AY 2013/2014 SEC meeting minutes: 30 Oct 13

Faculty Senate
USF FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
AGENDA
October 30, 2013
3:00-5:00 p.m., Student Services (SVC) 5012

1. Call to Order, Welcome & Introductions, Review of Agenda

2. Approval of Minutes from October 2, 2013 Meeting

3. Reports by Officers and Council/Committee Chairs (35 minutes)
   a. COC Nominations – Ellis Blanton (action item)
   b. Update on General Education and QEP – Karla Davis-Salazar
   c. Honors and Awards – Progress on Revisions – Marzenna Wiranowska
   d. Update on By-Laws Review – Drew Smith
   g. Other Reports from Councils (Chairs) and Initiatives

4. Old Business
   a. Update on Tenure & Promotion Guidelines Initiative – Gregory Teague et al. (25 minutes)

5. New Business
   a. Restructuring at the College of Education – Harold Keller, Elizabeth Shaunessy-Dedrick and COEDU Faculty Council Representatives et al. (25 minutes)
   b. Senate Agenda for November 13, 2013

6. Report from Senior Vice Provost and Dean Dwayne Smith (25 minutes)

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

8. Other

Adjourn - Next Scheduled Meeting – December 4, 2013
Present: Ellis Blanton, Karla Davis-Salazar, Versie Johnson-Mallard, Russell Kirby, Barbara Lewis, Wendy Nembhard, Steve Permuth, Scott Rimbey, Andrew Smith, Brianne Stanback, Gregory Teague, Marzenna Wiranowska

Provost’s Office: Kofi Glover, Dwayne Smith

Guests: Bill Black, Harold Keller, Elizabeth Shaunessy-Dedrick, Arthur Shapiro, Barbara Spector

The meeting was called to order at 3:02 p.m. by Faculty Senate President Gregory Teague. Senator Scott Rimbey attended today’s meeting as the new Sergeant-at-Arms. After introductions, a motion was made and seconded to approve the Minutes from the October 2, 2013 meeting as written. The motion unanimously passed.

Reports by Officers and Council/Committee Chairs

a. Committee on Committee (COC) Nominations – Ellis Blanton

COC Chair Blanton presented 3 faculty nominations to fill council vacancies. He explained that nominees not selected during the first review cycle are asked if they are interested in another council with a vacancy in their college. The nominations came to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) with a motion to approve. The motion was seconded and unanimously passed.

Mr. Andrew Smith, Chair of the Council on Technology for Instruction and Research (CTIR), announced that the council has a vacancy for a representative from the Administrative and Professional area. Ms. Pipkins will contact the president of the A&P Council to assist in filling the vacancy.

The Council on Faculty Issues has several vacancies that Chair Steve Permuth would like to fill. He will forward the information to COC Chair Blanton.

b. Update on General Education and QEP – Karla Davis-Salazar

1. General Education

Dr. Davis-Salazar reported that no feedback was received from faculty on the final recommendations of the State General Education Project. Having received no feedback, Dr. Robert Sullins, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, on behalf of the Provost sent to the State General Education Project Steering Committee that USF had no objections or comments, and that it was ready to implement the changes.
2. **QEP**
   The website and survey was launched soliciting feedback on the QEP with 229 people completing the survey so far. There is now a budget for the QEP so marketing can begin. The first group to target will be students. Dr. Davis-Salazar encouraged everyone to complete the survey which serves two purposes: (1) provides ideas to the committee, and (2) lets SACS know that everyone was given the opportunity to participate. The survey will be open until mid-November. There will be a follow-up email to remind everyone to fill it out. An announcement will also be made at the November 13 Faculty Senate meeting.

c. **Honors and Awards Council (HAC) – Marzenna Wiranowska**

   Based upon the feedback received from the SEC at its October 2 meeting, the HAC will revisit its charge and report the results at the next meeting. Chair Wiranowska then addressed the formulation of the HAC membership to include all system institutions which would make it a system council. President Teague responded that he has communicated this issue with Dr. Christopher Davis, President of the USF System Faculty Council (SFC), but a decision has not been made. President Teague will follow-up with SFC President Davis. Questions/comments raised about this Tampa council becoming a System Council included: The need to determine how much overlap there is in terms of mission and function of each body. Is there a hybrid version similar to the one for the Research Council that would work? Those things that are consistent with the System need to be identified. What part of the process applies for both the System and Tampa? It was pointed out that during past conversations, the other institutions wanted to maintain their autonomy. Are there potential problems with the other institutions being given the opportunity to award honorary degrees? Is there a way to facilitate them having access without having two councils? President Teague will communicate the response from the SFC to Chair Wiranowska.

