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USF FACULTY SENATE MEETING

September 18, 2013
3:00 – 5:00 p.m.
Chamber Room 4200 Marshall Student Center

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of April 17, 2013 Minutes

3. Reports by Officers and Council Chairs
   a. Solicitation for Sergeant-at-Arms – Barbara Lewis (5 minutes; action item)
   b. Call for Members of Committee on Committees – Ellis Blanton (5 minutes; action item)
   c. Volunteers to Review Bylaws – Andrew Smith (5 minutes; action item)
   d. Other Committees and Initiatives – Gregory Teague, et al. (5 minutes)

4. Old Business
   a. Quality Enhancement Plan – Karla Davis-Salazar (10 minutes)
   b. Update on USF Finances & Budget – John Long, Ralph Wilcox, Nick Setteducato (20 minutes)

5. New Business
   a. Proposed T&P Guidelines/Policy – Gregory Teague, et al. (45 minutes)
   b. Homecoming – Bill McCausland (5 minutes)

6. Report from USF System President Judy Genshaft (5 minutes)

7. Report from Provost and Executive Vice President Ralph Wilcox (15 minutes)

8. Report from USF Faculty Senate President and USF System Faculty Council Vice President Gregory Teague (5 minutes)

9. Other Business from the Floor

10. Adjourn for Reception

Next scheduled meeting – October 16, 2013
USF FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
September 18, 2013

Faculty Senate President Gregory Teague called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. After welcoming everyone to a new academic year, he accepted a motion to approve the Minutes from the April 17, 2013 meeting as presented. The motion unanimously passed.

REPORTS BY OFFICERS AND COUNCIL CHAIRS

a. Solicitation for Sergeant-at-Arms – Barbara Lewis

Secretary Lewis reported that Senator Arthur Shapiro has reached his term limit as Sergeant-at-Arms. No one stepped forward during spring elections, and Secretary Lewis asked for nominations from the floor at today’s meeting. There were no nominations received, therefore, Secretary Lewis will be personally contacting perspective candidates.

b. Call for Members of Committee on Committees – Ellis Blanton

As chair of the Committee on Committees (COC), Senator Blanton explained that the COC is comprised of one Senator from each college. If there is only one Senator from a college, that individual is automatically the COC representative. The main purpose of the COC is to review council nominations and make recommendations to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and Faculty Senate to fill vacancies. The process takes place during the fall and spring semesters. The solicitation process for the fall has ended, and it is time for the COC to vet the nominations. All work is done either via e-mail or Blackboard (last semester). A current COC roster was included in today’s meeting material. Last year’s membership carried over. Chair Blanton asked that any of those Senators who did not wish to continue, should let him know. Otherwise, there are representatives needed for three colleges: Education, Engineering, and Public Health. The review process will begin next week. Interested individuals should contact either Chair Blanton or Ms. Pipkins in the Faculty Senate Office.

c. Volunteers to Review Bylaws – Andrew Smith

Parliamentarian Smith announced that it is time to begin the review of the Bylaws. At today’s meeting he solicited for at least two additional volunteers to assist him in reviewing and considering updates/revisions. It is anticipated to have the work completed by the end of the fall semester. Senator Rosemary Closson was the only volunteer.

d. Travel Management Provider – Gregory Teague

President Teague announced that USF is close to selecting a travel management company with which to negotiate to provide this service.
e. **General Education Update** – Karla Davis-Salazar

Dr. Davis-Salazar gave an update on the status of General Education:
- total number of hours was returned to 36;
- 29 prescribed courses have been identified, of which 20 are already offered as gen
ed at USF; of the remaining courses, Undergraduate Studies is working to make
sure USF offers those courses and is also looking into offering all of them online;
- final revisions and comments on the state changes due back to the state General
   Education Project Steering Committee by November 1; and
- some flexibility is being built into the process.

