

1-1-2013

AY 2013/2014 FS meeting minutes: 2013-11-13

Faculty Senate

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

Scholar Commons Citation

Faculty Senate, "AY 2013/2014 FS meeting minutes: 2013-11-13" (2013). *Faculty Senate Archives*. 346.
https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/fs_pubs/346

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.



USF FACULTY SENATE MEETING
November 13, 2013
3:00 – 5:00 p.m.
Chamber Room 4200 Marshall Student Center

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of October 16, 2013 Minutes
3. Reports by Officers and Council Chairs (10 minutes)
 - a. Recommendations from Committee on Committees – Ellis Blanton (action item)
 - b. Other Committees and Initiatives
4. Old Business
 - a. Proposed T&P Guidelines/Policy – Gregory Teague and committee (35 minutes)
5. New Business
 - a. Proposed restructuring in the College of Education – Dean Vasti Torres and Elizabeth Shaunessy-Dedrick (25 minutes)
6. Report from USF System President Judy Genshaft (15 minutes)
7. Report from Provost and Executive Vice President Ralph Wilcox (20 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 – January 22, 2014

USF FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES

November 13, 2013

Faculty Senate President Gregory Teague called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m. He accepted a motion to approve the Minutes from the October 16, 2013 meeting as presented. The motion unanimously passed.

REPORTS BY OFFICERS AND COUNCIL CHAIRS

- a. Recommendations from Committee on Committees – Ellis Blanton
On behalf of the Committee on Committees (COC), Chair Blanton presented three nominees who accepted an alternative council appointment when they were not selected during the first review process. The recommendations came from the COC with a motion to approve. The motion was seconded and unanimously passed.

- b. Council on Faculty Issues (CFI) – Steve Permut
 - 1. CFI will be reinvigorating the assessment process for the President and Provost. Secretary Barbara Lewis will be assisting with the process.
 - 2. The council will be looking into ways to assess faculty morale.
 - 3. CFI and the Council on Educational Policy and Issues will be holding discussions on the budget to determine the current status now that the situation has stabilized and all of the Colleges have their 2013/14 budgets.
 - 4. A report on lecture capture will be forthcoming in January.

OLD BUSINESS

- a. Proposed T&P Guidelines/Policy

President Teague opened the discussion by stating that the guidelines have come before the committee a few times already and there has been a couple of different iterations of the post-guidelines. There have been public sessions as well as opportunities for people to provide comments on the proposed changes which were received and summarized for today's meeting. He provided the background that as of the first proposal the committee had addressed and made decisions on several of the issues that had been indicated in the charge. One of the features of the earlier proposal that received the greatest amount of discussion was the issue of whether there should be a requirement of outstanding in teaching as well as research for people going up for promotion to full professor and some relaxation of that expectation when people were going for tenure. That aspect of the proposal received the greatest amount of feedback. That area, as well as 4 others, was incorporated in the specifics that were in the survey. In the meantime, the committee also looked at some history of T&P records. With the help of Senior Vice Provost Dwayne Smith, redacted information was put into a data base of 116 cases, a one-third sample of those in Dr. Smith's possession. Analysis from that, combined with feedback received from many people in several settings, lead the committee to decide to pull back on the requirement that outstanding teaching be required at the point of promotion to full. That in itself carries some issues for which the committee received a fair amount of comments

as well. At this time, President Teague presented some of the data that was used to make that decision.

