USF FACULTY SENATE MEETING
January 31, 2018
3:00 – 5:00 p.m.
Chamber Room 4200 Marshall Student Center

1. Call to Order, Review of Agenda

2. Approval of Minutes from November 15, 2017 Meeting (action item)

3. Report from Faculty Senate President Jim Garey

4. Reports by Officers and Council Chairs (20 minutes)
   a. Bylaws/Constitution Proposed Language Presentation and Vote – Drew Smith (action item)
   b. Election Documents – Matthew Knight, Drew Smith (action item)
   c. General Education and Curricular Revision Update – Kyna Betancourt, Jill Roberts

5. Old Business
   a. Update on USF Strategic Plan – Terry Chisholm, Pritish Mukherjee (5 minutes)
   b. FUSE Program Update – Paul Dosal, Paul Atchley (5 minutes)

6. New Business
   a. What’s good/what isn’t good – Jim Garey (5 minutes)

7. Report on USF System Faculty Council Activities – Jim Garey (5 minutes)

8. Report from UFF President Arthur Shapiro (3 minutes)

9. News and Discussion on USF Consolidation - All

10. Report from USF System President Judy Genshaft (15 minutes)

11. Report from Provost and Executive Vice President Ralph Wilcox (10 minutes)

12. Other Business from the Floor (5 minutes)

Next meeting: February 21, 2018
Faculty Senate President Jim Garey called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m., after which he reviewed the agenda. A motion was made and seconded to approve the Minutes from the meeting of November 15, 2017. Before calling for a vote, President Garey clarified that the syllabus bank discussion would be discussed with the Senate Executive Committee and brought back to the Faculty Senate at a future meeting. A correction was put forth to change the word “appointment” to “apportionment” in item a. under Reports by Officers and Council Chairs. There being no further discussion or revisions, the motion to approve the Minutes, as amended, was unanimously passed.

REPORT FROM FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT GAREY

In addition to presenting background information on the proposed new apportionment process, President Garey also reviewed the plan for moving the process forward. Fully aware of the problems inherent with USF’s current apportionment process which is determined by college, he contacted the Faculty Council President of UNC Charlotte to learn about the model used there for determining representation. With this information, he and Drew Smith introduced a potential solution that would revise the system so that individual departments or department-equivalents within Academic Affairs will receive one Senator. One additional Senator will be apportioned to represent all Academic Affairs general faculty who are not otherwise represented. The USF Health Colleges will continue with senators apportioned by college because a number of their colleges lack departmental structure (Nursing, for example). Therefore, the new apportionment process will be a hybrid model, with departmental apportionment for Academic Affairs and a continuing college apportionment for USF Health.

President Garey explained that moving to a departmental model requires revising the Constitution and Bylaws. The Constitution changes require a 2/3 vote of the Senators present (must be quorum), a majority vote of the General Faculty, and approval from President Genshaft. Bylaws changes require a 2/3 vote of Senators present. As required by the Bylaws, the proposed changes were introduced at the November Senate meeting, and were ready for a vote at today’s meeting. President Garey pointed out that if the proposed Legislative consolidation of the three accredited institutions passes, this process will need to be revisited.

REPORTS BY OFFICERS AND COUNCIL CHAIRS

a. Bylaws/Constitution Proposed Language Presentation and Vote – Drew Smith

Parliamentarian Smith reviewed the proposed language revisions. He pointed out that departments will be delegated to elect their own Senators. How they choose to do that is up to the department. When Senator Lynn Wecker asked for the definition of “general faculty,” Parliamentarian Smith read the following as stated in the Constitution, Article I. General Faculty, A. Definition:
The general faculty of the University of South Florida shall consist of all full-time faculty members with the rank of Lecturer, Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, Instructor Librarian, Assistant Librarian, Associate Librarian, or Librarian. Full time is defined as 100 percent for 9 months or at least 75 percent for 12 months, temporary reductions in percent of effort due to insufficient funding are not germane. Visiting faculty, regardless of rank or duration of appointment, are not counted as members of the general faculty.