**OLD BUSINESS**

a. **Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)** – Karla Davis-Salazar

Dr. Davis-Salazar reported the following on the QEP:
- It needs to be submitted to SACS by February 2015.
- A steering committee was created consisting of 31 members from across the
  university (faculty, administrators, staff, students and alumni).
- It is an action plan to enhance student learning focused on a particular topic or
  area.
- Theme selected is “The Global Citizens Project” based upon (1) goal #1 of the
  strategic plan, (2) assessment data, and (3) outcomes of the 2005 QEP, which
  focused on general education and undergraduate research.
- Work is at the research phase.

Dr. Davis-Salazar emphasized that USF needs to be thinking about how it can set itself
apart in its approach to enhance student global learning. The steering committee will be
soliciting feedback on ways to do this. A web site will be developed. Comments,
questions or feedback may be sent to the e-mail account at QEP@usf.edu. Dr. Davis-
Salazar will provide updates throughout the process.

b. **Update on USF Finances and Budget** – John Long, Ralph Wilcox, Nick Setteducato

President Teague asked Mr. Long, Chief Operating Officer, to address three budget
questions: (1) How did USF get to where it is now? (2) What is the situation currently?
(3) What is the plan for USF?

Mr. Long responded that it was the “perfect storm” starting with USF spending past
reserves over several years with strategic investments, losing $45 million when the State
University System took a $300 million hit, and losing $30 million with the separation of
the Polytechnic campus. There was a strategic draw down of reserves; that is, $100
million drained in cash in 2 years. A three-year plan has been developed to protect the
university’s AA2 Moody bond rating – to reduce deficit spending, increase revenues and
restore cash reserves, and reinvest in the university (people and programs). Senator
Emanuel Donchin commented that reports should be provided by Tallahassee about how
much is being spent. President Teague asked what the timeline was. Mr. Long
responded that if things look good at the end of 3 years USF would break even and go to a cash sustaining model. The plan is to ensure academic excellence.

At this time, Provost Wilcox took the floor and directed everyone’s attention to the handout included in today’s materials which was a multi-year budget/expenditure analysis. He commented that USF has been tasked with meeting a $12 million reduction for the first year ($9 million in Academic Affairs, which represents a 3.3 percent reduction from spending last year). The Provost pointed out that these funds permanently go away.

President Genshaft added that it has been a priority to protect the academic core. She would like to see the final budget numbers go to the deans next week so that they can conduct the business that they need to do. USF needs to look at new revenue sources, such as international, out-of-state and more full-time students. USF will be asking the Legislature for funds to enhance the cybersecurity program and innovative education. In addition, USF needs to work collaboratively with federal and state agencies.

NEW BUSINESS


Before beginning his presentation, President Teague asked members of the T&P Guidelines Revision Ad Hoc Committee to have a seat at the front of the room for the purpose of interacting with the audience and to introduce themselves. President Teague gave a brief background for the need to revise the 15 year old T&P guidelines, such as the creation of the USF System and the establishment of the USF strategic plan. He explained that after a discussion between Provost Ralph Wilcox and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, a charge was created to update the T&P guidelines to focus on the substance, as well as the intent of thinking a different way about the T&P guidelines. Specifically, the committee was asked to think about how the T&P guidelines could better align with the strategic plan. The Provost also asked that there be a policy, not just guidelines.

The assumption is that the committee is trying to change practice, attempting to do so by working on the document and framing expectations for the groups that are actually working on the T&P criteria and procedures, i.e., at department and college levels. The intermediate goal is to improve those practices to achieve the desired outcomes over time. The long-term goal is to support the mission of the university in terms of long-term gains in scholarship, teaching, and service. Rather than start from scratch, the committee began with the current set of guidelines with the assumption that it would also abstract from those guidelines some key elements to become part of a policy; that there will also need to be some other documentation to help elaborate what is written in the guidelines. To date, the focus has been on the guidelines and the committee expects to work on the other pieces in the near future. At this time, President Teague briefly addressed proposed changes to the language regarding Criteria.
He added that one of the committee recommendations is that for promotion to Full, candidates be outstanding in both teaching and research, but that, recognizing teaching is an evolving art and skill, perhaps expecting attainment of that level before tenure would be too much – hence requiring at least strong. The committee also considered whether or not to keep the language the same as it has been for the annual evaluation; there is currently the same scoring system for annual evaluations and for tenure and promotion. The committee may decide to stay with the same language, but department and colleges would be asked to define just what they mean by outstanding, which could vary by rank, and certainly across organizational settings or unit.