Next, President Teague presented the feedback from the survey which was a representative distribution by category (assistant, associate and professor, a few instructors). There were 82 people who filled out the survey. The Academic Affairs colleges were represented relatively well, although Business and The Arts were a little bit lower than expected. All others were represented in the normal way. The five issues were rated as follows (see attached slide presentation for details): 1. Performance Standards – A large number of people were in support of the standard of outstanding at promotion and outstanding at tenure in research, and quite a few people who took some issues with that and said the committee should change to something else. 2. Alignment with Strategic Plan – There was much more wide-spread agreement with doing this. 3. Variable Performance Period – Quite a few people agreed that more time is needed. That fits if people are going to be asked to be outstanding by the time they apply for tenure, but the option of applying when ready without any particular opprobrium attached to that action is a good idea. It makes the intermediate evaluation period more important. This would need to be bargained. 4. Executive Advisory Committees – There was over 40 percent support for the creation of advisory committees and 12 percent wanted change. 5. External Letters Approach – This was the most unanimity among the respondents at 50 percent in support of the proposal that the identity of the external reviewers' letters be redacted but that the content should be made available to the candidate. There were 20 percent of the respondents who suggested changes.

President Teague then outlined how the remaining time on this issue at today's meeting would proceed: (1) He asked the committee, which had only today received this information because of waiting for people to respond, to say what their views might be, if they have changed their views, or how they would perceive going forward given that there is a document that represents the committee's recommendations. (2) A resolution will be presented. (3) Discussion will take place. President Teague commented that there is an expectation that this will change the way teaching is evaluated. Experts will be drawn in who can help the university do a better job of working on evaluating teaching. One of the next items of business is to move to a digital application process and that entails restructuring the application venue which could include peer evaluation.

A discussion took place about the redaction of names on external letters and the faculty member being able to waive the right to see the letters. Vice President Levy commented that there is the Sunshine Law on one hand, and on the other hand it is not in the same category as whoever determines that kind of rule. It sits in a gray area. President Teague referred to the language that it recommends that this be considered as an option. It had not been used before, it was a recommendation. He added that this was not the place to debate law because there was not time for it. In response to UFF President Paul Terry's request to see data from deans and chairs as to how problematic this is, President Teague replied that the committee did hear from the chairs in a rousing chorus that they have a lot of difficulty obtaining external review letters. It was virtually unanimous from chairs that the system of full disclosure was problematic.

Mr. Adam Aldridge, Student Government Representative, appreciated the discussion about teacher evaluations which gave him a better understanding of the process. He commented that he hoped the committee would require outstanding in teaching because it would say, as an institution, that teaching is the one thing it wants to do the best in preparing future generations.

At this time, the following resolution was presented:

The Senate endorses and supports the revised draft of the USF Tenure and Promotion Guidelines in the form as presented to the Senate in session on November 13, 2013 subject to revision by the Senate Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate Tenure and Promotion Guidelines Revision Committee with the understanding that the results of those revisions will not be sweeping in nature, and that the full Senate will see with an opportunity to endorse the completed document prior to the next Senate Executive Committee meeting.

A motion was made and seconded to accept the resolution and the floor was opened for discussion.

Q: Senator Nembhard asked what changes are anticipated having to be made.

A: Vice President Levy responded that the language needs to be clarified that people's measurements (outstanding, strong) in research will be correlated to the scale of their assignment. President Teague added that new information based upon this discussion and based upon information that has come since the last draft was circulated will be taken under consideration. The SEC does act on behalf of the Faculty Senate when the Senate does not meet which is the case in December. A promise has been made of the delivery of a document with the understanding that it may be further modified in the spring to reflect issues or questions that arise when department and college guidelines and criteria are updated. A product is to be done by the end of this semester. The motion, therefore, asks for the approval of the proposition that the committee will continue to stay in dialogue with the SEC and finish off that document. The Provost pointed out that the resolution goes a step further. He wondered, referring to the last 2 ½ lines, if, indeed, the SEC is authorized to speak and act on behalf of the Senate at large, what is the necessity in dragging this process on and on? Vice President Levy responded that he does not see this as a completed proposal and is subject to amendment. Since the Senate is being asked for approval, it made sense to come back to it for approval after the SEC approves it rather than asking this body to yield to the SEC. The Provost responded that if the committee sees fit to retain the 2 ½ lines, he asked for a time certain date to be included. His fullest intent is to move forward in promulgating policy with or without recommendations to change-up the guidelines that will be approved. President Teague shared that the committee had a quick exchange before today's meeting because he was working on the data. He would not feel it necessary to have that last set of lines because

the SEC can, in fact, act on behalf of the Senate. The intent is that a document is created by the end of December, pass it on to the Provost, and abstract those elements that become policy which then goes through its own promulgation process with opportunity for feedback and comment. There is probably not a need at that point for any final review; however, by the end of the spring when any other potential changes might be included in the document he would consider at least a courtesy discussion in the Senate would be relevant.

