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1. Call to Order

2. Approval of September 18, 2013 Minutes

3. Reports by Officers and Council Chairs (20 minutes)
   a. Approval of Senate Nominations – Barbara Lewis (action item)
   b. Sergeant-at-Arms Position – Barbara Lewis (action item)
   c. Recommendations from Committee on Committees – Ellis Blanton (action item)
   d. Honorary Degree Recommendation – Marzenna Wiranowska (action item)
   e. Other Committees and Initiatives – Gregory Teague, et al.

4. Old Business
   a. Update on Quality Enhancement Plan – Karla Davis-Salazar (10 minutes)
   b. Proposed T&P Guidelines/Policy – Gregory Teague and committee (40 minutes)

5. New Business
   a. Innovative Education Initiatives – Ralph Wilcox (10 minutes)

6. Report from USF System President Judy Genshaft (15 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

Next scheduled meeting – November 13, 2013
Faculty Senate President Gregory Teague called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. He accepted a motion to approve the Minutes from the September 18, 2013 meeting as presented. The motion unanimously passed.

REPORTS BY OFFICERS AND COUNCIL CHAIRS

a. Approval of Senate Nominations – Barbara Lewis

Secretary Lewis announced the receipt of the following nominations from: Dr. Jennifer Collins (CAS) to fill a one-year vacancy, Professors Marilyn Bertch and Fanni Green to fill three year vacancies in CoTA. The three nominations came to the Senate with a motion to approve. The motion was seconded and unanimously passed.

b. Sergeant-at-Arms Position – Barbara Lewis

Senator Scott Rimbey (CAS) volunteered to serve as Sergeant-at-Arms for the remainder of the academic year. Secretary Lewis asked that the Senate suspend the rules and not require a written ballot. A motion was made, seconded and unanimously passed to suspend the rules. A motion was made and seconded to elect Senator Rimbey as Sergeant-at-Arms. The motion unanimously passed.

c. Recommendations from Committee on Committees – Ellis Blanton

On behalf of the Committee on Committees (COC), Chair Blanton presented twenty-six nominations to fill vacancies on Faculty Senate Standing Councils. The nominations were approved by the Senate Executive Committee at its October 2 meeting and came to the Faculty Senate with a motion to approve. The motion was seconded and passed with 1 abstention.

d. Honorary Degree Recommendation – Marzenna Wiranowska

Chair Wiranowska announced that the Honors and Awards Council (HAC) received one nomination this semester for consideration of an Honorary Doctorate of Science for Dr. Richard Zare. The nomination was submitted by the Department of Chemistry, College of Arts and Sciences. On behalf of the HAC, Chair Wiranowska presented Dr. Zare’s nomination to the Senate with the recommendation that it be approved. A motion was made and seconded to forward his nomination to President Judy Genshaft. There was no discussion of the nomination and the motion unanimously passed.

c. Other Committees and Initiatives – Gregory Teague

1. On-line Student Evaluation

Senator Cynthia Patterson is chair of this Faculty Senate ad hoc committee for 2013-14. Now that the process has been used, there are priorities to address. Although the response rates were slightly down from the previous pilot, they were considered high for implementing this type of system. Issues the committee will be addressing include: appropriate ways to incentivize response rates, have
recommendations go back to the faculty, and expanding the evaluation to include
dissertation/MA courses which would be lumped together to protect the
anonymity of student responses. Any comments should be sent to Senator
Patterson (cpatterson@usf.edu).

2. **Travel Management**
   A company has been selected to consolidate travel services on campus. The new
process will take effect in January, 2014. President Teague clarified that it is not
a call-in operation. The committee worked on a business model that included
contemporary methodologies (internet, etc.).

**OLD BUSINESS**

a. **Update on Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) – Karla Davis-Salazar**
   Dr. Davis-Salazar announced that the QEP web site (http://usf.edu/qep), along with a
   survey, will go live on Friday, October 18. The website contains the steps the committee
   has been working on. Additional sections will be added. Information will be posted to
   the goals link. The university community will now be able to submit feedback about the
   QEP. It is important that everybody and anybody participate in the process because from
   a SACS perspective, the university needs to demonstrate participation from a broad base.
   An e-mail will go out with the web link to the survey. Regular updates will be provided.

b. **Proposed T&P Guidelines/Policy – Gregory Teague and Committee Members**
   Although there was a previous presentation of the T&P guidelines, President Teague
   pointed out that this meeting would be the opportunity for discussion at what is for the
   Senate the mid-point between first seeing the document and later action on the document.
   The intent of this session was to give the Senators another quick overview of where the
   committee is, what the timeline is, to identify the areas: (1) that the committee thinks
   have characterized the greatest amount of shift from the earlier guidelines, and (2) to talk
   about the issues that have come to the committee with reactions from faculty.