At this time, Senator Steve Permuth addressed additional criteria, such as taking the categories of teaching, research and service and looking at the strategic goals of the university. If there is going to be an informative view it will be to look at those as a matrix. It would be important to look at how things would combine and mix with each other. He then briefly addressed some of the changes in preparing the application, evaluating and presenting the evidence, and conducting independent reviews and making a well-rounded, compelling case and asking for recommendations. Senator Permuth emphasized that the approach is to take a look at the strategic goals of the university and consider their relationship to teaching, research and service. He added that there should be a review of the policy at the same time as the strategic plan so that tenure and promotion instrumentation follows the establishment of new strategic goals. But the guidelines statement can be exactly the same; it is the new strategic goals that get may vary over time.

Senator Permuth addressed assumptions about whether or not there will be grandfathering in with the new guidelines. There is no universal grandfathering. However, development of T&P criteria is a collaborative process, and there are contractual rights involved with a mechanism in which the administration must meet, or consult with, the USF Chapter of the United Faculty of Florida and talk about modification of criteria and when those criteria might become in affect. If there is agreement, new criteria can be effective starting with whatever date they agree. If there is not an agreement, the university has the power to establish those modifications with a delay of one year.

In looking across campus at how the tenure and promotion process is being handled, everyone is doing things different ways. The document contains a statement favoring a similarity in procedural structures across colleges. This will require some colleges to consider changes.

President Teague then addressed the length of the probationary period. There has been a move across the country to move away from a universal requirement to apply for tenure in the 6th year. This committee is recommending that USF do what the University of Florida and the University of Michigan are doing, which is to allow colleges to set their own probationary period. At the same time, the committee is recommending that a candidate could go up for review whenever he/she is ready. This could be viewed as a
recruitment advantage, and also a reasonable approach from an investment point of view by investing in faculty.

There seems to be a bimodal view of opinion on external review letters – on the one side, a strong feeling that they should be invisible to the candidates in order to be more successful in recruiting reviewers and end up with credible reviews; on the other side, there is the point of view that the candidate has the right to understand what evidence is being brought against him/her for the purpose of self-defense or at least comment. This committee has recommended that the names can be redacted by instructing the letter-writers to minimize the chance of detection of who they are.

Other committee recommendations:  • That some, not all, of the outside reviewers be from AAU institutions.  • That progress toward either promotion or tenure be specifically addressed in annual evaluations.  • That there be an explicit, comprehensive post-tenure review in terms of advancing to the next level.  • That the application process be electronic.  • That there be a requirement of periodic review of the guidelines.

To accompany the guidelines, there will need to be an additional guidance document having a number of pieces to try and elaborate in order to help people to understand the logic behind what is being recommended. This will be part of future committee discussions. The T&P Guidelines Revision Committee will have many discussions with the USF community and with other institutional components, get feedback (one e.g.: not enough said in the current draft about undergraduate research), produce drafts of the policy and guidance, form a subcommittee (including new people) to work on the digital application process, fine-tune the guidelines with discussion over the next couple of months, have a vote in the Senate of that draft, and deliver the products to the Provost and the Senior Vice President for USF Health by December. After that there will be the promulgation process, which will need the approval of the Board of Trustees due to the regulations being impacted, make the transition to electronic process and determine timing and eligibility.

Comments from members of the T&P Committee

Senator Harwood commented that in terms of moving forward once the guidelines have been established, is a need for workshops so that everyone can understand the process. The university has the opportunity to reinvent its expectations and put them into the context of reality and make this a cohesive effort.