Q: Senator Strange asked what the intent of the motion was. Why would the Senate vote on an unfinished document? Senator Permuth replied that there could also be a call for an emergency meeting of the Senate after the SEC meeting in December. This is a presentation of a committee. Therefore, he recommended either a full gathering of the Senate, if needed, or have the SEC to act on behalf of the Senate.

At this time, Senator Strange made the motion that there be a meeting of the full Senate on December 3rd. However, there was a motion on the floor. President Teague did not support the motion. Parliamentarian Andrew Smith stated that the motion could be amended to state that the full Senate would vote on the document on December 3rd. Vice President Levy proposed a friendly amendment to omit the last line. He added that this amendment could be worded so that it is understood that the SEC would be the last review body. But the question is, is there an opportunity in the intervening time for Senators to forward remaining concerns to the SEC so they can be voiced in the SEC meeting. President Teague agreed that this should be the case, but the question posed was whether the Senate is willing to convene again as a whole body at that point or is that even necessary. Discussion was held. A recommendation was made to send the document, via e-mail, to the Faculty Senate for a vote. Then, the SEC could make a decision based upon that vote. Vice President Levy commented that the document that has been circulating this fall represents an enormous change in the language of the guidelines. By endorsing what there is thus far, this stops the process from rolling backwards. There will be small changes from here forward, but this is where things are. So getting that vote of support matters because the Senate will, in essence, agree that this is what the document will be. Although input is still being received and small changes are being made, and there still needs to be that last “check of the box,” but it is not an open process that could send everything back to where it was before. It was decided to add to the end of the motion the wording “prior to the SEC meeting.”

Senator Strange then proposed a friendly amendment so that the resolution reads “the Faculty Senate endorses the revised draft of the USF Tenure and Promotion Guidelines document.” Does this mean that the SEC approves it? President Teague suggested that this was a good procedure, because there is a mechanism whereby the SEC acts on behalf of the Senate when the Senate does not meet. This would require getting the sentiment of the Senate on this draft and then act on that information. Senator Permuth, although in favor of this proposed procedure, voiced concern about electronic voting because to get the sense of the Senate is its ability to see and talk to each other. He wants to be assured that if people say no are they saying no to one item they personally do not like and then the whole document is not approved. He is in support of the endorsement and it could go

to the SEC as it has historically gone. If there is a feeling that that is not adequate, then he would also endorse a full meeting of the Faculty Senate.

Vice President Levy clarified that by voting on this resolution, as revised, would be approval of the document from the Senate, but there are some small pieces that need to come together. Then it will go to the SEC for final approval and at that point (the December meeting) the committee would have completed a document and completed the process of faculty input. At this time, a vote was taken and the motion to approve the revised resolution unanimously passed.

NEW BUSINESS

- a. Proposed Restructuring in the College of Education – Dean Vasti Torres and Elizabeth Shaunessy-Dedrick

President Teague reminded the Senate that when academic units are restructured, the expectation is that they come before the Faculty Senate to discuss that plan and that they will have, before then, ensured adequate discussion and input from the people who are effected by that restructuring. Before today's meeting the Senators were provided copies of policy 10-055 addressing this procedure. At this time, the floor was turned over to Dean Vasti Torres and Elizabeth Shaunessy-Dedrick to present the College of Education (COEDU) restructuring and realignment proposal.