   At this time, President Teague used a slide presentation to review a timeline starting with
   October through December 2013. The target is to submit the document to the Provost by
   the end of the semester after which the subsequent months would be the time for colleges
   and departments to look at their own guidelines and criteria and try to make the
   appropriate changes to make them consistent with what are now USF guidelines.

   The committee is beginning to develop a list of activities that should occur to be helpful
   in implementing the guidelines, such as workshops for T&P committee chairs and local
   administrators. These workshops would be a collaborative effort from various areas such
   as the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and the Office of Community Engagement, as
   well as looking at the Composite Task Force Report that contains goals for T&P
   guidelines that are relevant at the local, departmental level. The goal is that by the end
   of the spring term (April) a USF guidelines and policy, as well as criteria and procedures
   operating at the college and department level, and whatever policy changes need to occur
   would need to be approved by the BOT at their June meeting.
President Teague raised the issue of eligibility. There is a discussion between the university and the union about whether the changes are sufficiently substantial to require a full year waiting period or something less. If the full year waiting period happens, that means that they will become fully operational until end of spring term 2015, so that people coming into the university would be subject to those requirements. Traditionally, there is a partial grandfathering process such that people who are very early in their tenure probationary period are subject to changed requirements; people who are late in that period are not and are judged according to the old criteria. The point of demarcation has been the mid-tenure review process in that if a faculty member is in the first or second year and has not gone through a mid-tenure review, that individual will be subject to the new guidelines and policy; for those at a later stage, the existing guidelines would apply. However, a faculty member would have the choice to apply under the newer ones depending upon one’s situation. The question was asked about how it apply in the case of promotion to full. President Teague responded that the committee has not undertaken to evaluate that, but it needs to. Senior Vice Provost Dwayne Smith added that one year would be the minimum, and it would to go into effect immediately and any time period would have to be discussed further.

List of Changes that have brought about comments from people:

- Expectations for outstanding performance
- Provost-level advisory committee
- College choice of probationary period
- External letters: reviewers’ names redacted
- Alignment with strategic plan
- Annual review, evaluation of progress
- Procedural consistency

Other Comments Received

- whether or not there should be a full faculty vote on the guidelines
- delay T&P guidelines until after annual review criteria are updated

President Teague added that the ad hoc committee’s intent is to have committees making tenure and promotion recommendations do more looking at the quality of work rather than the number of things being submitted.

Q&A/Discussion/Comments on Guidelines

Q: Has there been any discussion about the different ways in which counting can be done?
A: There is disciplinary variation and within disciplines things count differently. The responsibility of developing criteria will be up to the departments.

C: Senator Emanuel Donchin commented that repeated reference to reward is a mistake; a tenure decision represents a prediction of future performance. Not emphasizing quality and prediction is not the way to become an AAU university. The award of tenure needs to be merit-driven.
Q: How does the change to an e-application fall within the timeline?
A: A subgroup of the T&P guidelines revision committee will work with another committee to work on finding a mechanism to be used to move to a digital process. President Teague commented that any volunteers from the Senate serving on that committee would do so in conjunction with a change to the guidelines. Vice President Philip Levy added that there are good precedents to look at, but there are some technical issues to address (what system to use, what will it look like). Second, is how to address having uniformity while at the same time ensuring appropriate adaptation of the process to variations in types of activity to be documented.

Q: By November when the Senate will be faced with voting, how will updates/changes be reflected? Explained?
A: The particulars of how that is done have not been worked on yet, but at this point the changes could be shown via direct changes or here is the document and here are the changes.

Q: Are town hall meetings still being held? If so, is there a schedule posted?
A: Senior Vice Provost Smith has been sending out notices to faculty. However, there is a Canvas site that was used in the past to receive feedback on the General Education changes proposed by the State. That list is still available, and President Teague is waiting for someone from IT to update the faculty list. He indicated that he might try sending an announcement to all the faculty on that list with instructions to look at the document which should be listed on the faculty’s list of Canvas sites. There were 2 Town Hall meetings – Friday, October 11 and Tuesday, October 15 – on the west and east ends of campus. Future meetings will be scheduled.

