

**SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**MINUTES**  
October 8, 2003

Present: Michael Barber, Glen Besterfield, Elizabeth Bird, Ellis Blanton, Susan Greenbaum, Sara Mandell, Fraser Ottanelli, Carol Steele, Nancy Jane Tyson

Provost's Office: Robert Chang, Renu Khator

Guests: Marilyn Burke, Emanuel Donchin, Kathy Whitley

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 p.m. The Minutes from the September 3, 2003, meeting were approved as amended.

**SENATE PRESIDENT'S REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS** (Elizabeth Bird)

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

- Kathy Whitley, Webmaster for the Faculty Senate, was at today's meeting to talk about some of the proposed changes with the website. Senator Emanuel Donchin and Ms. Marilyn Burke, Chair of the Honors and Awards Council, were invited to attend to discuss the proposed procedures for Emeritus professor status. Ms. Burke also presented revisions to the Honorary Degree Nomination Guidelines.
- The draft document of Principles on Shared Governance was forwarded to Interim Provost Khator. President Bird and Interim Provost Khator have agreed that moving to a simple promulgation may not work now, so there will be a brief consultative process whereby a work group will be put together consisting of a vice president and deans. This will be a small group that will take a look at the document together in the spirit of a shared process and will think about ways to present it to the university. After that, the document moves toward implementation. Since it was a principles document, it did not say anything about how shared governance will operate. Therefore, President Bird pointed out that it was important to work toward implementation as quickly as possible and to make this official policy.
- A SACS accreditation consultant visited USF who talked to many university people about the issues that USF is going to be facing with re-accreditation. The consultant pointed out that one of USF's major weaknesses for accreditation is that it is not moving fast enough and not making the commitment it needs to be at the highest level in terms of money. The big problems for SACS accreditation are credentialing of faculty, especially in terms of people teaching out-of-field. In particular, the regional campuses may have a problem in terms of credentialing.
- The other big issue that is going to affect everyone is accountability measures. There are three statewide bodies that are developing accountability measures for universities. At

some point USF could be ordered to develop some kind of accountability measures, specifically on student performance. There may be connections with the SACS accreditation but this is going to be a longer term thing.

- The Faculty Senate will be having visits from various people such as a member of the Quality Enhancement Planning Committee, which is part of SACS accreditation. Senator Hector Vila, Chair of the Governmental Relations Committee, is developing some actions for that particular committee. He plans to invite State Legislators to the Senate meeting in December for a question/answer session where the Senate can present to them what it thinks are the priorities for higher education in Florida and have the legislators respond to questions. Chair Vila would like to make the Governmental Relations Committee a much more active committee than it has been in terms of presenting the position of the faculty at USF to the state government.

### **INTERIM PROVOST'S REPORT (Renu Khator)**

Interim Provost Khator's report consisted of the following issues:

- After acknowledging President Bird's time and guidance on the SACS accreditation, Interim Provost Khator pointed out that USF is going to face some very challenging issues and there are two things that need to be done. One, is to take it to a high level and think about the urgency of what is in front of USF. Second, is having a plan to invest in policy enhancement.
- At the request of the Faculty Senate, Vice President Carl Carlucci has agreed to attend a Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting to discuss some of the issues that were brought up during the last Senate meeting.
- An organization chart of the administration was distributed. This was also on request from the Faculty Senate which will receive a copy of the same chart at the October meeting. The chart does not necessarily reflect how things are done academically. In other words, although it is not indicated on the chart, all academic work between the campuses and the Provost's Office is guided and directed from the Provost's Office. This will also be discussed as a part of SACS as well as regional campus guidelines.
- The issues regarding problems with the new *FAST!* Financial system have been investigated by Vice Provost Robert Chang through meetings with Human Resources and University Services. One of the questions raised by the Faculty Senate at the September meeting was the problems encountered with setting up an account. Under the old system, it took three to four days to set up a new account. Now, it takes three to four weeks for each research project. The system improvement does not justify that kind of a lengthening of the period. What concerns Vice Provost Chang is that the work seems to be done by different groups with the starting point of the process handled at a certain point and then it goes to another group and so on. This means that there is nobody overseeing the whole procedure beginning to end to shorten that period. Vice Provost Chang will be working with the Office of Research to have somebody put in charge so

that instead of one group working and passing things to another, the whole procedure can be looked at to find out how to shorten that process. He pointed out that there is no excuse to put in an elaborate system like this and turn it into a lengthy process. That defeats the purpose.