Dean Torres highlighted 3 aspects: rationale, process, and faculty input. The main rationale for requesting the change revolves around changes within the COEDU and trying to stress student success with administrative efficiency. The COEDU has seen a 22 percent reduction in SCH, yet it has been operating as if it had more than it actually does. The reason for this revolves around external factors that Dean Torres wanted to make the Senate aware of: (1) The creation of alternative teacher certification within the State of Florida has created more competition and short cuts have produced questionable quality. (2) The loss of State funding for teachers to be rewarded for advanced degrees has also affected enrollment. (3) Changes to undergraduate degree hours that limited the flexibility for students to take courses outside of their required major. This has caused the COEDU to consider more efficient ways of offering undergraduate and graduate programs.

As a result of these external factors, the COEDU seeks this reorganization to go from 8 current active departments to three departments. The savings are going to be substantial with the biggest being around department chairs. It also saves the college in administrative structures. The COEDU believes this proposed structure promotes less duplication for resources, less duplication of courses, and promotes collaboration among programs, such as the teacher education programs, which would be shifted from the dean's office to the department.

The second concern is around process. Dean Torres chose to work with faculty council which began before she moved to Tampa during the summer. Working with the faculty council, a task force was created composed of four members appointed by the council,

plus two members that were appointed by her. The proposal presented at today's Senate meeting was the recommendation of the task force. In addition, talks about changing the organizational structure of the college have been on-going for various years, so this is not a new topic within the COEDU. Dean Torres' role was to enact the process and move forward a proposal.

The reasons for maintaining the timeline is so that the college has the spring semester to implement the changes. Dean Torres is committed to working with the COEDU faculty council on the implementation and, as the process develops, she will seek input from faculty.

Dr. Shaunessy-Dedrick, chair of the COEDU faculty council, presented the background of developing the charge for and creation of a task force. In her opinion, the task force was very diligent in researching other models throughout the country to use. The task force also consulted with colleagues within USF's COEDU to inform how it might restructure and how it might collaborate and be connected. There were many structures, but the one presented to the Senate today was the final version they came up with. Feedback received from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (SEC) was that it wanted to hear more about the input of faculty in this process and be assured, on some level, that faculty were invited to provide input and that the process was inclusive. The task force invited faculty to four to five forums, as well as having the proposal posted on the Canvas site allowing people to post initial thoughts and reactions. After the task force completed its work, the proposal was forwarded to the dean, an action that started the 90-day clock under this policy. The faculty council then set up public meetings with faculty and staff and met with each of the department chairs and program coordinators and asked them their opinions. Dr. Shaunessy-Dedrick commented that no one came out directly and said publically they were in opposition to the change. There were comments about the nature of the change and possible configurations. The faculty council felt it has done all it could to solicit conversation about this particular issue which is reflected in the proposal. The faculty council ultimately decided that it would accept this proposal, but there are a few conditions which have been shared with the dean to which she has responded, not only to the faculty council, but to the entire faculty body. These concerns are also noted in the proposal response. Some of the timeline parameters have already been set. Both the faculty and staff voluminously questioned the timing of the nuts and bolts changes if it would be approved. So a little more specificity is needed about how the process would unfold should it be approved. There has been a consistent pattern throughout the process of dialogue with faculty at many different levels.

President Teague presented the following resolution reflective of the Senate's responsibility to evaluate the proposal:

Concerning the proposal for organizational realignment of the USF College of Education, the USF Tampa (delete) Faculty Senate finds that the process of development of the proposal has included sufficient consultation for what is proposed at this stage and that it appears likely that proceeding as proposed would yield the benefits described for the University of South Florida.

The Faculty Senate, therefore, recommends to the administration that the proposed steps be taken, with consideration of issues identified by the Senate and reflected in the report to the Provost.

The motion was seconded. There was a friendly amendment to delete Tampa in the first line so that it reads USF Faculty Senate. The floor was opened for discussion.

Q: What is the definition of efficiency?

