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President Laurence Branch called the first Faculty Senate meeting of the 2009-2010 Academic Year to order at 3:05 p.m. Before proceeding with business, he asked for a moment of silence in memory of the faculty members who had passed during the previous year: Dr. Charles Arnade, College of Arts and Sciences, September 7, 2008, and Dr. Priscilla Brewer, College of Arts and Sciences, October 6, 2008.

President Branch asked if there were any revisions to the April 22, 2009 Minutes. There being none, a motion was made and seconded to accept the Minutes as presented. The motion unanimously passed. A second request was made for any revisions to the May 6, 2009 Minutes. There were none, and a motion was made and seconded to accept the Minutes as presented. The motion unanimously passed.

REPORTS BY OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE CHAIRS

a. Status of Secretary Vacancy – Arthur Shapiro

Sergeant-at-Arms Shapiro announced that there is a vacancy on the Senate for Secretary. Nominations will be accepted until Wednesday, September 30th and can be sent to either him or the Faculty Senate Office. If needed, an election will be held at the October meeting.

c. Committee on Committees Report – Ellis Blanton

Chair Blanton announced that the deadline for receipt of nominations was September 18th and that the Committee on Committees (COC) was ready to review them. COC representatives are still needed for the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Education, and The Arts. Chair Blanton explained that the COC will send its recommendations to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) by e-mail with final recommendations to the Faculty Senate by the October meeting. The new process is an attempt to have the review early this year so that appointment letters can be sent before the end of the semester.

d. Updates from Faculty Senate Vice President Steve Permuth

Due to a family emergency, Vice President Permuth was unable to attend today’s meeting. He will give his report at the October meeting.

PROPOSAL FOR A SCHOOL OF GLOBAL SUSTAINABILITY – Linda Whiteford

Dr. Linda Whiteford, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs Strategic Initiatives, reviewed the joint project for a proposal to establish a new school at USF called a School of Global Sustainability (SGS). The presentation of the proposal was in keeping with the MOU
signed by Faculty Senate President Branch and Provost Ralph Wilcox on February 4, 2009, when major organizational restructuring of academic units is proposed by the administration. Dr. Whiteford pointed out that expectations of the Senate are: (1) assess if the process is in compliance with the MOU; (2) provide consultative feedback on the School concept; and (3) offer ideas of ways in which to strengthen the future of the School.

Per the MOU, the Faculty Senate Office will send the proposal for the SGS by e-mail to members of affected academic entities to ask for their written comments by the October Senate meeting. Vice President Permuth has been asked to coordinate any and all comments and questions pertaining to the proposal.

Discussion of the proposed SGS will take place at the October Faculty Senate meeting. A vote of compliance of the development of the school as stated in the MOU will be conducted at the November meeting. Dr. Whiteford pointed out the vote would not be on the master’s curriculum.

PRESENTATION ON THE TRAIN (The Research Administration Improvement Network) – Pearl Bigfeather

Associate Vice President Bigfeather attended today’s meeting to present to Senators the TRAIN: A Program to Enhance the Skills of Research Administrators. The TRAIN Depot website (http://www.research.usf.edu/train/depot) provides quick reference guides for each phase of the research administration process with links to detailed business process documents. A TRAIN Depot Workshop is also scheduled during the week of ResearchOne, October 5-8, 2009.

NEW BUSINESS

a. College of The Arts Appeal to Senate of Tenure Denial – Sang-Hie Lee

Senator Lee introduced colleague Professor Christopher Steele who received permission from President Branch to attend today’s meeting to make the Senate aware of a specific incident which, he believes, underscores a systemic problem stemming from the denial of granting tenure and promotion to Mr. Michael Timpson of the School of Music. His recent experience in trying to find out a reason for the denial brought to his attention that “shared governance is a sham without some meaningful degree of shared power, and if there are arenas where faculty should have the final say certainly tenure decisions would be among them.”