Another issue pertained to the invoice backup. Instead of 6,000 invoices backed up it is now down to 3,000. Accounts Payable has added nine OPS staff to the task who are being trained right now, but a way to erase this backlog still needs to be considered. One problem area is that invoices are getting mismatched, and therefore, they cannot pay them. That is, if the purchase order and the invoice do not match, payment is stopped. This is at least ten percent of the problem. Vice Provost Chang asked Accounts Payable to analyze the situation and he was presented with a list of the most problematic areas. He, in turn, will be sending out letters to the department chairs instructing them to inform their faculty or staff, whoever processes purchase orders, to make sure they have an accurate price.

The other problematic area is the lack of receiving reports. When the department does not indicate that there is a receiving report, then this is another match that will not let the payment go through. This turns out to be forty percent of the problem. Vice Provost Chang pointed out that some of these are very simple matters. It is the question of getting the message out to the right people so as not to have this pipeline of problematic invoices coming in. He hopes that through better communication and better management the situation will finally become controlled.

- USF has several groups working on accountability and performance measures. Vice Provost Ralph Wilcox is the contact person for all of those groups. A copy of a memorandum to Steve Uhlfelder, Chair, Board of Governors Performance and Accountability Committee, was distributed. This was a response regarding the performance measures. Any input to be given in whatever forum would help, as well as any guidance from the SEC.
- An Overview of Agency Performance Measures was distributed comprising eleven different groups. Some are in Florida, others are national. This is a compendium of what other groups are doing with regard to performance measures. The table is color coded based on the strategic goals of USF.

## **REPORTS BY OFFICERS AND COUNCIL CHAIRS**

### **a. Committee on Committees Report (Ellis Blanton)**

Committee on Committees (COC) Chair Blanton explained that because the selection of the COC did not occur during the spring semester, the nomination review process was delayed this semester. The COC members are currently reviewing recent nominations and will be meeting on October 20<sup>th</sup> to forward recommendations to the SEC.

At the request of the Chair of the Research Council and subsequently President Bird, the COC reviewed nominations for the Research Council “out-of-cycle.” This was done so that the Research Council would have sufficient membership to make decisions about the internal grant program. Chair Blanton identified those people who were nominated for positions on the Research Council that were qualified but also were the only nominations for that particular area. There were only two situations where there were multiple people nominated for one position, so he decided to hold those for discussion at the COC meeting to make final choices. The COC voted to accept the five qualified people who were the only nominations from their respective colleges. President Bird suggested that the SEC, speaking for the full Senate, confirm those nominations at this meeting. Then, these people will be informed by the COC that they are likely to be the nominees and they can be confirmed at the October 22<sup>nd</sup> Faculty Senate meeting.

At this time a motion was made and seconded to approve the following nominees for the Research Council: David Himmelgreen (Member-at-Large), Carol Mullen (Member-at-Large) Uday Murthy (BUS), Etienne Pracht (COPH), and Gregory Teague (FMHI). The motion was unanimously passed.

#### **INFORMATION ITEMS (Elizabeth Bird)**

a. 1991 Policy on Regional Campuses and New Proposed Policy

President Bird presented for informational purposes only two documents. One was the 1991 Policy on Regional Campuses and the other was the new Proposed Policy on Regional Campuses. The new document appeared during July with a request that comments from faculty were needed by August 15<sup>th</sup> which is when the document was to go into effect. However, this document has not had any real consultation given the way it was created. It was written by a committee of associate deans without any faculty. President Bird consulted with Interim Provost Khator who agreed that the Senate would form an ad hoc committee to look at this document from a faculty perspective. The committee has been selected and is chaired by Senator Steve Permuth.

Senator-at-Large Fraser Ottanelli, who is a member of the ad hoc committee, added that the documents have been subpoenaed. The ad hoc committee has met with everybody involved with writing the original documents, found out the history and has discussed the issues. Members of the committee have written critiques and at this point information is still being accumulated. The ad hoc committee plans to have a preliminary discussion with the Senate sometime around early November.