C: Senator Robert Welker suggested including in the timeline something about when the tenure process is modified to make sure the union is notified of the proposed changes in writing and offered an opportunity to discuss such changes in consultation with the university president or representative. President Teague will be in touch with Senator Welker about what the committee should do that is different from what it has done now so far to make sure the union is officially notified. UFF President Paul Terry expanded on the one-year delay by commenting that the contract states that a faculty member had to have at least 3 years of tenure-earning credit as of the date on which the tenure criteria are adopted, and they would go under the previous criteria. The more important thing, from a union perspective, is about appropriate notification and everyone knowing where they are. When the guidelines are adopted, that one year delay can be spent having colleges and departments revising their guidelines to align with the new T&P guidelines. In addition, that time could be used to professionally develop deans and chairs about the new guidelines. Senator Welker pointed out that it is the date of adoption by the BOT which determines under which rule one falls. President Teague clarified that the adoption date is the date that begins that one-year period, but that is the date that is relevant in terms
of one’s progress. Senator Welker confirmed that department and college
guidelines do not need to be approved by the union. The colleges and
departments must stay within the university guidelines when they revise their
criteria and can be adjusted to apply to a particular department or college.

C: Senator Nan Sook Park relayed her college council’s concern that the guidelines
are moving rapidly and that in consideration of annual evaluations, the approval
of the T&P guidelines should be made after the faculty annual evaluations have
been revised. President Teague responded that the committee has considered that
idea, and it was decided that it makes more sense to have this very broad umbrella
as a context within which the standards for annual evaluations were developed
rather than waiting for all of the annual evaluation criteria to be developed at the
local level and then develop the guidelines. Senator Wendy Nembhard shared
second-hand information of a directive from the Provost’s Office that the annual
faculty evaluations needed to be modified; therefore, departments and colleges are
in the process of revising their annual evaluation processes. However, they
wanted to wait until their processes were done before the T&P guidelines were
revised. (Senator Nembhard felt it should be the other way around.) Senator Park
reported that it had been proposed, at the Town Hall Meeting, that departments
and colleges should either ask the Provost for more time if, indeed, the process
was going on currently, or use the draft version of the T&P guidelines as a
guideline or rubric that they could base their revisions that they are proposing
now. Provost Wilcox stated that there has been no such decree. However, annual
reviews need to be brought into much closer alignment with T&P considerations.
He added that it makes sense to settle/agree on university-wide T&P guidelines
first before revising annual review processes. Vice President Levy commented
that the annual review serves a second purpose in this process. It serves as a piece
of the mid-term review which replicates the process of tenure review so that the
ultimate legal document is the mid-term review. Annual reviews are a piece of
that process, not only at the departmental level, but are important to the State and
are tied to raises. If the university is going to move to a model where that annual
review is, in fact, in some way a part of the tenure-promotion system, then its
logic needs to be structured somewhat differently because it is serving other
purposes right now. The two processes (mid-term review and annual review) are
colliding because one occurs at the university level and the other at the
departmental level. Vice President Levy felt the issue needs to be resolved at the
university level and then look at how the annual review can be tailored to move it
into that process. President Teague pointed out that the guidelines draft does
make explicit reference to including in that annual review process progress
toward the next stage. In addition, the committee did shy away from changing the
labels on the annual evaluation ratings.

C: UFF President Terry pointed out that tenure track faculty are a small percentage
of faculty at USF that get annual reviews. It is important to keep the bigger
picture in perspective because there are more than just tenure track faculty being
annually reviewed. He contends that once the T&P criteria are changed, that one-
year period is the time for departments and colleges to do the work they need to do.

C: The comment was made that for faculty who are tenure or promoted or instructors who are promoted, he has heard that the ratings are very high and that the deans are looking for more differentiation. The question was asked how to differentiate between using the annual evaluation as a measurement tool for quality improvement versus for salary, T&P, etc. President Teague responded that this is a discussion that needs to take place.

C: Senator Chaim Noy added that scholarship must be the main focus for high-level promotions, and he understands that right now it is on the same bar as teaching evaluations and research evaluations. President Teague responded that the committee would like to hear what people have to say about this. He characterized it as a logical sequence to be good at both scholarship and teaching/research. A faculty member could be only strong at teaching as long as he/she is an excellent research person. The logic is that one gets to outstanding in both areas by the time of moving to the rank of full professor. More than just valuing the work, how could it be stated that a faculty member only has to be strong? Vice President Levy added that faculty are still state employees, so there is a debt that people working at a public university have to the public in general, and the public understands that debt in the form of teaching. So, in relatively devaluing teaching to get to the next level, faculty would be risking a powerful backlash. Senator Nembhard pointed out that the reality is to be an outstanding researcher at the full professor level; it is difficult to also be outstanding in teaching. For someone teaching upper-level, difficult level doctoral courses with few students it is different than for someone teaching lower-level courses with 25-50 students. The way USF evaluates teaching now does not capture the outstanding teacher. The restrictions cannot be imposed unless the changes that support the change are made. She added that how USF evaluates teaching has to change at the same time that this new metrics comes into effect. Otherwise, if it lags, those that are caught in there could be very much affected by it.