A: Dean Torres responded that efficiency, in general, tends to mean that you do something in a more concise way with less money that benefits the college too. She would define efficiency as the cost of learning, the possibility of collaboration, and less duplication of courses are likely to be reduced. Communication within the departments will increase because those departments will be together although they will be bigger.

Q: Is it left up to the dean to define what efficiency is? Faculty may want to have a voice.

A: Dean Torres responded that in the task force report it did look at the strategic plan for USF, and it did see the recommendation for three departments. She accepted that recommendation as part of that definition of efficiency.

A: Dr. Shaunessy-Dedrick added that part of what also entered into efficiency was how movement sometimes brings financial gains, but there could be set backs in the long run. That kind of perspective drove conversations about efficiency, and it came down to these groups of people having a very common mission as teacher educators, and they are the largest constituency within the college. Trying on different hats was their effort to consider efficiency, and that is why other models were not accepted.

At this time, Provost Wilcox reminded the Senators that this policy (10-055) was carefully shaped to limit the Senate's role to approving adequacy or sufficiency of consultation and not to "dig into the weeds" of department by department, college by college, or unit by unit decision making. He was willing to discuss the matter offline, but stressed that it is important that the Faculty Senate understands the parameters that were negotiated as the policy was shaped three to four years ago. President Teague added that the Faculty Senate has typically been willing to have questions of all sorts asked, but the primary purpose is to determine whether the consultation has been adequate, and if the proposal overall is generally persuasive, that is a plus. Senator James Strange commented that there appears to be no stated criteria for determining that is the case. President Teague responded they are inclusive. He asked has the unit, that is proposing reorganization, presented information that suggests that there were lots of discussion within the unit, that consultation from faculty has been adequate for this stage of development of the work. This seems to be the intent of co-presentation of this work from the college administration and the faculty and is the information that is offered for the Faculty Senate to evaluate.

C: As a member of the COEDU, Senator Steve Permuth felt that the faculty input was basically okay. It was not excellent, but they did the very best that they could do with the circumstances that surrounded them. If the timeline follows the pattern (the 90-day clock started on September 30), if approved by the Senate would be going to the

SEC. President Teague confirmed that this was correct. Senator Permuth then offered these observations: the broader scope of what has happened with the budget. The question he raised is what is going to change now? At a recent SEC meeting, there were at least seven issues raised with some being answered but several that have not been responded to. Senator Permuth feels the work can be done within the 90-day parameter and he, in effect, moved to get it done. At this time, he had the following concerns: There needs to be a little more concern about students. He does not see student success being drawn in the proposal and that was one of the questions asked. Could you define a little more about what student success means, how it and the other strategic goals might be integrated? He would like in this proposal to talk about how the COEDU sees these falling into alignment with the strategic plan.

Senator Permuth asked the Provost to say whether or not this is what the Senate is supposed to do. Provost Wilcox reiterated his earlier reminder that the role of the Faculty Senate is to determine sufficiency of consultation. Senator Permuth asked if the Faculty Senate is considered consultation. Senate Vice President Phil Levy responded that the problem is that the Senate needs to keep focused on what 10-055 calls upon it to do, and the wording of this opens up the door to something that is outside the scope of 10-055. The Senate is asking to recommend that steps be taken. The Senate cannot make that recommendation, nor can it recommend that they not be taken. Policy 10-055 only allows the Senate to determine that procedures have been followed that the Senate believes faculty input has been taken across the board. All the Senate can vote on is that it believes that process has taken place and feels that 10-055 has been fulfilled. He does not think the Senate can do more, and the nature of its wording is pushing out the discussion about merits that is beyond the responsibility of the Senate. Senator Permuth then sought clarification by the Provost as to whether it is within the Senate's purview to ask that consultation exist with the SEC to improve the product to that body's perception. That is none of Senate's business? The Provost replied that he would have to return to the specific language of the policy. President Teague replied that the standard language in the resolution has been used at least four times in the past. It does not require the Senate to do an exhaustive analysis of the quality, but in order to imagine that it is worth going forward it has made sense for this group to say it makes sense. The Senate is not signing off on it; that is for the administrative apparatus to do. Vice President Levy responded that it still does not mean that the Senate should not have a discussion about merit, especially at the SEC level. It is really a question of what the Senate is able to vote on that makes sense. That is the issue. Senator Permuth commented that if the Senate cannot talk about efficiency or raise questions, what is it the Senate does? Vice President Levy responded that in this case, the Senate could ask if the process of change had considerable faculty input so that it can see that the input took place. Senator Permuth asked if faculty include the Senate and the SEC, or is it only the faculty of the unit so defined? If so, then the Senate has no business. Why is it involved?

