the CFI to review the T&P guidelines overall along with community engagement. In addition, in keeping with the strategic plan, a matrix on how to measure community engagement
from year to year has yet to be developed which could be done by either CFI or another committee. Past President Greenbaum expressed concern that if the T&P guidelines reform gets melded into the overall process there would be no way to know when it would actually be done. She also pointed out that the engagement matrix is moving along.

**CONSULTANT FOR CAMPUS SAFETY AND SECURITY REVIEW (Thomas Seamon)**

Mr. Thomas Seamon’s company, Hallcrest Systems, Incorporated, was engaged by Student Affairs to conduct a community survey and to look particularly at the University Police (UP) Department. Hallcrest Systems is a security and law enforcement research and consultant company working with federal, state, local governments, corporations, universities, and health care systems. The company is conducting a site survey of campus and the area surrounding the campus. The focus of the survey is on the Tampa campus only. Executives and other groups within the university are being interviewed. Document collection is being done to do research of the policy and procedures that have to do with security. The university has requested a final report of findings and recommendations before December 10, 2007.

Mr. Seamon’s purpose at today’s meeting was to ask the SEC for an evaluation of security and policing on campus. The question was asked how serious understaffing is for the UP. His reply was that there is no standard for staffing around the country for universities. Many factors have to be taken into account. Mr. Seamon commented that the problem of recruiting and retention should be addressed before addressing the problem of understaffing. However, he did not want to jump to conclusions until all the research has been done. A list of comparable universities with USF for which Hallcrest Systems has conducted surveys and have been accepted is available on the company’s website. Mr. Seamon pointed out that this is a limited engagement and his company will be making recommendations where further work should be done; for example, either in specific areas of the campus or technology. Concern was expressed about the prescreening of contractual labor and whether or not Hallcrest Systems would be reviewing university security policy that brings certain groups onto campus.

**REPORTS BY OFFICERS AND COUNCIL CHAIRS**

Nominations from Committee on Committees (Kim Lersch)

Twenty-six nominations to fill vacancies on the Faculty Senate Standing Committees and Councils were presented by Committee on Committees (COC) Chair Lersch. A motion was made and seconded to approve the nominations. The motion was unanimously passed and the full slate will be presented to the Faculty Senate at its October meeting.

There was a special request to approve the nomination of Dr. Wade Weast for an interim appointment on the Standing Committee on Research Misconduct until the COC reviews the full nomination packet. Chair Lersch explained this particular committee has some issues that need to be dealt with in a pressing timeframe and needs a full complement of representatives. A motion was made and seconded to approve his nomination. There was a call to question. A vote was taken and the motion was unanimously passed to appoint Dr. Weast to an interim appointment on the Standing Committee on Research Misconduct.
OLD BUSINESS

Revised Code of Conduct for Financial Functions

The original document was presented to faculty this past spring. As a result of faculty input, a dual system was proposed to the Board of Trustees (BOT) on behalf of Provost Khator that individuals could either complete an on-line training module and opt out of signing the form or sign the original document. Vice Provost Dwayne Smith added that the BOT rejected the notion of the dual system, especially the opt-out portion. The new proposal from the BOT is a substantially revised version of what had been distributed earlier. It dictates that people acknowledge their financial responsibility, and is a separate issue from the training sessions to be made available. Discussion was held. Several SEC members did not agree with the language on page 4 which states “…and agree to hold myself and those who report to me to the highest standards of ethical conduct,…”. Another area of concern was the lack of a reliable, accurate accounting system that could sustain accountability. It was pointed out that the previous language stating an individual was giving away their rights by signing this form was removed. In addition, if someone receives bad accounting advice it can be documented and will not be held accountable. All faculty with financial, signatory authority will be required to sign the form. A motion was made and seconded to accept the revised USF Code of Conduct for Financial Functions to be forwarded to the Faculty Senate. There was a call to question and the final vote was 4 opposed and 6 in favor of accepting the revised document.