Comments from the Floor

Senator Robert Welker commented about the outside reviewers and the suggestion that if there is a disagreement/dispute each party will pick one-half; the person under review picks two people, the chair picks two people. He views this as a problem if the department says that the person under review cannot know whether a person writing a letter is an enemy. If there has to be an unanimous agreement from the chair and the person to review about who the reviewers are, there might be less of a problem if the
person to review did not know who wrote the review, but when you give the chair the possibility of picking two people that are not agreeable to the person under review, and don’t the person under review know which of those four people who wrote the review, that is a problem.

Senator Emanuel Donchin – It was decided some time ago that it would be recommended to the candidate that they waive the right to any information from the letters. It is standard operating procedures at the University of Florida that every department chair is required to recommend to the candidate that they waive the right to read the letters, and we do not want to be prevented from doing that. Another issue was that tenure is not a reward for past achievements. He endorses the committee’s decision about teaching being tied to the evaluation. A third issue he was with tenure and promotion packets. The real problem is that USF requires that at every level of the promotion packet there has to be an evaluation of content.

Senator Welker – Suggested adding that there should be no significant relationship of reviewers to the chair.

Clarification was given that a reviewer cannot have been a co-author.

The earliest the new standards would be put into place is 2015/16 or earlier, depending upon the UFF contract.

The question was raised as to why the university-wide advisory committee was included and why it was chosen to be advisory. President Teague responded that it seemed to resolve a number of concerns, such as dispelling concern that there had been some kind of arbitrary action taken in the final stage. Senator Permuth commented that the issue becomes, at what point does the Provost share full information in regards to what happened and what has not happened. There is enough information to suggest that, when it comes time for a negative decision after a number of positives coming up, the assumption that the Provost makes a unilateral decision without checking with anybody appears to be erroneous. There is a lot of checking with a lot of people. Including an this committee is just one attempt to be fairer, to have an opportunity for another group that is advisory. This becomes advisory to the Provost and could be one way to try to dispel rumors of what is happening. The committee would make a recommendation but not a decision. The final decisions rest with the President of the university.

Provost Wilcox commended the committee for the remarkable job it has done. He pointed out that the document is not final and the responsibility rests on the shoulders of each Senator to take this document back for a lively conversation among their constituent groups and provide feedback and suggestions back to the Senate ad hoc committee.

Instead of the committee providing a summary of changes, Provost Wilcox encouraged the faculty to read the current document and then read the draft document. He urged to avoid a tabular representation of the document and that every faculty should do his/her due diligence at this point by reading the document and knowing it inside-out.
President Teague announced that the ad hoc committee will continue its work. Town Hall meetings will also be scheduled.

b. **Homecoming** – William McCausland

Mr. McCausland, Associate Vice President for University Advancement, attended today’s meeting to create awareness and ask for support from the Senate on ways to evolve Homecoming; that is, how to increase the Homecoming presence on campus. Nine colleges have plans to have some type of event where they are welcoming back alumni. October 20-26 is Homecoming Week and Mr. McCausland asked that the students have a lighter week as far as homework so they can be involved in the activities. Senators were asked to spread the word and to participate.

**REPORT FROM PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT RALPH WILCOX**

The Provost’s report consisted of the following items:

1. Announced a transformation summer school budget model has been created. Senator James Garey, from the College of Arts and Sciences, is a member of that committee.

2. Made an appeal to the faculty that USF undergraduate and some graduate students who are applying for national awards are having difficulty in getting letters of references from faculty. Faculty need to take the message back to their departments that they are here due to the success of students. Any suggestions and/or ideas may be sent directly to the Provost.

3. USF received $2.6 million in performance-based funding, topping other schools on a list of three metrics. The measurements were (1) percentage of graduates who were employed 1 year after graduation, (2) average full-time wages of undergraduates employed 1 year after graduation, and (3) cost to the institution per undergraduate.

**REPORT FROM USF FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT AND USF SYSTEM FACULTY COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT GREGORY TEAGUE**

President Teague commented that this body is the representative body for the faculty with the administration and it is important that it represent with diligence all colleges in this process. Any connection Senators can make with college governance groups will be valuable. It is incumbent upon the Faculty Senate to invite and optimize communication.

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