Referring to policy 10-055, second sentence, second paragraph, President Teague read "Those recommendations shall then be reported to and reviewed by the Faculty Senate or equivalent representative body of that member institution, which will assess the effectiveness of the procedures followed, review the implications for the entire

institution, and make a recommendation to the institution's administration." So, the phrase "implications for the ... institution" suggests a sense of whether the substance of the recommendation has some value; hence, the reason for including that language in the motion. President Teague felt it was reasonable for there to be a call to question and ask whether the Senate has seen in this rather lengthy proposal a set of changes that seems supported by the evidence in the proposal and, in particular, that has received adequate consultation from the faculty immediately involved. If there are provisos that should be added to the SEC's final letter to the Provost about this proposal, that will be included in discussion. So far, what has been discussed is not the substance of the proposal but rather whether or not the Senate should even be looking at that. President Teague maintained that the intent of the policy is for the Senate to look at the merits of the proposal with a light touch. Senator Permuth commented that if it is the policy that the Senate has no substance to stand on to ask these questions, then why does the Senate do it? Senator Permuth was in support of the proposal, but he had some questions. President Teague responded that it is the prerogative of this group to withhold its judgment about the substance of the proposal if it wishes. The Senate has been asked to review the implications for the entire institution, which is what the policy asks. Does the Senate find that the plan tries to be more efficient and to organize people in a way that allows them to collaborate effectively and to avoid less efficiency and duplication? Does the Senate find that the implications for the institution are worthwhile and, in view of the process whereby the faculty of that unit said this is what it would like to do, albeit with much discussion and some reservations, that this consultation was sufficient? If the Senate can find in favor of those 2 things, then it votes in favor of the proposal, wraps it up with whatever comments, and forwards it to the Provost. That is how the Senate has proceeded. If there are significant reservations and the Senate wishes to indicate no, it does not want to talk about content at all and only refer to process, the Senate could do that, but that is not what the policy asks the Senate to do.

The Provost added that the basic assumption was those faculty members, colleagues in units most affected by the recommendation are both best positioned and best informed, given the opportunity to evaluate the recommendation, and the role of the Faculty Senate was the assurance of the fullest opportunity for input in such recommendations. Effectively, this is what is being asked for today and have asked for on prior applications. He is confident and has been provided assurance that faculty members, in this case across the COEDU, were provided fullest and sufficient opportunity for input – yes or no.

At this time, President Teague suggested that there be a move to voting. Senator Permuth responded that he did not like to be hurried and was not sure how many Senators had read the document. His commentary was strictly a commentary of support for the proposal, but there are questions that should be answered. He added that faculty in the COEDU are not typical of faculty in other units, because they also support other units across the university. The implications for other units are more than other colleges receive. So, the need to talk to those people regarding something as significant as the restructuring of a college seems to be an assumption. President Teague stated that if the Senate voted in favor of the resolution, with commentary made in the Senate being part of the recommendation that goes forward, then Senator Permuth's recommendation would be

on record as suggesting that further consultation with other elements of the university needs to be a part of their going forward plan. Senator Permuth agreed that if there is a resolution that there is a need to get together to try and answer some of the questions, he would be in favor of that.