d. **Update on Bylaws Review – Andrew Smith**

   Parliamentarian Smith, Senator Rosemary Closson and President Teague have met one time as the Bylaws Committee to review outdated language since the last update. There are two questions they are looking at: (1) Is it necessary to have two separate documents? Senator Closson will research other universities. (2) What would happen if the Faculty Senate representation was changed to be represented at the department level? What impact would that have? A communication mechanism is needed so that Senators can report back to their constituents, as well as receive feedback. For example, the Faculty Senate size would increase to 80 giving most departments at least one Senator. Each college represented would gain one or two Senators (except the College of Education due to restructuring). This will allow for better feedback within and between Senators and their constituents. CFI Chair Permuth recommended Mr. Smith talk with Senator Emanuel Donchin about what the Council on Educational Policy and Issues found out. Senator-at-Large Wendy Nembhard suggested giving each college guidelines in terms of what they could do. Although she was in favor of increasing communication, she was not in favor of department Senators. President Teague commented that Dr.
Donna Peterson, Interim Senior Vice President for USF Health, will be attending Faculty Senate meetings on a regular basis which will keep that venue open.

e. **Other Reports from Councils (Chairs) and Initiatives**

1. **Graduate Council** – Russell Kirby  
   Cybersecurity MA was approved and has been forwarded to Board of Trustees (BOT).

2. **Faculty Council on Student Admissions** – Versie Johnson-Mallard  
The council meets the first Tuesday of the month. It is revamping its charge as well as determining how instructors can be helped.

3. **Undergraduate Council** – Brianne Stanback  
   A lot of new courses are going through. Undergraduate course curriculum can be sent via the website.

4. **Council on Faculty Issues** – Steve Permuth  
   A subcommittee of the council will be reestablishing the assessment of the president and provost. Secretary Lewis will be co-chair. The council also has a lot of interest in the T&P guidelines. CEPI may also be interested in the T&P guidelines as things progress.

5. **Council on Educational Policy and Issues (CEPI)** – Gregory Teague  
   President Teague has been included on correspondence between the group looking at the student assessment of instructors and CEPI, and he posed the question if they wanted to comment on the issue of incentives for completing the survey to ensure the response rates are as high as possible to get them as close as possible to the old scores. The concept of incentives is not to get higher scores, but to get people to fill out the form. President Teague added that someone from the on-line group should be present when the incentive discussion takes place.

**NEW BUSINESS**

a. **Restructuring at the College of Education** – Harold Keller (Associate Dean), Elizabeth Shaunessy-Dedrick (Faculty Council Chair), Bill Black (Faculty Council Secretary) and Barbara Spector (Faculty Council Vice Chair)

   On behalf of the College of Education (COEDU), Drs. Keller, Shaunessy-Dedrick, Black and Spector attended today’s meeting to present a proposal for the organizational re-alignment of the college. Before turning the floor over to them, President Teague pointed out this proposal was not at the same stage as some prior ones for restructuring units. It is still in formation so today’s discussion would be an advisory discussion with the SEC to find out what kinds of things would be helpful to get into this proposal in order for it to negotiate successfully the official stage which is action by the Senate to forward it after that. He reminded everyone that the SEC can serve in place of the Senate when the Senate does not meet. Since their 90 day period extends into December, the COEDU could, in theory, take longer if needed beyond the November 13 Faculty Senate meeting.

   The proposal submitted followed the procedures put forth in the USF System Policy 10-055: Policy and Procedures for the Proposed Changes in Academic Units of the
University of South Florida. It contained the description of proposed changes, rationale for the changes, statement of financial and budgetary implications of the changes, consequences and implications of the changes at the College of Education, timeline for implementation of the changes, and nature of preliminary consultations with the academic entities affected. Dr. Keller summarized that the proposal is for the reorganization of its current eight departments down to three. The organizational change structure was developed by a task force on strategic alignment consisting of four faculty appointed by the college’s faculty council, plus two appointed by the dean of the College of Education. The proposal was provided to faculty within 30 days and separate, open forums were held by the task force with faculty and staff, e-mails were solicited, personal conversations were solicited, and faculty were given the opportunity to provide feedback or comments and turn them in without names on them. All information is maintained on Canvas and managed by the task force.

Dr. Keller then explained the process used to come up with the proposed three departments as recommended in the proposal: Teaching and Learning, Educational and Psychological Studies, and Leadership and Lifelong Learning (L3). There was strong emphasis on creating a department that would pull together all of those programs that related to teacher education/teacher certification and distributed the other programs that did not lead to certification into one of two other departments. There was a handful of programs for which the task force could not agree on the best department, so the task force presented the options developed to this point to those programs and asked for their thoughts about where they wanted to go. All programs, except for two, were placed into the departments which they requested.

The rationale for the change was provided by a reduction in enrollment and credit hour generation over the past five years, and budget cuts. These issues required the college to consider how best to reorganize itself in order to better align with the USF Strategic Plan. The task force provided this organizational realignment to the dean who put together a set of statements consistent with the USF policy describing the budgetary implications of the changes, what the consequences are, and the implications of the changes at the College of Education. Four areas identified as having potential consequences and implications were: strategic plan alignment, faculty governance, tenure-earning faculty, and faculty with ambiguous unit identities.

