

2004

AY 2003/2004 SEC meeting minutes: 03 Nov 05

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/fs_pubs

Scholar Commons Citation

Faculty Senate, "AY 2003/2004 SEC meeting minutes: 03 Nov 05" (2004). *Faculty Senate Archives*. 147.
https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/fs_pubs/147

This Agenda/Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Archives by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usf.edu.

**SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES**

November 5, 2003

Present: Elizabeth Bird, Ellis Blanton, Susan Greenbaum, Andrew Hoff, Sara Mandell, Jana Futch Martin, Fraser Ottanelli, Sandra Schneider, Carole Steele, Thomas Terrill, Nancy Jane Tyson

Provost's Office: Robert Chang, Renu Khator, Phil Smith, Ralph Wilcox

Student Government: Kali Campbell

The meeting was called to order at 3:07 p.m. The Minutes from the October 1, 2003, meeting were approved as presented.

**REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT
ELIZABETH BIRD**

Before beginning her report, President Bird welcomed Secretary Jana Futch Martin back from her medical leave.

President Bird's report and announcements consisted of the following:

- She has met with the ad hoc work group to discuss the Principles of Shared Governance document which was passed by the Senate and subsequently forwarded to the Provost and President. It was agreed that further discussion was needed. The work group asked President Bird to put together a statement that will be the context of the document. The principles are accepted and discussion will now take place as to how to put them into practice. She distributed a copy of the document which gives a little context to the principles themselves. The principles are remaining identical to the way they were. The key point is that the document is not intended to lay out specific policy and procedures. Its intent was to initiate a dialogue whereby faculty and administrators come together and think about how to structure USF in a more genuinely shared manner.
- The new Emeritus proposal has been forwarded to Vice Provost Chang who has sent it out for wider consultation. Comments are due to him by November 17th.
- The Bylaws Committee has been dissolved and the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) will be reconstituted as the Bylaws Committee. Revisions to the Bylaws will be presented at the next SEC meeting for discussion. If the plan to have Legislators at the December Faculty Senate meeting does not materialize, then there will probably be a major discussion on the Bylaws. Discussion of the Constitution revisions will be moved to the January meeting.

DISCUSSION OF STRATEGIC PLAN PRIORITIES (Vice Provost Ralph Wilcox)

The University Strategic Plan for the next five years was approved by the Board of Trustees. It became the gauge against which USF will be measured by the Board of Trustees over the next five years. Contained in this document along with a Mission Statement, Vision Statement, Values and Goals are nine strategies, many hundreds of action steps, and ninety-two performance measures. The assumption is that all ninety-two measures are valid indicators of performance along the lines of these goals and strategies, but are also perceived as equally important.

One of the first exercises embarked upon this semester was to try to bring some greater meaning and understanding to the measures. Vice Provost Wilcox distributed a copy of the outcome of input that was sought from Academic Affairs, department chairs, deans, and faculty. The thirty-four measures highlighted in yellow rose to the level of most important as determined by Academic Affairs in terms of driving USF toward its vision of being a premier national research university. There are twenty-five green ones which are intermediate measures, and then the less important ones are shaded in beige. At Interim Provost Khator's suggestion, input was sought from the Academic Affairs side of the university with regard to possible new measures that might be considered. Those, in turn, appear at the bottom of each page. Each of the nine pages included one of the nine strategies in chronological order. At the bottom of each strategy on page one the thirteen outcome measures were identified. Below that there were other measures that were suggested by deans, department chairs, and groups of faculty across campus. USF has been asked to report at the next Board meeting a progress update on the first year of the 2002-2007 plan.

Vice Provost Wilcox explained that many challenges and flaws were encountered during the past few months. It was determined that many of these measures were poorly defined or not defined whatsoever, so there was no idea what people were measuring in the past to establish future benchmarks. Each of the measures has been more clearly defined, delineating the reporting period which varies from federal fiscal years, to state fiscal years, to county years, to academic years. This is in tune with the tremendous shift of accountability issues of every level of higher education, whether it is the federal level all the way down to the local Board of Trustees level.

At today's meeting, Vice Provost Wilcox wanted to explore some of the more highly rated top tier, yellow highlighted measures to see whether there was some sense of consensus from the faculty. The idea being once again that this will allow the Provost, in particular, to bring some focus to research allocation as USF moves forward into a budget planning cycle in the spring semester. It will bring some focus for academic leadership for faculty members at this university in terms of what is important, with regard to driving the institution to the next level.

