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The meeting was called to order at 3:02 p.m. The Minutes from the May 5, 2010 meeting were approved as corrected - title for Dr. Tobin and date of July, 2011 SEC meeting.

REPORT BY OFFICERS AND COUNCIL CHAIRS

a. Faculty Senate Nomination – Paul Terry

Secretary Terry presented a Senate nomination for Professor Barbara Spector from the College of Education to fill a two-year term effective Fall Semester 2010. A motion was made and seconded to approve her nomination. The motion unanimously passed and Secretary Terry will notify her of the SEC’s decision.

OLD BUSINESS

a. Appropriateness of Presentations at Faculty Senate Meetings – Steve Permuth

Vice President Permuth was not at today’s meeting; therefore, the issue will be discussed at the July meeting.

b. Review of Proposed Articles V-VIII of Bylaws – Paul Terry

Parliamentarian Ken Cissna reminded the SEC that Article V. Resolutions was adopted last year as policy by the Faculty Senate. However, President Branch recommended adding to the first sentence of Article V. “The Faculty Senate may declare its position on a matter within its jurisdiction through a Faculty Senate Resolution (FSR).” Vice President-elect Huntington Potter pointed out that the word “year” was omitted in the last line of Article V. D. Resolution Voting. The correct wording should be “… to be reintroduced for one calendar year from the date of its vote.” A motion was made and seconded to accept these revisions. The motion unanimously passed. Past President
Michael Barber asked for clarification on the phrase “by no less than two-thirds vote.” Parliamentarian Cisna replied the deciding factor was the number of members present at the time of the vote; unless stated otherwise, a vote is the majority. There was a call to question. A motion was made and seconded to approve Articles VI. through VIII. of the Bylaws. The motion unanimously passed.

Prior to today’s meeting, President Branch sent an e-mail message to the SEC members with the following additional suggestions for revisions to both the Bylaws and the Constitution:

**Bylaws**

1. Add “Tampa” to the title.

2. Add the following phrase before Article I: Throughout this document references to “Faculty Senate” or “Faculty Senator” or “Senate Executive Committee” refer to “University of South Florida Tampa Faculty Senate” or “University of South Florida Tampa Faculty Senator” or “University of South Florida Tampa Senate Executive Committee.”

3. Article I. C. Officers of the Faculty Senate
   a. add a line to the first paragraph stating that an officer shall serve no more than “x” successive terms (to be discussed by the SEC)
   b. delete f. under 1. President changing current g. and h. to f. and g.

4. Article II. Meetings of the Faculty Senate
   Add D. Function – The Faculty Senate is the primary faculty advisory body to the University of South Florida Tampa President, Provost, and Vice President for Health on all matters that pertain to the academic climate of the university.

5. Article III. B. Faculty Councils
   a. Correct punctuation in third paragraph, fifth sentence, as follows:
      …Committee on Committees, which shall consult with the Provost, the Faculty Senate, by majority vote, will appoint members from . . .
   b. add to each of the ten council descriptors the following phrase:
      CEPI advises the Provost or designee and the Vice President for Health or designee on matters that . . .

A motion was made and seconded to accept these suggestions. Discussion was held. A friendly amendment was made that the Function of the Faculty Senate be added as a stand alone statement toward the beginning of the Bylaws document instead of under the article on meetings. President Branch accepted this friendly amendment. He will confer
with Secretary Terry on where it should be included. The basic Function of the Faculty Senate should be added to both the Bylaws and the Constitution. A discussion of whether or not to have term limits for officers and differential term limits for different officers will be discussed at the next SEC meeting. There was a call for the vote. The motion unanimously passed.

Secretary Terry clarified that at the July meeting all of the changes to the Bylaws which were approved today will be incorporated into the document. Everyone should review the document once more for any additional changes to be made at the July meeting. According to the Constitution, the Faculty Senate needs thirty days to review. Both revised versions of the Bylaws and Constitution will be sent to the Senators early August for review.