At a meeting held the previous week, the faculty council voted to accept the proposal. It will write additional commentary about the next steps. It is anticipated to have that completed by the end of this week.

Dr. Shaunessy-Dedrick reported that the faculty council has had the proposal from the dean since September 30th at which time it was distributed immediately to faculty electronically along with USF Policy 10-055. At the same time, the faculty council task force Canvas site was transitioned so that faculty could continue to view the development of the document. Feedback from the faculty and staff was centered on the transition period that would occur between January and the summer. Both groups wanted more specifics about the transition and needed to know a little bit more information than what
has been presented so far. The dean thought it presumptuous to get too specific at this stage, but that it would be better to wait as the process unfolded. However, once the faculty council accepted the proposal it agreed to develop more specific guidelines between now and the time this proposal would be sent to the Faculty Senate.

Concerns/issues from COEDU faculty: • Physical space will not be a priority. • Of greater concern was the selection of chairs for the 3 departments. Also, the question was asked about how would a larger department of 52 be managed, and could it be managed by a chair? • Conversations have also taken place about equity within the college based upon that configuration. • Function • T&P implications and how the annual review process will be affected. Reshaping of governance documents would take place in the spring, but not finalized until the fall. • How would faculty council function? Be changed? • Staffing considerations. How will things be run? • How will changes affect faculty moving forward? Some faculty felt the changes are not needed and would like a more compelling rationale. • There were degrees of agreement with the proposed changes. • What happens to tenure? Does it lie in the department or program? There seem to be some legal issues for which there is not appropriate information to address. • There seems to be a lack of input from a significant number of faculty; limited explicit input. • The big issue/concern was who is going to make what decisions using what criteria.

Dr. Glover addressed the question of where does tenure reside or where does a faculty member get tenure. He explained that tenure qualifications are not changed until the documents are rewritten. The department specifies the requirements. Senior Vice Provost Smith added that if the COEDU proposal is approved, tenure goes with faculty to the new department (under reorganization) if the department accepts the faculty member.

Comments/Suggestions/Questions from SEC Members

Senator Shapiro commented that the issue of 52 people in a department needs to be worked out. Dr. Kirby asked the outcomes that the college hopes to achieve. Senator-at-Large Nembhard commented that the Faculty Senate is interested in concrete, compelling arguments for the change, as well as a clear understanding about the implications for T&P. In addition, the document should include proposed solutions that have been agreed upon. Dr. Wiranowska suggested that the COEDU look at the model used by the USF College of Medicine. Dr. Karla Davis-Salazar suggested that the impact on students’ needs be addressed in the document. Dr. Permuth commented that the budget is not clear, such as will the chair have support from an assistant chair. President Teague added that the strength of the rationale for timing is very important. The test is whether or not the proposal shows that the amount and type of consultation has been appropriate. Does it seem likely that the benefits that are touted will, indeed, occur?

President Teague summarized the discussion of the proposal as follows:

There is the question of whether the COEDU must proceed for whatever reason on the timeline it is on right now because questions have been raised that it seems like it is being
done in a hurry. And, if so, do they want to regard this as a proposal that started the clock in September? If so, then the process needs to be completed prior to the end of December, which means either the Senate produces a resolution on November 13th or (1) decide they have longer to work things out for January, (2) go ahead with this proposal for the November 13 FS meeting, or (3) plan for getting most of the way there but still having some material to develop in time for the SEC to do it in December. If adequate consultation has been conducted within the college, then they can develop the proposal by the 13th that includes a plan as to how things will move forward. If additional rationale is provided by November 13, it can be on the Senate agenda. Or, if more time is needed, it could be considered by the SEC in early December.

REPORT FROM SENIOR VICE PROVOST AND DEAN DWAYNE SMITH

All colleges have submitted their budgets which included impact statements from deans. With this information, a revised budget with modest cuts was reissued as reflected in the handout distributed by Dr. Smith. He pointed out that year 1 has been moderated. He added that President Genshaft was one of the driving forces behind the reductions. However, there still has to be implications of these budget cuts.

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

President Teague reported that the SEC might be in the position of wrapping up the T&P guidelines next month. On September 16, a draft document was sent out to faculty for comments. A redraft will be sent out based upon comments. The general response has been good, but there have been some comments about various items: the either/or option for ratings, the idea of an advisory committee to the provost, and having the potential for colleges to allow a longer probationary period.

The plan, as outlined by President Teague, is to issue a new draft (with few changes and responding to suggestions) and ask faculty to comment about these issues. One week later, a draft will be distributed to the Faculty Senate. There will be a resolution presented at the November 13 Senate meeting with the option of having it say the Senate is in favor of the document but would like to see the following changes by the SEC.

Secretary Lewis, Senator from the Library, commented that the librarians need to decide how to address the issue of either having outstanding in research or service because of the differences within their disciplines. She added that because librarians do not have a large research assignment, it comes down to how much time is allocated to do research. President Teague will follow up with Secretary Lewis on suggestions about how to include this in the T&P document.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.