Faculty members who hold administrative appointments beyond the department level, such as president, provost, senior vice president, executive vice president, associate vice president, assistant vice president, vice provost, dean, associate dean, or similar other positions and titles, and persons acting in the above capacities are not counted as members of the general faculty for the duration of their administrative appointments. Department chairs and directors of academic departments or units are members of the general faculty.

Senator Gregory McColm asked for clarification as to whether a Senator can be appointed by a department chair. Parliamentarian Smith responded that a department chair could not mandate who the representative will be. Representatives are not appointed but elected.

There being no further discussion, a motion was made and seconded to approve the proposed language revisions and move to the new apportionment system. The motion unanimously passed. A vote on the new process will now be solicited from the general faculty.

b. Election Documents – Matthew Knight

Secretary Knight presented the USF Faculty Senate Election Schedule and the USF Faculty Senate Apportionment for 2018/2019. A motion was made and seconded to accept these documents. It was clarified that the approval of the apportionment would be contingent upon the general faculty vote and approval from President Genshaft. There being no further discussion, the motion unanimously passed.

c. General Education and Curricular Revision Update – Kyna Betancourt, Jill Roberts

Dr. Roberts, chair of the Undergraduate Council, did not have anything to report because no new curriculum items had been received.

Dr. Betancourt, chair of the General Education Council (GEC), reported that the GEC was reviewing the 72 courses it received. Not all colleges submitted all of their allotted
courses. The GEC is also beginning to work on the student learning outcomes for the next two tiers of the pyramid and will be finalizing those by the end of the semester.

OLD BUSINESS
a. Update on USF Strategic Plan – Terry Chisholm, Pritish Mukherjee

Dr. Chisholm reported that the committee has been meeting each month. Progress is being made with such things as analysis, sending out surveys, and incorporating technology into the process. Dr. Mukherjee added that the committee is beginning to look at the 4 goals as set forth in the Strategic Plan. The committee is interested in staying with those goals with possibly adding one.

b. FUSE Program Update – Paul Atchley, Fai Howard

Drs. Atchley and Howard, from the Office of Undergraduate Studies, co-presented information on FUSE. Dr. Atchley explained that FUSE is a graduation pathway for high achieving students that ensures learning outcomes are met for all USF programs through curricular alignment with FUSE partner institutions. Dr. Howard added that the key design feature of FUSE is a renewed focus on a seamless student experience. The program is viewed as the best way to ensure 4-year graduation rates.

NEW BUSINESS
a. What’s good/what isn’t good – Jim Garey

Following up on what was presented at the beginning of the Fall 2017 Semester, President Garey first asked for feedback from the Senators on what good things were happening at USF for the Spring 2018 Semester. Comments offered were:

• The English Department was excited about the curricular path.
• The Library is doing what it can with textbook affordability.
• There were no problems with parking this year.
• The new apportionment process.

What isn’t good:

• The struggle to appoint students to councils. It was clarified that there should be a statement in the council charge.
• Not enough proactive efforts to do better in diversity faculty hiring.
REPORT ON USF SYSTEM FACULTY COUNCIL ACTIVITIES – Jim Garey

President Garey reported that at its January 25th meeting the SFC discussed the proposed consolidation of the three institutions. Proposed guidelines were reviewed on policy #10-055 for deans to follow to ensure the SFC and Faculty Senates are supplied the appropriate information regarding faculty consultation of proposed changes.

REPORT FROM UFF PRESIDENT ARTHUR SHAPIRO

President Shapiro reported that UFF is not happy with HB 423, and that HB 25 will create a lot of uncertainty.

LETTER OF SUPPORT – Jim Garey

Before opening the discussion on the proposed consolidation, President Garey presented a draft letter of support to be sent to the USFSP and USFSM Faculty Senate presidents. A quick review and discussion of the letter was held resulting in a slight revision of the last sentence.