President Bird commented that the current documents are going out for information to the Faculty Senate with the next meeting cycle so the Senators will have time to read them and respond. At the November Faculty Senate meeting, Senator Permuth will present the committee’s report. The Senate will discuss it and take a position. Simultaneously, Vice Provost Ralph Wilcox, whose area is regional campuses, is also looking at the issue and getting feedback from deans and other people. When he has assembled the material from all groups involved, he will continue to work with the faculty and Senator Permuth to

move toward a final resolution. There needs to be a lot more discussion and Senator Permuth does not anticipate that there will be a working document for regional campuses until the end of the year.

b. Undergraduate Committee Response to Policy on Exploitation (Elizabeth Bird)

President Bird explained that the Policy on Exploitation was a policy that was created without any faculty input by a group of administrators in response to a perceived need. The policy had begun the promulgation process which Interim Provost Khator agreed to halt so that the document was no longer moving forward. However, it has been forwarded to the Faculty Senate for comment. Both the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils were asked to review the document, not to rewrite it but to respond. Undergraduate Council Chair Glen Besterfield presented the Council's response (attached). The Graduate Council referred it to a policy subcommittee.

c. Senate Web Site (Kathy Whitley)

President Bird met with Associate Librarian Kathy Whitley to discuss the need to make the Faculty Senate website more useful, more informational, more attractive, more a source where the faculty can come to see what the Senate is all about and find relevant documents etc. At President Bird's request, Ms. Whitley attended today's meeting and presented examples of three websites and one secondary page mockup for consideration by the SEC. Ms. Whitley explained that the actual look of the page is window dressing and probably more important is what comes behind that which is where useful parts of the website are located. The most requested items need to be on the menu bar. The section under that could be used as a space that gives news and lists specific documents. A feedback box could be integrated on the front page or set up as a link. The secondary page is where such items as the members would be listed, the Executive Committee, or the Bylaws. One preference expressed by President Bird was the use of pictures of the members so faculty could identify who is who.

President Bird added that she would like the site to be a depository for useful documents for the faculty, not just Senate documents but documents on promotion, etc. Although that information is also available on the Provost's website, faculty preference is to access a site where they can learn about something from a faculty perspective. She asked that the SEC members send comments to her about what they want to see on the website, such as more/less pictures, resources, what should the website actually be able to do. In addition, if anyone finds another kind of graphic look that might be better and more effective they should also send that to her.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

a. Revisions to Constitution

President Bird received feedback from Senators for some minor additional amendments to the *Constitution*. The *Constitution* will be on the November SEC agenda for full

discussion. She asked that the members review the document, particularly the section on the responsibilities of the Senate. They should send any suggestions, modifications, or amendments to her before the November meeting.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### a. Revisions to Honorary Degree Nomination (Marilyn Burke)

Honors and Awards Council (HAC) Chair Marilyn Burke attended today's meeting to present recommended changes to the Honorary Degree Nomination guidelines. Chair Burke explained that the HAC requested the removal of the last line of section one and a shortened version of item number 2. Therefore, item number 2 would read "The nominee must have demonstrated eminent achievement and scholarship that embodies the objectives and goals of the honorary degree. In addition, the nominee must be one who has made a noteworthy contribution to faculty, students, and/or other units of the University, or to Academia in general." This recommendation came as a motion to the SEC, passed by the HAC, that needs to be endorsed by the Faculty Senate before it becomes policy. A motion to support this proposal was made and seconded and the proposal was opened for discussion. One member asked what prompted this dissatisfaction with the honorary degree definition. Chair Burke replied there was some question as to it being too specific in certain areas, not giving enough latitude. It also makes the guidelines a little less defined, because the HAC felt that it was a little too specific. With number two rewritten the way it is, the qualification does not have to be specifically just financial. The HAC members want to consider a lot of things but within the confines of making quality contributions. At this time the motion was unanimously passed to accept the proposed changes from the HAC to the honorary degree nomination guidelines and forward them as a recommendation to the full Senate at its October meeting.

### b. Revisions to Emeritus Professor Award (Marilyn Burke, Emanuel Donchin)

At the request of President Bird, Senator Emanuel Donchin attended today's meeting to present a new proposed policy on the Emeritus Professor process. President Bird explained that last year in the College of Arts and Sciences there was quite a broad discussion about the Emeritus process at USF. During these discussions, it was pointed out that the process at USF is very anomalous compared to almost any other university in the country. Usually, Emeritus status is automatically given upon retirement and that is very common. Some universities have a time frame while others have a much more simple process that might be something along the lines of somebody being nominated within the department. Essentially, it puts the decision making for an Emeritus in the department because that is where the faculty member has spent his or her time.

