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FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES
April 14, 2010

Present: Michael Barber, Rosalie Baum, Ellis Blanton, Laurence Branch, Kenneth Cisna, Emanuel Donchin, Grandon Gill, Michael LeVan, Steve Permuth, Arthur Shapiro, James Strange, Paul Terry

Provost’s Office: Tapas Das, Linda Whiteford, Ralph Wilcox

Guest: Sang-Hie Lee

The meeting was called to order at 3:02 p.m. A motion was made and seconded to approve the Minutes from the March 17, 2010 meeting. The motion unanimously passed.

REPORTS BY OFFICERS AND COUNCIL CHAIRS

a. Revised Guidelines for Askounes-Ashford Distinguished Scholar Award – Sang-Hie Lee

On behalf of the Honors and Awards Council (HAC), Chair Lee had presented at the February Faculty Senate meeting a proposed revision to the guidelines for the Askounes-Ashford Distinguished Scholar Award, which was the addition of the request for documentation of impact on the global scholarship as part of the evidence of significance to the field, 3.b.4. At that meeting, the question was raised as to the difference between “international,” as stated in (2) of the same section, and the term “global.” The HAC revisited the wording and rescinded originally proposed item 3.b.4. and expanded the current item 3.b.2 to the following: Letters of endorsement by acknowledged authorities as to the nominee’s local as well as national and international status; and “documentation of impact on the global scholarship, demonstrated by number of citations, number of dissertation/books sold, and other narratives that describe broader impacts.” The council’s rationale was that it interprets “international” to mean the status in the disciplinary community geographically; “global” covers a broader and more comprehensive community (e.g., multidisciplinary, cultural, societal) beyond geography. The new proposed language came to the SEC with a motion to accept the revised wording. The motion was seconded and unanimously passed. It will now go to the full Senate at its April meeting.

b. Faculty Senate and Officer Nominations – Paul Terry

1. Faculty Senate Nominations

Secretary Terry presented the following slate of nominees for the Faculty Senate as of today’s meeting:
FACULTY SENATE ELECTION RESULTS
AND PENDING NOMINATIONS

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
Vacancies: 3 three-year terms; 2 two-year terms; 2 one-year terms
Elizabeth Bird - 3 year term
Michael Coover - 2 year term
Carolyn Ellis - 1 year term
David Himmelgreen – 1 year term
Philip Levy - 3 year term *
Adriana Novoa - 3 year term *
Elaine Smith - 2 year term *

COLLEGE OF BEHAVIORAL & COMMUNITY SCIENCES
Vacancies: 4 three-year terms
Lisa Rapp-Paglicci
Gail Donaldson *
Sondra Fogel *
Kathryn Hyer *

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
Vacancies: 1 two-year term; 1 one-year term
Robert Welker (1-year term) *
Richard Will *

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
Vacancies: 1 three-year term; 1 two-year term; 1 one-year term
William Young – 3 year term*

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
Vacancies: 3 three-year terms; 1 one-year term
Shekhar Bhanasli – 3 year term
Scott Campbell – 3 year term
Andrew Hoff – 1 year term
Srinivas Katkoori – 3 year term

COLLEGE OF MEDICINE
Vacancies: 6 three-year terms
Nagwa Dajani (A)
Cuc Mai (A)
Andreas Seyfang (A)
Donald Wheeler (A)
Bryan Bognar *
Karl Muffly *
COLLEGE OF PUBLIC HEALTH
Vacancies:  2 three-year terms
Wendy Nembhard *
Alan Sear *

COLLEGE OF THE ARTS
Vacancies:   2 three-year terms; 1 two year term
William Hayden
Christopher Steele
Sang-Hie Lee – 2 year term *

Names with asterisks next to them are pending nominations. There are only two vacant Senate seats to fill at this time. Secretary Terry contacted deans of those colleges that had vacancies and received assistance from Senators in recommending potential faculty. Once the College of Education seats are filled, there will be 60 Senators. A motion was made and seconded to approve the nominations as presented. The motion unanimously passed. These nominations will now go to the full Senate. Any additional nominations received from the College of Education will be voted upon by the SEC via electronic mail.