NEW BUSINESS

a. **USF System Faculty Council Charter**

President Branch provided background on this topic by stating that Provost Wilcox has been given the task as part of the evolution of the system to get together a Faculty Council, a Faculty Senate or some body that represents the four to-be separately accredited institutions. Meetings have been convened at which the four Faculty Senate Presidents and the Provost have attended to discuss this issue. Although there was initial confusion on the timeline and basic structure, the group is back on track and on schedule. An entity that has approximately eighteen members is to be up and operating by July 1, 2010, however, questions pertaining to the proportion have yet to be answered. By August 6 that group could elect their two officers (President and Vice President), and the President of the USF System Faculty Council would be the faculty BOT member for the following duration for a term of one or more years.

CEPI Chair Emanuel Donchin stated that this body needs to be clarified. Is it a substitute for the Faculty Senate that will be providing advice to the administration on educational matters? Or, is it a body that is to deal with intercampus issues? Taking the responsibility for moving this conversation forward, Provost Wilcox commented he did so because he felt it was essential that faculty of the USF System be provided a meaningful voice at a time when the System has been evolving at light speed. President Branch thanked the Provost for recognizing the vacuum and stepping in to look out for the faculty.

Provost Wilcox pointed out that the one-page document called “USF System Faculty Council Charter” agreed to on June 1, 2010 by the four Faculty Senate Presidents is intended to be an interim mechanism to move the conversation forward. The notion of developing a system-wide bylaws and constitution has been clearly recognized. To answer the question as to why the rush, he offered the following explanation: (1) USF is under notice from SACS that a special report on USF System Governance has to be submitted no later than March, 2011. To ensure that faculty have a voice in shaping governance for the USF system for the months to come, he thought it best to impose the
July 1 deadline. (2) It is critical to ensure that there is a duly elected, or representative member, of the faculty serving on the BOT.

In answer to Dr. Donchin’s question as to what is the purpose of a system-wide council, the Provost answered that the role and responsibility of the group is to oversee academic and faculty matters across the USF System. Not to provide oversight at local affairs, those reside in the hands of the local faculty senates, but recognizing that 95 percent of academic policies are system-wide policies. Provost Wilcox added that the argument is quite sound in that there is a need for an appropriate system-wide faculty governance mechanism. The bulk of the work remains to be done, but it will not be done if there is not an appropriate and representative group of faculty, system-wide, in place to do so. Each campus will determine how members join the council – either elected to or appointed to, and if appointed, by whom – from the Faculty Senates. The Provost emphasized that this is meant to be an interim mechanism to shape the future of faculty governance across the USF System.

Student Government is looking at faculty governance for guidance in selecting their BOT representation. The expectation is that the faculty will lead the way and establish a model that could be replicated by Student Government across the System and, indeed, by staff groups as well.

Parliamentarian Cisna observed that the charter does not indicate this is an interim mechanism, and there is no sunset provision. He recommended that the last sentence state that this document expires on a specific date. The Provost commented he thought it was a good idea.

**NEW BUSINESS**

a. **Discussion with SACS Team on Faculty Governance-Related Items** – Stephen RiCharde and Kathleen Moore

SACS team leaders Drs. RiCharde and Moore were invited to today’s meeting to provide the SEC with a perspective of the constraints that SACS imposes upon USF as it evolves into a system. At this time, President Branch posed two questions: (1) Does it seem reasonable to the team that the USF System Vice President for Academic Affairs has no direct reports and no authority over the academic programs at the component members of the System? (2) How does USF continue to survive with SAC accreditation when there are numerous programs on the Tampa campus that do not report through the Provost?

As a way of introduction, Senior Vice Provost Dwayne Smith suggested that this might be a fruitful discussion. Both Drs. RiCharde and Moore are leaders of USF’s SACS team, and they have found themselves immersed in SACS culture. In particular, what is it that SACS is looking at, what is SACS concerned about as they come into an institution? As jumping off points, Dr. Smith distributed a document containing a map showing the region covered by SACS. The northern boundaries are Kentucky and Virginia, the western boundary is Texas, but it does not include the Panhandle or
Oklahoma and Arkansas. The only state in the SACS region that has collective bargaining at a four year institution is Florida. The second piece of information was a list just of the institutions in Florida that are covered by SACS all are currently accredited at the present time. He stated it would be worthwhile to look at the other array of institutions that have been SACS accredited. Upon review of the list, Dr. Smith saw no mention of a Faculty Senate or Faculty Council at those institutions. At this time he turned the floor over to Drs. RiCharde and Moore.