No discussion was held. Dr. Steele’s complete speech, with accompanying documents, is attached to the Minutes.

b. Draft Governance Document USF System

In an attempt to have a dialogue on the USF system, Faculty Senate President Branch asked President Genshaft to respond to a list of issues and concerns generated from the draft Governance Document. These included:
1) Shared governance requires faculty membership on USF System Councils;
2) Clarification of several included and missing terms will be helpful
   a. The term “Chief Academic Officer” for the system is missing;
   b. The phrase “academic planning liaison to the BOG” is used in 7a;
   c. The phrase “USF System Vice President and Provost” is used but there is not a single direct report.
   d. The term “Senior Advisor to the President” is used for Dr. Holbrook. Is that a new designation?
3) The organization charts of both the Tampa Campus and the USF System FAIL to include International Programs at all.
4) Concerning the Tampa campus, SACS guidelines seem to require that all colleges/academic programs should report directly to the Provost (which would include the colleges within USF Health, although the VP for USF Health could still have a direct report to the president for the non-academic matters of USF Health). In addition, the following offices/activities should also report directly to the Provost: student affairs; the office of research (innovation can still report directly to the president); IT; and perhaps a few others.

Sergeant-at-arms Shapiro added the perspective that the organizational chart currently has about 16 to 18 direct reports to the USF System President, and that kind of structure is unheard of in academic settings. Six or so direct reports would be more usual.

President Genshaft responded that this process needs to be fashioned for each individual institution. As to how the Senate will be affected when the other institutions are accredited remains to be seen. She added that USF will be looking at other system models, and as these documents are worked on, the Faculty Senate will stay informed.

REPORT FROM PRESIDENT JUDY GENSHAFT ON SYSTEM STRUCTURE

President Genshaft reported on the following items:

• She has been holding separate, open lunches with faculty, with staff, and with students to listen and learn of each group’s concerns and anxieties. She and Executive Vice President Wilcox will be visiting departments to get a sense of their struggles and challenges. In addition, President Genshaft will be sending messages to alumni and parents.

• A retreat centered on the discussion of the USF system structure is scheduled. Attendees will include administrators, deans, and one representative from the Faculty Senate.

• St. Petersburg’s NCATE application has been completed. There was no action to report at this time. Sarasota-Manatee campus submitted its SACS application July 1. USF Polytechnic campus will be sending in its SACS application in December.
REPORT FROM EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST RALPH WILCOX

A graph titled “USF System Resource Change” was distributed showing the different kinds of money coming in from the State.

Provost Wilcox reported that any recurring revenues would be invested in: faculty retention, continuing to grow the faculty cohort, increasing graduate student stipends in amount as well as in number, and campus infrastructure in the form of new construction and renovation.

In response to the report given by Professor Christopher Steele, Provost Wilcox commented that all tenure and promotion cases considered last year followed due process. The Task Force on Faculty Roles, Responsibilities and Rewards has been asked to look closely at the tenure and promotion process. He expects to receive any changes in policy or other recommendations in the near future.

Provost Wilcox announced that next month he expects to “ramp up” a system wide task force for student enhancement. An invitation will be extended to Faculty Senate President Branch to serve on that task force.

REPORT FROM CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF USF HEALTH STEPHEN KLASKO

Dr. Klasko reported on the newest events at USF Health:

- The start up of a Center for Advanced Learning and Simulation to assess the competency of physicians with simulators. The new center will be located downtown with a hotel connected.

- College of Public Health is celebrating its twenty-fifth year.

- Dean Patricia Burns, College of Nursing, is stepping down. A search for her replacement is being lead by College of Public Health Dean Donna Petersen.

- The Dean of Pharmacy search has been narrowed to three finalists.

- A hospital partnership is still in the process of being developed.

REPORT FROM FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT LAURENCE BRANCH

President Branch announced that United Faculty of Florida President Sherman Dorn was not at today’s meeting, but Dr. Dorn’s report has been posted in his Blackboard content collection. President Branch forwarded Dr. Dorn’s message, with links, to the Faculty Senate List before today’s meeting. He asked that everyone open and look at Dr. Dorn’s remarks.

Ms. Jennifer Belmont was introduced as the new president of Student Government. Also attending today’s meeting was Mr. Matthew Diaz, Student Senate President Pro Tempore. The
Faculty Senate Executive Committee has received from Student Government a resolution on Affordable Textbooks which will be reviewed at its next meeting.