The department chairs in Arts and Science brought forward a proposal last year with the goal of it coming to the Senate. Unfortunately their recommendations did not go directly to the Senate, they went instead into the Provost's office and no further. So it was decided to revisit the issue this year and to move on it very quickly. Toward the end of

the summer President Bird appointed an ad hoc committee chaired by Senator Emanuel Donchin from the Department of Psychology which has been one of the groups talking about this for some time. The recommendations then went to the Honors and Awards Council. The SEC and the full Senate need to do two things, one of which is recommending that the awarding of Emeritus moves out of the Honors and Awards Council and into the purview of the Senate. Second, is recommending that this is the process to be followed. At this time the floor was turned over to Senator Donchin and HAC Chair Burke.

Senator Donchin commented that the consensus of the ad hoc committee is reflected by the proposal. He explained that an Emeritus is a career state, that it is not an honorary award, therefore, it does not belong in the Honors and Awards Council. The first step is to remove the emeritization process from the Honors and Awards Council and replace it with a procedure. There was some disagreement in the committee as to what extent it should be special or automatic. The idea is that the retiree writes the department chair and asks to become Emeritus. The department chair advises the dean, the dean approves or not, as the case may be. The dean recommends to the Provost to approve or not. Then it is recommended to the university president.

HAC Chair Burke added that the HAC recommended step 6 as a safety valve so that it is one less opportunity for the Emeritus not to become a popularity contest. The addition was "In the event the departmental chair and/or dean does not support the nomination, then the nominator will forward the nomination with supporting documents directly to the Chair of the Honors and Awards Council by the deadline date." The reason for putting this clause in is that, based upon past experience, the HAC knows there have been cases in which the department chair does not support Emeritus status. Such people could be denied the title of Emeritus because of just one person.

Discussion centered on numbers 2, 3 and 6 under **Process** and how it will be the department's responsibility to establish safety mechanisms for nominating faculty for Emeritus. When asked why it was taken out of the college tenure and promotion process, Senator Donchin replied that the ad hoc committee felt that in most universities Emeritus is automatic, but they wanted to make it this way but not totally automatic. He then summarized the process as follows: The applicant writes the chair, the chair uses several different mechanisms. How does the department make the decision? The department is going to adopt their policies as to whether or not they need the faculty member. The nomination comes out of the department and goes to the dean, and the dean can decide what needs to be done, such as recommending the nominee to the Provost. Presumably, the president has to sign off. The chair cannot send the nomination directly to the president. That is why the committee put in the stages so as not to specify either to the dean or the provost. The notion was that a nominee does not need letters of reference or all kinds of recommendations. Presumably, someone who has been at USF twenty or thirty years and is at the state where he/she will retire will become emeritized.

Interim Provost Khator pointed out that she is pleased with this proposed process, but would like to keep it with the faculty. That is, if it is left to the discretion of the

department chair or whomever, and she has to sign off on the nomination, then she would like to see an award of the peers or something. However, she did ask if the department decides that it does not want this person around, can just the chair and a faculty member drive this process? Vice President Greenbaum expressed that she did not agree with giving so much discretion to chairs because sometimes chairs abuse their discretion. She asked why it could not be put with the tenure and promotion process and let the department vote on it? That way if the chair says no and everybody else in the department says yes, then that gives the dean something to look at that would not be there if it was just a denial by the chair.

Senator Donchin replied that he had no problem with having the faculty vote on that. However, he asked how to deal with the faculty member that retires and his/her colleagues do not like the person. Is this person not going to be given Emeritus status?

Senator-at-Large Fraser Ottanelli commented that such a person, granted Emeritus, might then have a vote in faculty decisions. If such a clause is included, then there needs to be a strict process. Senator Donchin replied that you are talking about a person who has been accepted by the faculty, been granted tenure at the university by the faculty, but not sure that you want to put this person back to a vote. Senator-at-Large Ottanelli added that in terms of the rights of the faculty member not to be dealt with by a chair who never did like him and is not about to give him anything, a faculty vote may jeopardize the people applying for Emeritus, but it broadens it out more than just the chair.