2. Officer Nominations

The following slate of officer nominations was presented:

President – Laurence Branch (2010-2012)
Vice President – Huntington Potter (2010-2011)
Secretary – Sang-Hie Lee (2010-2011)
Sergeant-at-Arms – Arthur Shapiro (2010-2011)
Member-at-Large to the Senate Executive Committee – David Shapiro

Based upon information Secretary Terry received from Administrative Specialist Ann Pipkins on April 5, 2010, regarding President Branch not being eligible to be a Senator per the full-time requirement of the Constitution, or an officer, he took the opportunity to review Dr. Branch’s job information in GEMS (Global EMployment System). The GEMS record he faxed to Ms. Pipkins showed Dr. Branch’s status as full-time, but at .75 FTE. On Monday, April 12, Ms. Pipkins faxed to Paul an updated GEMS report showing Dr. Branch’s status has been changed part-time. The next day, Ms. Pipkins shared the same information with the entire SEC as FYI. Secretary Terry decided to bring the issue to the SEC, because he was not willing to make an eligibility ruling without bringing it to the full SEC in an open and transparent manner for thorough discussion. He added that he had not been contacted by any SEC member regarding this issue.

At this time, President Branch gave a history as it pertains to him and as he recalled it. He was first elected to the Faculty Senate maybe five years ago and just completed two years as President. He served two years as Vice President and was a Senator before then. When he was first elected as a Faculty Senator from the College of Public Health
(COPH), he was full-time with a 1.0 FTE and, as per his contract, was bringing in 25 percent of his salary on grants. Sometime during 2008 he ceased his grant support of the 25 percent. He received a letter from his dean in 2008 that he would be reduced to .75 FTE, but the letter did not state anything about full or part-time. Dr. Branch commented that he had no problem with that, those are the contracts in the COPH. He had asked with the grant funding expiring if he could possibly shift to 9-month on his .75 E&G funding and have the summer months be his own responsibility. He was told no because in the COPH everyone is kept on 12-month contracts. It stayed like this until last week when Secretary Terry alerted Dr. Branch that there were questions about his eligibility on the basis of his full-time criterion. He was unable to access his GEMS data, but subsequently learned that his job data in GEMS, as of the previous week, had said what he always assumed it said was full-time and that his FTE .75 coming from E&G and the other point .25 is not coming. However, at the moment, he does have a .10 on a grant that makes his appointment .85, but is not reflected. As of last week, GEMS reported him as full-time until he was alerted by Secretary Terry that it had been changed to part-time. Dr. Branch expressed concern that somebody can change the job information in GEMS without informing the individual.

Dr. Branch was asked about the status of his grievance against the university. Dr. Branch said the grievance is against Vice President Klasko’s interpretation of his initial contract, and that is what is being grieved. The grievance has gone to binding arbitration. Sergeant-at-Arms Shapiro commented that he has served on the UFF grievance committee and this certainly “smacks of retaliation.” Dr. Branch added this could be retaliation against doing a good job as Faculty Senate President or retaliation for the grievance.

Vice President Steve Permuth was asked to lead the discussion, but before opening the floor he asked for a proforma statement of the approval of Larry Branch as Faculty Senate President. Although Parliamentarian Cissna did not know what this meant, a motion was made and seconded.

Ms. Pipkins added that she questioned why Dr. Branch’s job information in GEMS said full-time but .75 FTE. Her contacts in the Provost Office that are familiar with GEMS could not answer that question about the discrepancy, so she called the COPH. COPH, in turn, called the College of Medicine (COM) where it was discovered that there had been a coding error when Dr. Branch’s FTE dropped to .75. The COM considers anything below 1.0 FTE as part-time and the change was made at that time.