President Teague stated that there was a resolution that allows for steps to be taken with issues identified in debate and reflected in the report. Senator Permuth was asked to forward a list of those elements that he would recommend be included in a report to the Provost about the Faculty Senate's discussion. If there are others, they could also be included and then move forward to voting on that report including elements that have come up from the SEC. Senator Permuth was in favor of this action and was willing to offer any support he could provide. The final sentence was modified to read: "The Faculty Senate therefore recommends to the administration that the proposed steps be taken, with consideration of issues identified by the Senate, whether in discussion or forwarded subsequently, and reflected in the report to the Provost." At this time, a vote was taken on the resolution. It passed with 1 abstention.

REPORT FROM USF SYSTEM PRESIDENT JUDY GENSHAFT

Before giving her report, President Genshaft applauded Faculty Senate President Teague for the work he and the Senate have done this year.

The President then gave the following updates:

- The Association of Public Land Grant Universities has formed a new task force that approximately 9 to 10 universities were asked to be a part of. These are the universities that are high research but not necessarily land grant. USF has been recognized as one of these universities. Being a member of such an organization is a very high point of pride.
- USF has received the Senator Paul Simon Award for internationalizing the campus.
- Dr. Karen Holbrook was elected to the National Board of Directors of the Fulbright Association.

Budget Update

President Genshaft reviewed the distributed handout of the USF-System History of E&G Revenues and Expenditures – Revised 10/25/13 (Draft). She pointed out that the 2013-14 appropriations from the Legislature was a very good year in re-appropriating the recurring E&G revenues. Although there was a trend-line that went down in 2012-13, it did go back up in 2013-14. The most recent Legislature needs to be thanked for this, especially President Gates and Speaker Weatherford, who made sure that USF's appropriations went back up. It helped that USF could count and keep its tuition which is controlled by the Legislature. Some of the money appropriated is differential tuition which is put into undergraduate programs, advising, and student success.

President Genshaft emphasized that this year's cut backs are not a financial crisis, and USF is on the right strategy, by making a course adjustment. USF needs to make sure its spending is related to its continuing money. She stated that USF dipped down into its reserves and carry forward money because the university knew there would be some money taken away in 2012-13.

Rather than have that money taken away and not know whether it would come back, the spending was planned. However, USF now needs to make sure that its carry forward and reserves are built up and make sure its recurring and spending are in sync. How much is the right amount of reserves is the question asked in a letter from BOG Vice Chair Mori Hosseini. The State requirement is 5 percent of the E&G budget. When the BOT started in 2001, it raised it to 8 percent, so USF has always kept an 8 percent reserve. With USF using so much of its cash this past year, President Genshaft recommended that it be brought up to 10 percent so that there is enough cash (carry forward) on hand to have enough money for a certain number of pay periods should anything happen. She reiterated that thanks to the current Legislature, the money did go back up which was appreciated, but USF has to build its reserves. The President also reiterated that USF is moving in the right direction and doing the right budget strategy as confirmed by different entities. She will forward to President Teague the letter from BOG Vice Chair Hosseini, along with her response, for dissemination to the Senators.

REPORT FROM PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT RALPH WILCOX

Provost Wilcox's report consisted of the following items:

- He referenced the presentation received by the Senators on the advances and expansion of Innovative Education (IE), formerly University College, which is expected to be a growing, on-line education enterprise at USF along with cost recovery and market rate models. The expectation is that USF will not see a return to general revenue public investment in higher education at the same rate as years past. Any growth in revenues will be coming through as a result of innovation driven, partnership driven initiatives. IE is a big part of that, as well as INTO.
- Transforming summer school is also going to be a big part of this. The money available in the past is no longer available to draw upon, yet there is a growing need and demand from students. There is a summer school planning committee of which Senator James Garey is a member. Summer school will be driven in large part by meeting student demand, finding new/increasing markets, and developing a sustainable financial model to support that delivery in the summer. The Provost emphasized that the size of summer delivery will not be reduced but will be expanded to meet the above items.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.