Senators interested in obtaining information on the discretionary raises given this past year should contact Vice President Steve Permuth.

When President Branch receives e-mails asking for participation in any initiatives, he will try to match Senators with these initiatives.

Vice President Permuth, along with Senators Ellis Blanton and Arthur Shapiro, has been asked to correlate all inquiries received on the proposed SGS. Any comments and questions on the SGS should be sent to Vice President Permuth.

The USF Intercampus Faculty Council was created to provide the various campus/institutions of the University of South Florida with a voice in the governance of system-wide issues of direct concern to the faculty and to ensure, through consensus, consistency in administrative practices across USF. Members include the president/vice president of the USF Tampa Senate, and chairs of the USF St. Petersburg Faculty Senate, USF Polytechnic Faculty Governance, and USF Sarasota-Manatee Governance Association. President Branch asked that any issues and ideas pertaining to the USF system be sent to him.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m. to partake in the food and refreshments provided by Executive Vice President and Provost Wilcox. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be Wednesday, October 21, 2009.
ADDENDUM

Follow-Up Items

1. Provost Wilcox asked to provide FTE for the 2001 and 2008 benchmarks, as well as dollar support for people listed on the Institutional Growth, AY 2000/01 through AY 2008/9-Selected Measures handout (FS Mtg. 10-15-08).

2. President Branch to appoint an ad hoc committee to examine whether or not due process was followed in the dismissal of a faculty member (FS Mtg. 02-18-09). Graduate Council Chair Strange accepted the responsibility of looking into this matter.

3. Provost’s Office to look into whether a policy exists on what constitutes a dean search committee (FS Mtg. 02-18-09).

4. The CEOs of the USF Polytechnic and the Sarasota-Manatee campuses will be invited to attend a meeting of either the Senate Executive Committee or Faculty Senate to discuss organizational structures and issues that influence their campuses (FS Mtg. 02-18-09).

5. Secretary vacancy (FS Mtg. 09-23-09); filled 10-13-09.

6. COC nominations to Senate (FS Mtg. 09-23-09).

7. Vote for proposed SGS in light of MOU (FS Mtg. 09-23-09).

8. Creation of task force on student enhancement – Provost Wilcox (FS Mtg. 09-23-09); nominees sent to Provost Wilcox on 10-12-09.
First, I want to thank this body for allowing me to speak. While I will be addressing a specific incident, I believe it underscores a systemic problem. I will be mentioning a faculty member by name, and I want the senate to know that he has given me permission to do so. I also want to say that I speak for myself, not as the designated representative of any particular group.

Let me begin by quoting two lines from the University Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion. “The peer review process is the best means of judging significance and contribution of the candidate’s research/creative work.” and “Like research/creative work, it (referring to teaching) is best judged by a peer review process,” In both cases peer review is distinguished from administrative review. It is also clear that “peer review” is not synonymous with external peer review. If it were, the section on teaching would border on the nonsensical, and the use of the modifier “external” might sensibly be expected in the first use of peer, not the fourth. I do not mean to suggest that external review is not carried out by peers, simply that these are not the only or even primary peer group to be considered. That is to say they are one of a number of peer groups best qualified to make judgment.

The Tenure and Promotion application requires recommendation from six sources. Of these, three are reasonably considered peers (departmental tenured faculty, departmental tenured faculty advisory committee, and college tenure and promotion committee), three are not (chair, dean, and provost).

Last spring Michael Timpson of the School of Music was denied tenure. Let me say here that I am not a member of that school’s faculty, and that my personal contact with Mr. Timpson has been essentially nonexistent.

The tenured faculty in his school voted 16 to 2 in favor of granting tenure. The school’s 5 member tenure advisory committee voted unanimously to grant, as did the 8 member college committee. The judgment of these groups is supported by five of his six external reviews, and the dissenting letter was considered, at least by the college committee, on which I served, to be remarkably unprofessional. Both the school and college tenure committees evaluated professor Timpson’s research and teaching as outstanding. The best sources of judgment could not have made their support for granting tenure more obvious.