CEPI Chair Donchin called to question. Vice President Permuth restated the motion that Larry Branch be named President of the Senate. Secretary Terry called for the division of the house. Parliamentarian Cissna pointed out that merely because one member calls to question does not provide adequate parliamentary grounds for closing off discussion if there are members who still wish to speak. Vice President Permuth overruled Secretary Terry’s call for the division of the house.
CEPI Chair Donchin thought the SEC should address the question of what the Senate means in its Constitution by full-time employment. He made the motion that it be defined as the equivalent of the 9-month, 100 percent employment. Parliamentarian Cissna ruled that this motion was out of order because there was a main motion on the floor. There was a call for the vote.

Senator Lee asked that the SEC continue in the direction it was going with when was the record changed and then there would be a better understanding. Past President Michael Barber explained that the entry date on the job information corresponds to the date of job classification. For example, Dr. Branch was made Distinguished Professor in 2008. At that point 2008 was when his job classification changed from 9001 (Professor) to 9007 (Distinguished Professor). That is why the entry date is the same on all of these documents. The entry date represents the date of change in job classification. Every time there is a change in job code, a new GEMS is generated to show the new job classification because the State arranges faculty by job code. Secretary Terry commented that this is a unique situation in that Dr. Branch’s data says 12-month. The bigger question is it was changed without consultation with Dr. Branch. It was clarified that the change occurred on Monday, April 12th.

Senator Lee pointed out that when both forms are compared, both show a .75 FTE. One says full-time, the other part-time. Why not go ahead with the assumption that Dr. Branch has been nominated for President on the basis of the .75 FTE, full-time? Past President Barber clarified that Human Resources is the only area that can change an appointment status form. The COM does not have its own Human Resources, there is only one university and only one Human Resources. Secretary Terry added that it bothers him that this was changed based on a phone call from an administrative assistant and that someone did not consult with Dr. Branch. He, too, thinks this is retaliation.

Vice President Permuth commented that assuming that Dr. Branch has served inappropriately for a couple of years it may well be that everything he has lead in signature is invalid. In fact, as President of the Senate, Dr. Branch sat inappropriately as a member of the Board of Trustees because he was not eligible. There’s a question here of something called Pandora’s Box.

Ms. Pipkins asked how will this affect the Constitution as far as the membership criteria because it says full-time, especially if someone knows that Dr. Branch’s FTE is .75 and they want to serve on the Senate. How is that to be addressed? Vice President Permuth responded that .75 has nothing to do with the fact that the person is a 9-month appointee. He agreed with CEPI Chair Donchin that a 9-month appointee is full-time no matter what the percentage is. CEPI Chair Donchin reiterated that the SEC needs to define what full-time employment for an academic member of this community of scholars, and that is considered a 9-month, full-time appointment in which one has a full-time assignment of teaching, research and service. Past President Barber responded that the Constitution would have to be changed. Graduate Council Chair Strange questioned if the SEC accepts it as full-time, is it not enough?
There was a call to question. The vote on the motion that Larry Branch is duly appointed as President of the Senate was taken. It passed with one nay and one abstention.

CEPI Donchin then clarified his motion as it pertains to the definition of full-time eligibility to mean a 9-month appointment with a full assignment of teaching, research and service, or its equivalent. Vice President Permuth pointed out that this would require a constitutional change. Graduate Council Chair Strange commented there were things that can be done by resolution, and then there are things that are written into the Constitution. He felt this could be kept in resolution without having to rewrite the Constitution. Parliamentarian Cissna stated that there could be a motion that interprets the meaning of full-time. Vice President Permuth commented that he would make sure this is presented to the full Senate. There was a second and the motion discussed.