As team leader, Dr. Moore gave a general sense of what the team thinks SACS wants of USF and the USF System and then opened the floor to questions. What SACS mostly asks is what it calls integrity. Integrity is about being true to one’s own institutional self. SACS accredits institutions and not systems, so the USF System will never be accredited by SACS. The institutions within the System ultimately will all be accredited by SACS. Integrity as defined by SACS is about defining the institutional mission, meeting the mission, establishing the policies, procedures, processes and functions that are necessary to meet the mission, and being in compliance with an institution’s own policies, procedures, rules and regulations. There are only a few very rare instances in which SACS actually mandates the content of policy or procedure. One of those is faculty credentialing where there are very specific expectations.

According to the SACS manual, “Principles of Accreditation,” the core requirements which are necessary for accreditation and the comprehensive requirements which support the core requirements and are not totally necessary for maintaining accreditation in that there can be non-compliance that can subsequently be rectified. The standards state that the institution must have a policy on XYZ, so the institution decides what the content of that policy is, and the institution’s obligation is to be in compliance with its own policy. For the most part, SACS is telling USF that it is free to define itself. If that definition meets the SACS criteria, in terms of falling within the SACS scope of accreditation, and USF is internally consistent with what it says it does and who it says it is, then the likelihood is that SACS is not going to have any problems of the details of how that is being brought about within the institution.

The major concern of all accrediting associations is the student and the educational experience that the institution delivers to them. SACS sees the faculty as the mechanism by which that quality educational experience is delivered to students. That is why most of the standards are about students, how they are served, how they are instructed, how their learning is measured, the effectiveness of the instruction, and how students are dealt with if there are problems and issues. SACS concern about faculty credentialing is because it wants to make sure the instruction being delivered to students is of quality. SACS standards represent concerns of the U.S. Department of Education which looks at how the institution is living up to the public interest, because there is public money in both public and private institutions. There is an interest in making sure that those resources are being expended on a quality product; that is, looking out for the public interests. Dr. Moore pointed out that SACS is a membership association. Therefore, in theory, USF’s relationship with SACS is voluntary. The majority of the members are not like USF. They are small colleges, many of which are private or religious. The mode of
SACS tends toward the small, private, undergraduate college making it sometimes difficult for an institution like USF to fit itself into those standards.

The Governance Special Report Work Group is working on a fifth year interim report for SACS, anticipating reaffirmation in 2015. This interim report is to address how USF has evolved as a system and that it has developed properties, policies, procedures and organizational structures that would reflect it. Therefore, the work group is pulling together all of the information that makes the USF System viable in terms of its relationships with its member institutions. The report will be turned in early 2011.

President Branch asked what the organizational chart will look like for the System. He is concerned that as a System, the USF System Vice President for Academic Affairs does not seem to have authority or the responsibility that is given to that position to manage the quality of education. Dr. RiCharde replied that from a SACS perspective does USF have consistent policies and does it consistently follow them? The burden is not to conform to a specific type of system, but whether or not an institution is in compliance with its own policies. An institution gets on a register with an organization such as SACS by conforming to certain regulations of the Department of Education which are the fourteen requirements that will be reported on in the interim report. SACS wants consistent policies and evidence that the institution is following those policies. Dr. RiCharde reiterated that SACS does not accredit systems, only individual institutions.

Provost Wilcox added that academic quality assurance becomes the responsibility via accredited institutions. Therefore, it is up to the separate accredited institutions to establish appropriate structures within their own institution to assure maintenance of quality. Dr. Moore explained that it is up to the regional campuses within the System to demonstrate the degree of control that those institutions have primarily, from a SACS perspective, over their own academic programs. SACS wants a separately accredited institution to have its own academic program set with the faculty of those institutions in control of the curriculum of those academic programs. SACS does expect that decisions about the curriculum will be made by the faculty, but it does not say how that would occur just that there is faculty input in those decisions. That is, does a System exist at an institution that facilitates the degree of freedom for its member institutions that SAC requires them to have?