At this time, there was a discussion of several of the goals, specifically those listed under Strategy 1: Promote nationally and internationally distinctive research and graduate programs. Vice Provost Wilcox invited input to the whole document to be sent directly to him.

REPORTS BY OFFICERS AND COUNCIL CHAIRS

a. Nomination Recommendations from Committee on Committees (Ellis Blanton)

Committee on Committees Chair, Ellis Blanton, presented the following nominees for university-wide committees and councils:

**COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR FACULTY SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS
Fall Semester 2003**

Academic Computing Committee

James Marshall (STPT)

Marianne Sarkis (FMHI)

Commencement and Convocation Committee

Miguel Labrador (ENG)

Faculty Committee on Student Admissions

Betty Epanchin (EDU)

Graduate Council

Susan Becker (COPH)

Roger Brindley (EDU)

Judith Ponticell (EDU)

Christopher Steele (VPA)

James Strange (CAS)

Brent Weisman (CAS)

Honors and Awards Council

Linda Moody (NUR)

Rajan Sen (ENG)

Instructional Technology and Distance Learning Council

Bonnie Braur (STPT)

Ron Dulaney (ARCH)

David Williams (VPA)

Publications Council

Valerie Janesick (EDU)

Research Council

David Himmelgreen (CAS) Member-at-Large

Uday Murthy (BUS)

Daanish Mustafa (STPT) Member-at-Large

Etienne Pracht (COPH)

Research Council (continued)
Gregory Teague (FMHI)
Joel Thompson (CAS)

Undergraduate Council
Pam Fleege (EDU)

University Honors Program Committee
Denisse Thompson (EDU)

**COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
PRESIDENTIAL COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS
Fall Semester 2003**

Athletics Council
Marchell Cuppett

Committee on Black Affairs
Chandra Foreman
Rony Francois
Paula Webster

Women of Status Committee
Kim Vaz

These recommendations came to the SEC as a motion from Committee on Committees. The motion was seconded and opened for discussion.

Graduate Council Chair Sara Mandell brought up the issue of having two members of the Graduate Council from the same department, that is, another member of her department (Religious Studies) on the council. COC Chair Blanton commented that it should be specified in the council's charge whether or not to allow two individuals from the same department to be members of that particular council. President Bird stated that as long as there is nothing in the Senate *Bylaws* that expressly prohibits this or makes it impossible to distinguish, she would feel uncomfortable saying that this person cannot be nominated just because he is a member of the same department. She added that someone could, at a later date, recommend a mechanism to be included in the *Bylaws* that will not allow duplication. At this time, it was suggested that the SEC approve this slate of nominees with the understanding that whatever arguments there are should be taken care of next year. The motion passed with one opposition.

NEW BUSINESS

- a. Proposed Council on Educational Policy and Issues (Ellis Blanton)

COC Chair Blanton presented the following revised charge for the proposed Council on Educational Policy and Issues as a motion from the COC to adopt it as a standing committee of the Faculty Senate:

COMMITTEE: **COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND ISSUES**

AUSPICES: The CEPI is a standing council of the USF Faculty Senate and receives authority for its actions through that body.

CHARGE: The CEPI is concerned with all matters that influence the quality of education at the University. It deals primarily with issues, policies, and procedures that affect academic quality and environment on a University-wide basis.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

The council shall develop its own operating procedures, subject to the approval by the Provost. Functions of the council include:

1. Review existing academic policies and recommend to the Faculty Senate and Provost modifications that will improve academic quality and environment.
2. Initiate and recommend to the Faculty Senate and Provost new policies that address academic and educational quality and environment.

MEMBERSHIP:

1. Membership shall consist of one faculty representative from each college, campus and unit with voting representation in the Faculty Senate; one additional faculty representative from any college having more than 250 full-time faculty members; and a third faculty representative from any college having more than 400 full-time faculty members.

Faculty members of the Council will be appointed for staggered three-year terms, with one third retiring each year. Members may serve two consecutive terms, after which they must retire from the Council for one full year before seeking re-appointment.

2. One undergraduate student, to be appointed to a one-year term. May be reappointed for a second one-year term.
3. One graduate student, to be appointed to a one-year term. May be reappointed for a second one-year term.