At this time, President Bird asked for a suggestion or a motion. It was agreed that there should be a statement each department's governance document on the rights of the Professor Emeritus. It should be up to each department because each department is a different culture. Whether or not an Emeritus has the right to vote on department matters should be up to the department faculty. For purposes of today's discussion, President Bird recommended that the Proposed USF Policy on Emeritus Status be amended to state that each department will develop its own internal procedures for making recommendations.

At this time, there was a series of motions made pertaining to the proposal. The first motion was made and seconded to delete number 6 under the **Process** section of the proposal. The motion unanimously passed. A second motion was made and seconded to revise number 2 to add "It is expected that each department will develop its own procedures for reaching the recommendation that the chair will then write." The motion unanimously passed. A third motion was made to add to number 3 "In either case, the letter should briefly evaluate the candidate's record as a faculty member." The motion unanimously passed. A fourth motion was made to remove the granting of Emeritus status from the charge of the Faculty Senate Honors and Awards Council. The motion was seconded and unanimously passed. The last motion made and seconded was to accept the Proposed USE Policy on Emeritus Status as amended. The motion was unanimously passed. The proposal will be presented to the full Senate at its October meeting.

d. Proposed New Committees (Elizabeth Bird)

The first council discussed was the Council on Educational Policy and Issues. President Bird explained that USF has a problem in implementing the notion of shared governance. There is no procedure by which the faculty of the Senate initiates policy. Although there are other councils/groups that may be initiating policies, there is no central committee where policies originate or from where faculty can respond. When there are general policies that reflect the academic life of the institution, they have to have somewhere from which to originate. This was President Bird's motivation for putting together the following charge:

**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. 13 tenure-track or tenured faculty, who will be voting members, distributed as follows:
  - Three from College of Arts and Sciences
  - One from College of Engineering
  - One from College of Engineering
  - One from College of Education
  - One from College of Marine Sciences
  - One from College of Nursing
  - One from College of Public Health/FMHI
  - One from College of Visual and Performing Arts
  - One from College of Business Administration

- One from Health Sciences
- One representing regional campuses

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.

This would be a new standing council of the Senate, and its charge would be broad. It would be concerned with all matters of quality of education at the university, primarily with issues, policies and procedures that affect academic quality on a university-wide basis. President Bird looked at other universities and this was the kind of language that was used. The council shall develop its own operational procedures subject to approval by the Provost. This council would not have the power to change policy, but would have

the power to bring policy suggestions forward to the appropriate people. President Bird suggested the council be composed of thirteen, tenured faculty who will be the voting members. She suggested the same kind of distribution of membership as with the other Senate committees and councils. President Bird presented this council to the SEC to find out whether or not it thinks it is a good idea and whether it would be useful. The floor was opened for discussion.

The comment was made that the formation last year of ad hoc committees with the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils did not work well. President Bird was asked if she had polled any existing committees. She replied that she had not contacted any of the other committees because none of the charges deal with policy, except for the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils. There are so many policies that are not confined to graduates or undergraduates or any particular subfield. This would not prevent any other committee from looking at policies. A motion was made and seconded to recommend to the Committee on Committees that this council be formed.

Past President Nancy Jane Tyson asked how committees were doing this year. During her term as president there were a lot of problems with committees having difficulties convening and difficulty finding people willing to be on committees. The COC was commissioned to try to retire some of the committees and so forth. She expressed that she was a little bit skeptical about creating new committees and wondered if the situation is any healthier now. President Bird replied that some of the committees are very active and some are almost dead. She thinks part of the problem is there are committees that do not really know what they are supposed to be doing. Then there are issues which float around because there is no committee that can address them. The needs and the committees need to be matched with what is available. She added that the committees need to be more proactive and create agenda items for themselves. President Bird does not want to create another committee that is going to sit around and do nothing., so she feels that there is a whole lot of business that this committee could take care of working with the administration.

A motion was made and seconded to forward this proposed council to the Committee on Committees for its review and recommendations to be presented to the SEC at a future meeting.