Secretary Terry asked for clarification. Graduate Council Chair Strange is calling it a resolution, but the Parliamentarian says the Senate would be asked for a definition of how it defines full-time. Graduate Council Chair Strange stated that the resolution defines full-time. CTIR Chair Grandon Gill suggested rather than specifying 9 months, he offered a friendly amendment that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee be in charge of interpreting what full-time is and handle it on a case-by-case basis. There was the question of whether or not to add an e.g. 9-month to Dr. Gill’s friendly amendment. It was decided it should not be. He added it might be payback or a clerical error, but the SEC does not want clerical errors to determine who serves on the Senate, so have people involved.

Vice President Permuth commented what should be done in this case since Dr. Branch will be president is for him to check out exactly what happened. Who does how, what, where, and when? If it is the dean of a college, a vice president, or a clerical person that made the change, these are separate issues. If there is this possible theory of conspiracy, we need to find out not only who did it but who gave the orders to do it. The question is how much of this does the SEC want to do and open Pandora’s Box? Dr. Gill read his motion again as: The determination of full-time shall be made by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee if there is any question. There was a call to question. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Vice President Candidates

Two nominations were received for the position of Vice President – Michael Gibbons from CAS and Huntington Potter from COM. It was discovered that Dr. Gibbons is finishing a three-year term on the Senate which ends August 1, 2010, and he did not elect to self-nominate or was not nominated for one of the six vacant CAS Senate seats. Although Dr. Gibbons is a Senator that has been nominated, the Constitution does not clearly define the position of Vice President as it does for the President. Secretary Terry decided to bring it to the SEC for a ruling.

Parliamentarian Cissna stated that there seems to be the oddity of having elections in the spring for what is essentially one Senate, electing officers that will take office in the fall for what is a subsequent Senate. The relevant clause in the Constitution is that “The
Faculty Senate shall have (all of the officers) elected by the members of the body from among the elected Senators.” The elected Senators would refer to those whose terms would include the 2010-2011 academic year, but an argument can be made that the election is this spring and that the Senator involved is, indeed, an elected Senator now. Newly elected Senators are eligible to vote and are allowed to run for office. Outgoing, as well as incoming Senators, vote.

CTIR Chair Gill made the motion that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee resolve the ambiguity of who is elected and who is eligible just as they would remove the ambiguity of full-time. In addition, the Executive Committee should interpret “elected” meaning elected to the term to which they are going to serve as an officer. The motion was seconded. Sergeant-at-Arms Shapiro asked how someone could be a Vice President if he/she is not a Senator. Past President Barber responded that it could be inferred that if he is elected to an officer position he gets another term. It does not say that one has to be a Senator when elected; it does not say what happens in the following year should one be elected.

Senator-at-Large Baum commented that she is disturbed by the fact that new members are being added; that is, the Senate will not have all of the Senators that will be Senators in the fall, but they are being given a vote although they are not known yet. The ones that are known are the ones who are Senators right now. Names are still being added to the list of Senators, but they will never be able to be officers because the list has not been finalized, so there is a time element here. COC Chair Blanton pointed out that Senators are elected by the colleges. Parliamentarian Cissna commented that the Senate is allowed to fill vacancies without colleges having elections. Secretary Terry clarified that that the new Senate does not start until contracts start which is August 7. Graduate Council Chair Strange asked Past President Barber if there is a precedent in which the Senate has elected someone, ever, who is rotating off? The answer was “no.” CTIR Chair Gill restated his motion as the Faculty Senate Executive Committee make determination with respect to eligibility of officers and what is meant by elected. The motion was seconded and unanimously passed.

Secretary Terry made the motion that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee approves Senator Huntington Potter as Vice President, Senator Sang-Hie Lee as Secretary, Senator Arthur Shapiro as Sergeant-at-Arms, and Senator David Shapiro as Senator-at-Large for the 2010-2011 USF Tampa Faculty Senate officers. He requested that these officers be appointed as this is a non-contested election. The motion was seconded. Parliamentarian Cissna clarified that this slate of candidates could be approved because they are running unopposed.