REPORT FROM USF SYSTEM PRESIDENT JUDY GENSHAFT

President Genshaft reported that Governor Rick Scott has appointed Leslie Muma and Charles Tokarz to the Board of Trustees. Mr. Oscar Horton has been appointed to the USF Board of Trustees by the Florida Board of Governors.

After reviewing the history of accreditation at USF regional institutions, President Genshaft focused her attention on HB 423, which proposes consolidation of the USF institutions. She pointed out that USF leadership (specifically the President or the BOT) did not initiate the consolidation, but that it is the vision of the Honorable Chris Sprowls and the Honorable Jeff Brandes as set forth in HB 423. As written, the bill places responsibility for developing an implementation plan with the USF Board of Trustees, and presenting it to the Florida Board of Governors for approval by January 15, 2019. HB 423 envisions USF being under a single regional accreditation by July 1, 2020. Since there is no descriptive language in the bill, this gives USF the opportunity, after dialogue and consultations with colleagues at the other institutions and partners, to plan its future rather than it be determined in law by the Legislature. This consolidation would align USF with other Florida multi-campus public universities. She emphasized that USF will follow process, will be transparent, and will be inclusive. In addition, it is important that the regional campuses keep their identities.

President Genshaft outlined examples of benefits for our students under the consolidation model: all USF students will be graduating from a pre-eminent doctoral degree granting institution and fluidity of coursework and majors will be easier for students to obtain. Other benefits, as outlined in Chair Lamb’s January 31 letter to Representative Sprowls and Senator Brandes include:
• All USF students, regardless of the campus where their primary instruction takes place, will graduate with a diploma from the University of South Florida, a nationally-recognized and highly-ranked Preeminent Research University.

• For the first time, the benefits of graduate research and doctoral opportunities would be available at all USF campuses.

• The success of every USF student will contribute equally towards maintaining USF’s standing as a national top-tier research institution, a Preeminent Research University in Florida, and to achieve our vision to become an AAU institution. Therefore, each student, regardless of location, will benefit from the investments necessary to achieve and maintain each of those goals.

• All students attending any USF campus will have the opportunity to access every degree program offered across the entire USF System. The instruction in many of those programs could be offered on the local campus or through more convenient delivery systems.

• The need for students to transfer between USF institutions to seek the educational opportunities of their dreams will no longer be required. Upon admission to a unified USF, students would be free to move between campuses at their pleasure and at a time that best suits their educational and personal needs.

President Genshaft cautioned, though, that the proposal is part of a bill that could fail or be vetoed by the governor. It is too early in the session to know what will happen. Community-wide and campus discussions and conversations at all three institutions are being held.

At this time, President Garey returned to the letter of support to the regionals. A motion was made and seconded that the amended letter be sent to the USFSP and USFSM Faculty Senate presidents. Senator Richard Manning commented that he did not understand how the identities of the other institutions could be preserved under the consolidation. There being no further comments or discussion, the motion unanimously passed.

REPORT FROM PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT RALPH WILCOX

Provost Wilcox made the following comments on HB 423:

• It has elements from the last session.

• Although there is no reference to the state college system this year, it is embedded in separate bills.

• Preeminence is now listed in the bill. The House has included an additional $23 million in its early, proposed budget. USF is acknowledged as meeting existing metrics.

• The Senate has included $100 million in recurring performance-based funding; zero dollars have been allocated from the House.

• It is being recommended that points be given for improvements, not excellence.

• There is a recommendation to change the formula for distribution of funds.

• The financial aid package is exceptional.
• There is a new program with a $24 million placeholder that will invest in the design of graduate/undergraduate/research programs to reach national or global prominence.

• Although a model for block tuition has yet to be determined, there is no guarantee that it remains, or that the bill will be approved, or if the proposed incentive is approved.

ISSUES FROM THE FLOOR

UFF Secretary McColm commented that the faculty are not engaged enough in the university community as evidenced in the Constitution revisions to the election apportionment, HB 423, and HB 25. These proposals are occurring due to the lack of participation by faculty.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.