Administrative review proceeded with the school’s director recommending the granting of tenure, but with an outstanding evaluation only in teaching, still sufficient by USF’s criteria for the awarding of tenure. The college dean recommended denying tenure, and gave strong evaluations in all categories, applying a definition of outstanding teaching that is nowhere supported by the criteria established by the School of Music and posted on the college website. The provost recommended denying tenure. We have no way of knowing how he evaluated this or any candidate.

At least the director and dean, like the peer committees, must present a written defense of their decisions. This at least makes rebuttal possible. In the past I have argued that a chair, dean, or provost who disagrees with the peer review ought to be unusually persuasive in the defense his stance. Peer review, while the best source of judgment, is not infallible, and I believe that where an administrator is in fact more persuasive it is important that the peer committees reconsider their findings. In Michael Timpson’s case no such persuasiveness was evident. In fact, the dozen or more rebuttal letters including letters from Morten Lauridsen, National Medal of Arts
recipient, and William Bolcom, NMA recipient and Pulitzer Prize winner, draw attention to the imprecision and lack of nuance evident in the written administrative review.

Late in the spring, after the provost chose to agree with the college dean, a small group of involved faculty asked to meet with him. My hope was that he would defend his decision. Instead he offered to listen to us. I am sure this was extended graciously, but we had already spoken. The refusal to offer any explanation for his stance is, I think, a kind of arrogance, no doubt unintended but arrogance just the same.

At the meeting with the provost I was asked whether I accepted that people could have differing opinions. After a stunned moment, I answered that of course I acknowledged that opinions might differ, and that one of the ways they differ is in their merit. Surely at a university the merit of an opinion should be measured by its rationality, its nuanced understanding of the information considered, and its persuasiveness to those who are acknowledged experts in the area under consideration. The power to have unchallenged last say strikes me as a poor substitute for these standards.

While I could speak at length about the oddities surrounding Michael Timpson’s application review by our administrators, for example the suggestion that he win an award for which he is not eligible and the failure to acknowledge the significance of his receiving a Fulbright research grant, my larger concern is with what we must conclude about shared governance at USF. Six recommendations are made leading to a decision regarding tenure. Three of these are acknowledged as best sources of judgment in a document issued from the Provost’s office. In Michael Timpson’s case four of the six recommenders including all three of the best sources of judgment voted to grant tenure, and yet tenure is denied to him. It would appear that at USF “best” is not a superlative after all, and the careful deliberation of faculty can be dismissed without reasonable justification, or worse-without justification at all.

Shared governance is a sham without some meaningful degree of shared power, and if there are arenas where faculty should have the final say certainly tenure decisions would be among them. I have been at USF too long to hope for much, but as we move forward with our AAU aspirations, perhaps we should consider whether the mere presence of governance structures is sufficient to claim an adherence to the principles of shared governance. The University of Florida, which of course shares the challenge of dealing with Florida’s peculiarities, defines “shared governance” far less anemically. I would refer you to UF Board of Trustees document R03-14. In it you find the following statement, “As practiced at the leading American research universities, shared governance is a system of dual authority and responsibility…” This document goes on to recognize three levels of faculty authority, the lowest being “consultation” defined as having, and I quote, “input into the decision-making process, and especially to be informed of the nature and rationale for decisions before they are made.” Surely we can demand at least this of the provost’s office in disputed tenure cases. If not, I would ask you, why should I or any of my colleagues bother to serve on committees that simply give the illusion of shared governance?

If we are to achieve our AAU/PBK aspirations, it will take more than sleight of hand. It will take the sort of genuine investment in principles of faculty authority the University of Florida community has embraced. I have just finished a review of our application to PBK, and am asked to sign a letter that, among other things, claims that USF demonstrates a commitment to these principles. Much as I would like to see our students have this opportunity, it is even more important to me that our university exhibit a true concern for undergraduate liberal arts education, and more relevantly, at least today, that it embrace a balanced and applied structure of
shared governance. I hope that some of you have grappled with these or similar concerns and can point me to a reasoning that supports endorsement. As it stands today I am skeptical, and the events of the last six months have only made me more so.