Secretary Terry added that he will inform Senator Gibbons that his nomination for Vice President was brought to the SEC for discussion, and it was ruled that he was not eligible.
b. Technology Fee Proposal through Council on Technology for Instruction and Research – Grandon Gill/Tapas Das

Associate Provost Das prefaced the discussion by stating that faculty reviews were received last year on the technology fee proposals. Recently, when Vice President Michael Pearce attended an Associate Dean’s meeting and explained how technology fees were collected, reviewed and awarded there were comments that there was not enough faculty involvement in the process. Associate Provost Das would like to ensure that there is faculty involvement on these resources so that this challenge does not happen again. He added that Dr. Pearce would be willing to attend a Faculty Senate meeting to discuss the technology fee process.

As Chair of CTIR, Grandon Gill sits on the Information Technology Management Council (ITMC) which is the group that goes through all the proposals to review, prioritize, and make recommendations to Dr. Pearce who will make the ultimate decision. The question was whether to involve the CTIR in reviewing all these proposals. Dr. Gill’s recommendation is that the current system is working. Vice President Whiteford commented that at the Associate Dean’s meeting, where this topic came up, they wanted an opportunity to have a larger voice not necessarily with all of the proposals, but with the whole review process. In addition, the Council of Associate Deans will be sending something forward to Dr. Pearce asking for consideration of the process.

President Branch summarized there is a recommendation that the current process is working, and the suggestion that additional attempts be made to make sure that faculty have input on the subset that they want. He added that Dr. Gill is a voting member of the ITMC for which President Branch gives credit to Dr. Pearce. He also applauds the Provost who has invited the Faculty Senate Presidents from the various USF separately accredited components to sit on the Academic Affairs Management Council, and it operates by consensus so the issue of voting membership is mute. President Branch will take Dr. Pearce up on his suggestion to report to the Faculty Senate on this aspect.

Dr. Gill added that he has proposed in the past to the ITMC that if one takes a look at the criteria for the use of the technology fee as it now stands is virtually impossible for an individual faculty member, or even a small group of faculty members, to propose something that actually meets the criteria. His suggestion as a possibility for future cycles is that they allocate a certain percentage of funding for pilot projects of the sort that faculty members could propose and have those projects go through a separate process. If such a project is started, the CTIR could prioritize those pilot projects. Right now, the interpretation of the statues is such that it would require approval by the students, faculty and the administration. He suspects that such approval would not be difficult to get because the students have been very reasonable and very action-oriented throughout this whole process. Associate Provost Das added that such a proposal would have to be approved by the ITMC. Although he is in favor of such a proposal, the proposals that have now been submitted and are ready for review should be looked at by a faculty group to determine which ones involve faculty and provide a review.
President Branch reiterated the discussion as follows: Dr. Pearce to attend a Faculty Senate meeting to review the process; there is a plea that more faculty get involved in the review process; CTIR will continue the opportunity for screening and distribution to interested individuals.

c. **USF Policy 0-207 – Public Communication – Emanuel Donchin**

As chair of the Council on Educational Policy and Issues (CEPI), Chair Donchin presented an issue from CEPI on USF Policy 0-207 – Public Communication. Copies were made available prior to today’s meeting, as well as distributed. The issue focused upon was the first sentence addresses that faculty are welcome to respond to media requests to discuss matters that are within their “area of expertise.” At the end of that paragraph is the statement that faculty are not to represent themselves as speaking for the university. As the administrator responsible for Policy 0-207, Vice President Michael Hoad met with CEPI. The first sentence was added into the policy because he wants to encourage faculty to be responsive to media requests. CEPI Chair Donchin pointed out that the problem is that in the past some people who have made controversial statements have gotten into trouble because they are accused of speaking outside their area of expertise. CEPI does not want this to be an issue at USF. CEPI, with agreement from Dr. Hoad, stated an interpretation that said that the faculty member is the sole judge of what is within his/her area of expertise. Dr. Hoad also agreed that a faculty member cannot be blamed if interviewers, either in the press or in the media, imply that the faculty member represents the university, merely because the individual holds the title of a professor at the university. As long as faculty members do not claim to be official spokespersons for the university, they cannot be held responsible for errors of judgment, or reporting, by the media representatives.