4. Ex officio, non-voting members will include:

- Provost or designee
- Dean of Undergraduate Studies, or designee
- Dean of Graduate Studies, or designee
- VP of Health Sciences, or designee
- VP of Student Affairs, or designee

If a member of the CEPI accumulates three unexcused absences per year from regularly scheduled meetings, he or she will cease to be a member, and will be replaced promptly according to the standard procedures for nomination and appointment. Excused absences may be granted by the Chair or Vice-Chair of the Council, and shall not exceed four in number per year.

APPOINTMENT: Nominees will submit nomination forms to the Committee of Committees of the Faculty Senate which will review each nominee.

The Undergraduate Student member will be appointed by the Student Senate.

The Graduate Student member will be appointed by the Graduate and Professional Students Organization

CHAIR: The Chair will be elected from among the voting members.

The motion was passed and the charge was opened for discussion. Chair Blanton explained that the charge was reviewed by the COC at its October 20th meeting. It was recommended by the COC that the Membership section reflect other committees that had a similar type of mission. Membership should be based not on just a list of colleges, but representations from different colleges based on their faculty. There was a question if the library should also be included because this committee is considered to be university-wide as opposed to individual programs like graduate or undergraduate programs. Therefore, membership should be more inclusive as opposed to exclusive. That is why the COC opened the membership up to representation from each college, campus and unit.

Chair Blanton asked whether or not the St. Petersburg campus has their own council to perform the same functions as this council. He also wanted to know if that campus is a part of this council and should they have branch campus representation as well. Chair Blanton recommended that the St. Petersburg campus be included in the membership of this council until it is determined at a later date whether or not it is appropriate for them to be involved.

The second issue regarding this council's charge had to do with its operational and relationship with the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils. Chair Blanton pointed out that there is no relationship. The idea is that the relationship should evolve over time and allow the different councils to determine how that relationship should be.

There being no further discussion, a vote was taken on the motion to forward the charge of the Proposed Council on Educational Policy and Issues to the Faculty Senate for its consideration at its next meeting. The motion was unanimously passed.

b. Proposed Changes to Library Council Charge (Ellis Blanton)

COC Chair Blanton presented a revised Library Council charge which incorporates a change in the focus of the council from a lower operational level to a higher strategic level in order for it to be more of an advocate for the policies of the library system. The revised charge came to the SEC as a motion from the Library Council and the COC. There was no discussion. The motion was seconded and unanimously passed.

c. Proposed Committee on Faculty Affairs (Elizabeth Bird)

President Bird presented the following draft proposal for a Committee on Faculty Affairs:

COMMITTEE: COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS

AUSPICES: The Committee on Faculty Issues is a standing committee of the USF Faculty Senate and receives authority for its actions through that body.

CHARGE: The Committee on Faculty Matters is responsible for advising the Senate and Provost on any matters that influence the personal and professional welfare of the faculty, including issues of evaluation of faculty and administrators.

RESPONSIBILITIES: The Committee shall develop its own operating procedures and will be responsible for the following:

1. Examining and/or initiating policies and procedures of the University that influence the professional and personal welfare of the faculty. These include, but are not limited to faculty personnel policies, including such matters as: tenure and promotion; sustained performance review; any incentive and excellence programs initiated by the university; any other faculty performance evaluative standard.
2. Examining and proposing University policies and programs associated with faculty development.
3. Gathering and publicizing information on faculty needs and concerns
4. Developing and implementing procedures for faculty evaluation of administrators' performance.
5. Developing procedures for the formation of Peer Review Committees to hear the cases of tenured faculty who have received notice of termination; forming such committees as needed.

MEMBERSHIP: 10 tenured faculty members are to be appointed for staggered three-year terms, including two at-large members and one member each from the following:

College of Arts and Sciences
College of Business
College of Education
College of Engineering
College of Visual and Performing Arts
Medicine/Public Health/FMHI/Nursing
A regional campus
Library

APPOINTMENT: The Provost will appoint the voting members of this committee upon the recommendation of the Faculty Senate.

CHAIR: The chair shall be a voting faculty member elected by the committee.

President Bird proposed that this charge go to the Committee on Committees for either its recommendation or revision. This committee is based upon the discussion that the SEC had regarding the need for a committee that would focus on faculty issues and faculty evaluations. During that discussion it was suggested rather than have another committee in addition to the Faculty Evaluation and Standards Committee, the role of that committee could be subsumed by this one and broaden the charge to look at any and all issues that pertain to faculty welfare. In addition, this might be the appropriate committee to determine how a review for administrators could be structured. President Bird summarized that the charge has a broad range in initiating policy and procedures that influence professional faculty welfare, including faculty personnel tenure promotion, and any other faculty performance evaluative standard. This would be the committee that administrators would come to for such things as the Presidential Faculty Pay Awards.