NEW BUSINESS

a. Committee Nomination Process (Emanuel Donchin)

Council on Educational Policy and Issues (CEPI) Chair Donchin raised the issue of why the nomination process is so slow and cumbersome. He recommended that the constituencies, i.e., colleges that are being represented should be contacted to nominate faculty. Approvals should be done by the deans and not by the Faculty Senate. Instead, it was suggested by the SEC that the college council chairs should be contacted to solicit for nominations. CEPI Chair Donchin felt that by going through the colleges it would speed up the nominating process. Past Vice President John Ward strongly suggested that these committees need to be vetted by the Faculty Senate. It was agreed that CEPI Chair Donchin and Secretary Dale Johnson should review the nomination process and report back to the SEC with recommendations on how to improve/speed up the process, but not take away any control by the Faculty Senate.

b. Reporting Protocol from University Assessment Steering Committee (Michael Barber)

The Office of Assessment has requested the opportunity to attend Faculty Senate meetings to report items of information value. As a member of the University Assessment Steering Committee, Senator Michael Bowen will be the liaison between the Senate and the Office of Assessment. A motion was made and seconded to support this request. The motion was unanimously passed.
c. **New Classroom Scheduling Template** (Laurence Branch, Ralph Wilcox)

Vice President Branch reported that he attended a meeting called by Vice Provost Dwayne Smith to discuss an administrative proposal to have a framework for the scheduling of classes. Vice President Branch stated that he was very much in favor of the proposal which is to move the university from a four to a five day a week class schedule. A scheduling template was distributed. Vice President Branch pointed out that three credit hour courses (50 minutes each) that meet three times a week will be scheduled on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays. Three credit hour courses that are offered twice a week (90 minutes each) will be offered Tuesdays and Thursdays. These two components comprise 78 percent of all courses. The new schedule would better utilize existing facilities. Vice President Branch stated that the Faculty Senate should be strongly in favor of this proposal as it brings the university forward. There will be problems, because historically, USF has not had this kind of template before. Vice Provost Wilcox pointed out that this template was primarily intended to meet the needs of undergraduate students. Graduate programs can fall into multiple one-hour slots at the discretion of the particular graduate program. President Barber clarified that this proposal retains flexibility in graduate education, but changes the culture for undergraduates.

Vice Provost Wilcox outlined the following reasons for moving this proposal forward: (1) improved space utilization, (2) performance incentive funding, (3) addressing student progress and success, and (4) ensuring that students can fully schedule their classes. The driving force behind these is the university’s call for new instructional facilities and additional base budget resources. However, these will only come in the future based upon undergraduate performance. USF will get new buildings if the Legislature is convinced that the university is utilizing, at an optimal level, the instructional facilities it currently has.

The draft proposal was discussed. President Barber commented that some of the value of this template is that when the university runs short on facilities, a three year plan is needed in order to know whether a class can be held at a particular time. There are some advantages to doing this, but also concerns about how it is implemented. One of the biggest challenges is how many of the classrooms are unusable; that is, technologically equipped as well as physical condition. President Barber summarized the valuable points to this issue: (1) getting the resources and (2) providing a mechanism whereby students can schedule their classes. A motion was made and seconded for the SEC to approve a structure for assigning classroom times and spaces to be presented to the Faculty Senate. A friendly amendment was to ask that the rooms be upgraded to current standards. It was recommended that the SEC should come up with a minimum amount of equipment each room should contain for ten students. In addition, this proposal should be made workable for undergraduate and graduates. The motion was discussed. Some SEC members expressed concern about the lack of flexibility in the new proposed scheduling. It was clarified that the SEC was recommending the approval of the concept, but not the
proposed classroom scheduling template presented at today’s meeting. The motion was unanimously passed to move the topic forward to the full Faculty Senate for discussion at its October meeting.

c. **Tenure and Promotion Guideline Reform** (Susan Greenbaum)

Past President Greenbaum clarified that this process should have been initiated some time ago in connection with strategic planning and the changing nature of how tenure and promotion should be evaluated. She would like to use the Senate as the vehicle to get the process started, but was not sure what the most efficient way was to do that. She pointed out that the Provost needs to be involved in it, but that the Committee on Faculty Issues could also make a recommendation. However, the work has to be done at the college level. Vice Provost Wilcox suggested that the process begin by reviewing the current tenure and promotion guidelines because of their antiquation. President Barber asked Vice Provost Wilcox to seek clarification that if the Senate examines revisions to the tenure and promotion guidelines are changes to said guidelines an academic or a work issue? Past President Greenbaum will bring the issue to the full Senate at its October meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.