CEPI felt that the proper course of action is for the Senate to endorse this position in some way so that it is in the record if ever the issue arises. To change the wording of the policy is so complicated and cumbersome CEPI felt it was not necessary, but if the SEC and the Senate endorses the sentiment in this statement then it would be part of the record. CEPI Chair Donchin made the motion that the SEC endorses this statement so that it is in the record. If approved, it will be presented to the Faculty Senate. The motion was seconded and discussed. Provost Wilcox raised a question regarding the statement “In those cases where an employee is asked to appear as an official representative of …” if it was relevant to state more clearly who needs to make that request? Dr. Donchin responded that the policy states that if a faculty member is invited to speak for the university, it is to be cleared by the Office of Public Relations. There being no further discussion, the motion was unanimously passed to approve this endorsement and present it to the Faculty Senate.

d. **Language Regarding Instructors in Board of Trustees MOU – Emanuel Donchin**

CEPI Chair Donchin prefaced the discussion by stating that this item arose as part of the instructor’s promotion criteria which CEPI was charged with considering. CEPI was invited to attend a conference call of the Board of Trustees (BOT) to approve the final
version, after which it was negotiated with the union. The BOT web page explains the policy. The language used was bothersome to CEPI, particularly the final sentence of the following paragraph:

"...The MOU requires budget and resource allocations to fund increases in salaries and benefits. This career path in promotions for Instructors will help the University to recruit the nation's best who wish to devote all or the greater part of their career to instruction and not research. Instructors help the University keep its status as a Research Intensive Institution and advance the University towards its strategic goals by carrying the heavy load in teaching and thus allowing the best researchers to devote more time to research...."

The following excerpt is from the letter submitted by Dr. Donchin to President Branch regarding CEPI’s comments and recommendation regarding the last part of this paragraph:

The philosophy articulated in the quoted paragraph may be interpreted as implying that teaching is a task of secondary importance and that we need to shelter our "best scholars" from instructional roles. This is a philosophy that seems to be inconsistent with USF's strategic goals which have us aspire to the status of a major research university. It has been the basic assumption in Research Universities that active participation in the creation of knowledge, at the cutting edge of each discipline, is necessary to assure quality instruction at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

CEPI discussed the language quoted above from the BOT web site, and would like to suggest that the SEC, and perhaps the Faculty Senate, recommend to the Provost that a formulation much more consistent with USF's Strategic Goals, and responsibilities, would read as follows....

"...The MOU requires budget and resource allocations to fund increases in salaries and benefits. This career path in promotions for Instructors will help the University keep its status as a Research Intensive Institution and advance the University towards its strategic goals by carrying the heavy load in teaching and thus allowing the best researchers to devote more time to research. Instructors provide a significant contribution to the instruction offered by the University and help the University to execute its instructional mission, given the inadequate number of tenure track faculty relative to our undergraduate, and graduate, enrollment.

A motion was made and seconded to approve this recommended change. Discussion was held. President Branch proposed a friendly amendment and a change in focus. He recommended this go through the SEC and then the Faculty Senate which would make a request that the BOT statement be changed to reflect this. The friendly amendment was to delete the last phrase of the proposed sentence “... given the inadequate number of tenure track faculty relative to our undergraduate, and graduate, enrollment.” CEPI Chair
Donchin accepted the friendly amendment. Provost Wilcox asked for what purpose this action is being taken? The action has already been taken by President Branch as a Trustee, but this language was not included even though it was part of the instructions or the introduction to the action presented. Provost Wilcox clarified that this language does not appear in the document that was approved. President Branch confirmed that this language came from CEPI after the document was approved. Provost Wilcox continued that the purpose of the proposed action is to go on record with the statement of principle, to add some clarification. CEPI Chair Donchin responded that the statement was made publicly and some reaction is appropriate. That is why this is to be recorded as a statement of principle and be made part of the record. Provost Wilcox commented that the substance of what is being suggested is not altogether right, and he hoped everyone recognized there is a good reason why there is a particular mix in instructional “work force” in a research university environment.