I would like to conclude by publicly offering Michael Timpson my apology for my part in the process he has just endured. My belief that the University would not so casually dismiss its own rhetoric; I have come to see as simpleminded. I am ashamed, first for myself, but also for my university. Thank you for hearing me.
D. APPENDIX D: GRAPHIC REPRESENTATION OF AN EXAMPLE OF SHARED GOVERNANCE

[Diagram showing the proposed process of shared governance activities involving roles of Administration, Faculty, and Academic Activities, Administrative Activities, Strategic Planning, Appointment, and Provide Leadership for the Unit.]
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
RESOLUTION

Number: R03-14
Subject: Resolution on Shared Governance
Date: December 5, 2003

WHEREAS the University of Florida Faculty Senate on April 26, 2000, approved the following definition and purpose of Shared Governance for consideration for inclusion in the University of Florida Constitution:

“Shared Governance” is the participation of administrators, faculty, staff and students in the decision- and policy-making process. The purpose of shared governance is to provide avenues to University improvement and productivity through the creation of a partnership based on mutual respect and collaboration. Such shared responsibility entails working toward mutual goals established by a fully enfranchised University community and therefore collaborative participation in: a) the identification of University priorities, b) the development of policy, c) defining the University’s responsibility for ethical leadership, d) enhanced community partnerships, and e) the governance of the University as a whole.

WHEREAS President Young on May 2, 2003, gave the University community and the Joint Task Force his vision of shared governance:

As practiced at the leading American research universities, shared governance is a system of dual authority and responsibility, constitutionally created, in which certain decisions pertaining to university policy, rules, and procedures fall within the control of the faculty or an organization selected by and acting on their behalf. Decisions pertaining to academic matters such as curriculum and degrees would be an appropriate example. Decisions in other policy areas that the governing body has delegated to administrative authority, but that have substantial impact on the academic enterprise, are traditionally undertaken only after consultation with appropriate agencies of the faculty. Conversely, in making decisions
that fall within their purview, senators are obligated to seek the counsel and advice of appropriate administrative officers.

WHEREAS the Faculty Academic Advisory Committee, responsible for timely Faculty input into the development of policy in its formative state, resolved on March 6, 2003, to advise the President on identifying issues in shared governance in which the Faculty may play a larger role and to recommend future structure and process;

WHEREAS the Presidential-Faculty Senate Task Force on Shared Governance and the Committee on Senate Structure and Effectiveness have reviewed policy and practice at peer and model peer institutions (Summer/Fall, 2003); and

WHEREAS the Faculty Senate, as the representative body of the University of Florida Faculty, has asked President Young to request the Board of Trustees to agree to the principles of shared governance between Faculty and Administration at the University of Florida;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. The University of Florida Board of Trustees recognizes the principles of Shared Governance between Faculty and Administration as set forth in the Faculty Senate Resolution adopted April 26, 2000 and as elaborated upon by President Young on May 2, 2003;

2. The Board of Trustees, the President, and the Faculty through the Faculty Senate will begin to implement policies and procedures that recognize the principles of Shared Governance on three levels:

   a. **Determination**: The Board of Trustees will recognize and consider delegating to the Faculty and its representative body, the Faculty Senate, the authority to determine certain matters, which will be defined and agreed upon, relating to academic policy, including matters of curriculum and tenure and promotion policy;

   b. **Recommendation**: The Board of Trustees will recognize and consider delegating to the Faculty and its representative body, the Faculty Senate, the authority to recommend to the President certain matters and policy relating to the areas of faculty quality and welfare, planning, budget and resource allocation, research and
scholarship, and academic facilities and infrastructure. “To recommend” means to reach a decision jointly, such decision not to be overturned by the President without further discussion with the Faculty representatives and an effort to find a solution satisfactory to all members of the University of Florida;

c. **Consultation:** The Board of Trustees will formally recognize that the Faculty through the Faculty Senate will have an opportunity to **consult** with the President (or designee) on other matters connected with the priorities and policies of the University and their implementation. “To consult” is to have input into the decision-making process, and especially to be informed of the nature and rationale for decisions before they are made.

The Board of Trustees, through the President, and the Faculty, through the Faculty Senate, will begin to implement policies and procedures that require and facilitate the implementation of the principles of shared governance at all organizational levels of the university, from individual academic units upward.