Q: Dr. Marzenna Wiranowska asked, how does the factor of percentage of assignment get weighed? How does one put their efforts in each of the areas of teaching and research? President Teague clarified that, for example, it should be expected that excellent performance in a 10 percent assignment would look different than excellent performance in 50 percent assignment, at least in degree, and that needs to be understood. Dr. Wiranowska felt this was an important to be looked at.

C: The comment was made that someone who is a really good researcher is almost always a really good teacher. The other way does not necessarily work because there are a lot of great teachers that cannot do the research. Having the criteria of outstanding in teaching and research makes sense because of that observation.
This ended the discussion. President Teague asked that Senators keep providing input and asked them to encourage their colleagues to also provide feedback to either him or the committee.

REPORT FROM USF SYSTEM PRESIDENT JUDY GENSHAFT

USF and UCF tied for first place to receive a performance based, one-time funding this year in the amount of $2.6 million. USF has now received from the Board of Governors (BOG) a performance funding model for this year. Last year’s performance funding model had 3 criteria, but this year’s model will have a 10-item set of criteria. The first 8 will be applied to all Florida universities. The ninth measure the BOG gave to the other universities, but not to the University of Florida or Florida State, is the number of national AAU faculty awards. The remaining institutions will be rated on the decrease in excess hours earned by undergraduates at the time of graduation. Criteria 10 is each institution’s own choice with the approval of the Board of Trustees (BOT). The BOG will have $20 million again this year, but it is looking for another $50 million from the Legislature. USF is now looking at a research measure it will propose to the BOT for its own metric. Although several measurements are being considered, the tendency right now is to go with the number of post-doctoral students.

REPORT FROM PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT RALPH WILCOX

Since the last Senate meeting, he and President Genshaft have been meeting one-on-one with college deans about the impact the current budget reduction scenario is going to have on the core mission of the departments and colleges. If possible, there will be no impact on student and faculty success including support for research growth. It is expected that USF will collect more tuition than had been projected this academic year in large part because of the change in the mix of students – more international students, out-of-state students. Budget reduction targets are in the process of being assessed in Academic Affairs, and to the extent possible starting to offset a portion of that reduction (SCH and research-generating colleges and departments) with a new and additional tuition coming out. The plan to get to the $9 million reduction will be softened to some degree but how much will not be known until after the budget reduction reviews have been completed.

University College (UC) is now known as Innovative Education in large part because UC was creating some communication difficulties across the university. No state dollars are invested in the unit; it operates off the revenue it generates. It is set in statute that on-line education must be administered by the continuing education unit of the university. Although USF was the number 2 producer of on-line education last year, there is room for growth. The Provost explained that Innovative Education is a support service organization that will do all the legwork (from technical student services to faculty development for on-line delivery), but the faculty will still develop the syllabi and content of courses. In the upcoming days, faculty will receive an e-mail message that they will be paid $500 to take a professional development course. The reason for this is that SACS requires documentation that every instructor that is teaching an on-line class has to complete a professional development program. The professional development course is being handled by Innovative Education.
The 3 primary drivers of Innovative Education are: general on-line courses subsidized by the State, cost recovery models that receive zero State subsidies, and market rate programs that allow a public university to design, deliver and make a profit which can be re-invested in the institution.

New Initiatives:
1) This semester more resources will be pushed out as incentives to faculty members, to departments, and to colleges to engage in growing USF’s on-line enterprise in response to the needs of its students.
2) Significant investments will be made of $10,000 per course that faculty members, departments or colleges elect to move from a traditional face-to-face development and delivery process to an on-line platform. Innovative Education has the staff, instructional designers, and technicians to move courses into that platform.

Senators were encouraged to e-mail questions to the Provost. He would like to hear how this new model of Innovative Education works for the faculty.

Next month, the Provost, in conjunction with Senator Jim Garey, will provide an update on summer school. Senator Garey is a member of a task force looking to transform the delivery of summer school starting the summer of 2014.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.