In the interest of time, President Branch asked the group to consider the proposal that the SEC, and subsequently the Faculty Senate, make this a statement of clarification on the policy adopted by the BOT. Parliamentarian Cissna clarified given that this no longer appears on the BOT web site and not a publically accessible document any longer, and given that President Branch has already spoken to this and gone on the record in writing about this issue, it seems that the Faculty Senate has taken care of this. President Branch commented that he did his actions on behest of the chair of CEPI, who at that time, had not had an opportunity to get full concurrence with all of the CEPI members. There was a call to question. President Branch will make available the counterpoints; a copy of the clarification comments will be sent to the SEC. The motion was unanimously passed.

OLD BUSINESS

a. Review of Proposed Articles IV-VIII of Bylaws – Paul Terry

Secretary Terry pointed out that the remaining articles of the Bylaws are formality. Due to the fact that there were some issues of specificity, review of the proposed Articles IV – VIII was tabled until a future meeting.

REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT
LAURENCE BRANCH

President Branch reminded everyone that the SEC has lunch with Provost Wilcox on Monday, April 19, at 11:30 a.m.

REPORT FROM PROVOST RALPH WILCOX

Provost Wilcox distributed copies of an article from The Chronicle: AAUP Faculty Salary Survey. Improvement for USF has been witnessed from year to year.
Budgetary Report

The Provost outlined what is going to guide institutional actions for the Tampa campus:

- stay the course strategically through discipline and focus on what is moving USF forward;
- freeze and manage enrollments by driving the size of the faculty cohort larger while managing enrollment; and
- compliance with SACS standards and principles at the 60 percent threshold.

The budget scenario for the upcoming year at this time looks as if the Legislature is moving toward the Senate budget proposal that provides for a 6 percent base budget reduction, with about 100 million dollars of that reinvested into the universities or into high need areas as defined by the Legislature. The rest of the loss will be offset by a 15 percent undergraduate tuition increase, 8 percent which has been built into the budgets of both the Senate and the House for the coming year, assuming that the Governor will approve it. All campuses will be asked to increase tuition 15 percent.

The bigger concern for the Provost is next year when all projections suggest a growth in revenue collection between 3 to 5 percent, but expenditures are climbing much faster. In addition, it is expected that 23 million dollars in economic stimulus funding will be lost. The plan for the coming year to ensure that instructional needs are met will be done by hiring instructors instead of tenured or tenure earning faculty as done in the past two years. A shift in balance will most likely be seen between tenured and tenure earning faculty and other full-time non-tenure earning faculty. The Provost pointed out it has nothing to do with any long-term plan to undo tenure; it has everything to do with a commitment to meet the needs of students. USF has a responsibility to hold in reserve as much recurring funds as possible in anticipation of some tough times in the foreseeable future. USF is the only public research university in the State of Florida that has been able to avoid the lay-off of tenured and tenure earning faculty, furloughs, and the closing down of academic programs. These commitments hold for both the Provost and President Genshaft, but are contingent upon what happens in the coming months.