The title of the committee was discussed. It was decided to call it the Committee on Faculty Issues. At this time, a motion was made and seconded to rename, to extend the charge, and to rethink the membership of the Faculty Evaluations and Standards Committee. The charge will be forwarded to the Committee on Committees for review. The motion was unanimously passed.

d. Response to Regional Campus Documents (Steve Permuth, Fraser Ottanelli)

Senator Steve Permuth, Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on Inter-Campus Procedures, attended today's meeting to present the committee's recommendations. Senator Permuth also commended the other members of the ad hoc committee for their diligence and hard work. Those people are Senator Fraser Ottanelli, Arts and Sciences, Senator Mary Cuadrado, Arts and Sciences (Sarasota campus), Senator Barbara Loeding, Education (Lakeland campus), Senator Marcia Mann, Education, Professor Murray Cohen,

Business, and Senator Ellen Hufnagel, Business (St. Petersburg Campus). The eighteen-page report, along with appendices, can be viewed at the Faculty Senate web site <http://www.lib.usf.edu/usf-fs>.

At this time, a motion was made and seconded to accept the recommendations of the ad hoc committee and forward the recommendations to the Faculty Senate for consideration at its November meeting. The motion was unanimously passed.

OTHER

- a. Graduate Council Chair Sara Mandell announced that the Graduate Council awarded four outstanding thesis awards and four outstanding dissertation awards earlier in the week. There was a small monetary stipend. The council also awarded a number Ann Winch awards. She asked that not only the SEC but the Senate as well notify faculty in their departments that these awards are available. The deadline for this coming year is March or April, and the Council would like to have more nominations.

On another issue, Graduate Council Chair Mandell wanted to make the SEC and the Senate aware that the individual who was in charge of the catalog has resigned and the Office of the General Counsel has not picked up the promulgation of the catalog. The Graduate Council was given a very late notice at the end of August that the all materials to be put into this year's catalog must be processed by December. As a result, there are a number of departments that feel pressured because they cannot get changes in on time. Chair Mandell pointed out that the council will do its best to get as many things done as possible before the deadline.

The second item Chair Mandell addressed was that she would be submitting revisions to the Graduate Council charge to COC Chair Blanton. The major change will be eliminating the Policy Subcommittee of the council by making it an ad hoc committee that will be represented as a committee of the whole.

The last issue addressed by Chair Mandell was concerning an individual who was just appointed to the council and Chair Mandell appointed him to the Curriculum Subcommittee. In an e-mail addressed to the staff person who provides clerical support to the Graduate Council, the individual stated that he would attend the meetings of the subcommittee, but would not participate. Chair Mandell asked for suggestions on how to handle this situation. President Bird asked the SEC members if they had any suggestions for Chair Mandell. Senator-at-Large Ottanelli asked what it was that Chair Mandell was asking from the SEC. She replied that she was not asking them to do anything. She was informing the SEC of what the problem.

Associate Provost Phil Smith explained that because the catalog is held to be a rule document of the university then it is subject to the rule promulgation process. That is the reason for the time crunch. It is his understanding that courses can be added, as well as things that are not in the catalog legitimately. It is when a change is made that affects students negatively, like a change in degree requirements, or put in courses they have to

take. Associate Provost Smith recommended that Chair Mandell consult with the Graduate School dean.

Vice Provost Wilcox commented that this situation is particularly sensitive because this is the edition of the catalog that SACS will review as part of the reaffirmation of accreditation. A complicating factor is the St. Petersburg campus which at the same time has to create its own catalog to pursue separate accreditations. The question now becomes how are two catalogs represented, one for USF and one for St. Pete separately, or both as one. He added that USF does have a window of opportunity to push back the approval process at the Board of Trustee level.

The only piece of advice for Chair Mandell from the SEC was to prioritize, and trust the judgment of the department.

- c. Vice President Susan Greenbaum asked if there was a way to initiate a tracking feature for the faculty personnel rules on-line that shows how rules have been changed. Associate Provost Smith replied that once the rules leave the administration's hands there is a person in the Office of the General Counsel who does all the administrative procedures and changes. He feels it would not be difficult to get a line-through copy of that document and indicated that he would check into it.

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