Dr. Moore explained that all USF policies are currently being reviewed. A determination is being made as to whether they are institutional or System policies. Eventually, there will be a set of System policies and a set of four sets of institutional polices. In some cases, these will be procedures for the implementation of policy. Policy language is being rewritten so it fits the System, and then each institution can use that policy to create a procedure that describes how that policy is implemented at that particular institution.

Parliamentarian-elect Elizabeth Bird asked if SACS does not accredit systems why is it so important to have a faculty council (which is a system council) up and running as soon as possible? Dr. Moore replied that the System, and its member institutions, has established that it is important to have that kind of faculty representation. The Provost
added that what is a SACS requirement is the special report which will address policy, procedure, and implementation. SACS is not telling USF how to do it, but to show how USF plans to do it. In addition, Dr. Moore stated that part of the issue revolves around the requirement for faculty representation on the BOT. The USF BOT is the BOT for the USF System and the BOT for each of the individually accredited institutions within that system. That seat on that System board is what drives the need for a process to raise the faculty governance to the System level.

Dr. Moore addressed Dr. Branch’s point about programs not reporting to the Provost. There are uniform policies and procedures for all academic program action, so there is full review of all new programs on all campuses.

REPORT FROM PROVOST RALPH WILCOX

Provost Wilcox reported the following items:

• Governor Crist signed the budget last week. One of the key components he vetoed was the 46 million dollars in PECO recommendations for the Polytechnic campus. The Governor did approve the 8 percent tuition, 10 million dollars in recurring operating funds for Polytechnic campus, and 6 million dollars in recurring funds for the USF School of Pharmacy. The State University System Governance Bill was approved in advance of the budget.

• The USF comprehensive campaign has raised over 350 million dollars toward its goal of 600 million dollars.

• Distributed a brochure on USF’s College of Marine Science R/V Weatherbird II research vessel which has been sent to the Gulf of Mexico to document and study the impact of the Deepwater Horizon Spill on marine life and the gulf’s ecology.

• Summer enrollment figures: up 5 percent on the Tampa campus, up 11 percent on the St. Petersburg campus, up 2 percent on the Sarasota-Manatee campus, down 3 percent on the Polytechnic campus.

• USF’s application for a Phi Beta Chapter has been turned down this year. A copy of the letter from the Society informing USF of its decision was shared with the SEC. The two biggest challenges at USF continue to be student/faculty ratio and graduation rate. Associate Vice President Graham Tobin and College of Arts and Sciences Dean Eric Eisenberg were thanked for their hard work on the application process.

• The English Language Program has been restored.

At a request from Ms. Merilyn Burke, Chair of the Publications Council, Library Council Chair Christine Probes brought up the previously reported status of the Publications Council. She commented that the Publications Council serves the quality of the institution and it needs consideration of funding.
REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE LAURENCE BRANCH

At the July 7 SEC meeting, President Branch would like to have a decision made on who the representatives will be to serve on the USF Faculty Council.

Dr. Branch was out of the country when the last ACE Workgroup meeting was held at which was discussed recommendations for tenure. Sergeant-at-Arms Arthur Shapiro attended and made a statement on behalf of the Faculty Senate concerning the process and recommendations at the USF Polytechnic campus. Dr. Branch found it helpful, and was grateful, for Dr. Shapiro to attend so that the ACE Workgroup had the opportunity to see another representative from the Faculty Senate. A copy of Dr. Shapiro’s statement was distributed to the SEC.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:25 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; 07/01/09 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; 05/05/10 SEC Meeting; 06/02/10 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 Permuth 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. Secretary Terry to inform Vice Presidential nominee Michael Gibbons of SEC decision regarding his nomination (04/14/10 SEC Meeting).

24. SEC to provide feedback on USF System Strategic Plan to Steve Permuth; Permuth to follow-up with President Branch on system issues and faculty system issues (05/05/10 SEC Meeting)

25. SEC to provide feedback on appropriate presentation topics at Senate meeting to Steve Permuth for discussion at June 2, 2010 meeting (05/05/10 SEC Meeting; 06/02/10 SEC Meeting; 07/07/10 SEC Meeting)

26. Final review of Bylaws and Constitution (06/02/10, 07/07/10 SEC Meetings)

27. Decision on who will serve on USF Faculty Council (06/02/10)