The Provost clarified a message sent to the deans that as instructors are hired, they will be expected to carry a four-four teaching load or equivalent. In addition, in the case of tenured faculty there should be no assurance of a reduction in instructional load, but that will be left to the discretion of the department chairs and deans based upon demonstrable, scholarly research productivity in years past, not in a single year. It is time for tenured faculty to pick up a higher responsibility, or load, when it comes to instruction. Deans will be held accountable. Due to the fiscal autonomy afforded the regional campuses, they are not being held accountable for duplicating these actions.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.
ADDENDUM
Outstanding Items
Senate Executive Committee Meeting

1. Committee on Faculty Issues, along with CEPI Chair Donchin, to re-examine Emeritus policy (09/03/08 SEC Meeting).

2. Formal procedures for creating a logo – Michael Barber (09/03/08 SEC Meeting).

3. Role of adjuncts at a research university to be pursued by CEPI (10/01/08 SEC Meeting).

4. Status of graduate teaching awards from Graduate Council – James Strange (10/01/08 SEC Meeting).

5. Report from Provost Wilcox on regional campus accountability (02/04/09 SEC Meeting).


7. Discussion of recent revisions to Bylaws and Constitution – Michael Barnett (06/03/09 SEC Meeting; 09/09/09 SEC Meeting; 10/07/09 SEC Meeting; 11/04/09 SEC Meeting; 01/13/10 SEC Meeting; 02/10/10 SEC Meeting; 03/17/10 SEC Meeting)

8. Request of Provost Office for credentials of faculty teaching summer school – Steve Permuth (06/03/09 SEC Meeting).

9. Request of Provost Office for quantification of summer school class sizes – Steve Permuth (06/03/09 SEC Meeting).

10. Feedback from Graduate and Undergraduate Councils on mechanism for dialogue between faculty, students and administration on changing the type of course offerings available – James Strange and Michael Le Van (06/03/09 SEC Meeting).

11. Feedback on approval for existing courses that are changed into on-line courses – James Strange and Michael Le Van (06/03/09 SEC Meeting).

12. Change in policy review process – invite either a member of Office of the General Counsel or Vice President Kathleen Moore to a meeting (06/03/09 SEC Meeting).

13. Status of funding for Publications Council – Ralph Wilcox (07/01/09 SEC Meeting)

14. Decision regarding display case (07/01/09 SEC Meeting)

15. Feedback from Office of General Counsel on issue of privacy and SafeAssign – Michael LeVan (10/07/09 SEC Meeting)
16. Request to President Genshaft that Steve Permut h be added as a member of group discussing the USF System – Larry Branch (10/07/09 SEC Meeting)

17. Request for Provost to report on the areas in which USF is excelling/lagging with regards to doctoral degree productivity and competing for students (11/04/09 SEC Meeting).

18. Feedback from CFI on draft definition of faculty statement – Paul Terry (11/04/09 SEC Meeting)

19. Timeline from General Counsel Steve Prevaux for revision of Post-Retirement Policy #0-614 – Emanuel Donchin (12/02/09 SEC Meeting)

20. Creation of ad hoc committee to prepare a Faculty Senate response to Article 13, Layoff and Recall – Laurence Branch (12/02/09 SEC Meeting)

21. Names of 10 Senators sent to Provost Wilcox for consideration of membership on ad hoc committee on Promotion and Tenure – Laurence Branch (12/02/09 SEC Meeting)

22. Strategic Performance Update Report to Faculty Senate – Graham Tobin (12/02/09 SEC Meeting)

23. Report from Graduate Council Chair Jim Strange on Craig Knight issue (01/13/10 SEC Meeting; update 02-10-10 SEC Meeting; update 03/17/10 SEC Meeting)

24. Secretary Terry to inform Vice President nominee Michael Gibbons of SEC decision regarding his nomination (04/14/10 SEC Meeting).
Completed Items

Future discussion of the structure and ownership of the committees that report to the Faculty Senate (01/07/09 SEC Meeting; 02/10/10 SEC Meeting)

Discussion of USF System Governance Document (07/01/09 SEC Meeting; 11/04/09 SEC Meeting; to be distributed to SEC by Larry Branch for edits) 11/06/09