The Committee on Faculty Issues was the second committee introduced by President Bird. This committee would be responsible for advising the Senate and Provost on any issues that influence the personal and professional welfare of the faculty. After a brief discussion a motion was made and seconded that the SEC supported the principle of this committee and that an ad hoc group should be formed to develop it. The motion unanimously passed.

e. Discussion of Advisory Council of Faculty Senate Resolutions

President Bird presented the following motions passed by the Advisory Council of Faculty Senates (ACFS) at its meeting in Tallahassee on September 19, 2003:

**The Advisory Council of Faculty Senates (ACFS) representing the faculty of the State University System in Florida at the September 19th meeting passed the following motions:**

**1. Accountability**

The ACFS recommends the following measures and changes to those proposed by the Accountability Committee of the BOG:

- (a) Any measure of student performance (e.g., CLAST) must have a stake for the student.
- (b) BOG measures should utilize the existing accountability measures required by SACS and other accrediting agencies.
- (c) Faculty representatives should participate in the development of accountability measures and serve on task-forces or subcommittees responsible for formulating and deciding on the accountability measures.
- (d) Accountability measures should be consistent with the mission and goals of each institution.
- (e) A new horizontal column should be added with a heading reading "Research & Service" and a subheading reading "Evidence of Productivity." The recommended measures under this new column should include: funded research; scholarly and creative productivity; academic service; public and professional service; and university service.
- f) Accountability measures should be utilized consistently over a significant period of time.

**2. Tuition**

Given that state funds are limited and that Florida's undergraduate tuition is ranked nearly last nationally, the ACFS recommends that in-state tuition be raised by ten percent with an additional option of five percent to be determined by the vote of the Board of Trustees at each university. It is understood by the ACFS, that this would be strictly an increment to the legislature appropriation.

**3. University Entrance Requirements**

The ACFS resolves that all candidates for admission as freshmen to the SUS must fulfill the General Requirements for High School (four years) or its equivalent. The Standard College Preparatory Program (3-year) and the Career Preparatory Program (3-year) are not acceptable for admission of freshmen in the state university system.

**4. Presidential Selection Standards**

The ACFS strongly recommends that, except in extraordinary circumstance, all finalists for the position of university president have both strong academic credentials and substantial experience at the senior levels of university leadership.

**5. Faculty Salaries**

The ACFS recommends that individual faculty salaries in the SUS be brought up to the national averages in comparable universities, disciplines, and levels within 5 years. It also recommends that faculty salaries be increased to the same percentile nationally as that of senior level administrators.

After the ACFS meeting, there was a discussion about some of the above issues the Senate presidents thought were important for faculty and the State University System (SUS) in general. Areas of concern were tuition and the university entrance requirements. President Bird distributed to the SEC members a list of Florida High school Graduation Options. A system has been created whereby a student can graduate from high school in three years, not an accelerated program, but basically graduate with eighteen credits instead of twenty four. This was passed with great haste and very little discussion by the Board of Governors or the Florida State Board of Education. It is in force, high school students are already being advised that they can take this option and complete graduation. The real problem with this three year plan is that it eliminates things such as American history and government, and there is a low level of mathematics requirement. Instead of having three credits in higher level math, the three year program goes to three credits of algebra and one other math course. There are a lot of things that get dropped. It is like a high school diploma "lite." The ACFS had a long discussion about that and recommended that all candidates in the SUS must fulfill the old four year requirement and that the three year program is not acceptable to USF. The faculty are taking the position that this three year high school graduation option is unacceptable. President Bird would like to take this particular issue to the Faculty Senate and see if it would endorse that position. The motion was made and seconded not to endorse the three year high school diploma; that four years is required to prepare students. The motion unanimously passed. It will be presented to the full Senate at the October meeting.

She next addressed item four on presidential selection standards which was largely in response to some of the university presidents whose selection the faculty have protested. The ACFS passed this motion, stating that they recommend all finalists for the position of university president have both strong academic credentials and substantial experience at the senior level of university leadership. A motion was made and seconded that the SEC endorse item number four. The motion unanimously passed.

Number 5 was the final issue which stated that individual faculty salaries should be brought up to the national averages in comparable universities and the further recommendation that faculty salaries would be increased to the same percentile nationally as that of senior administrators. What the Florida figures show is that senior level administrators are paid at the national average. Faculty members are not. The argument has been that administrators are paid high salaries to get them to come to Florida and stay, and the same principle should apply to faculty. A motion was made and seconded to endorse this motion by the ACFS. The motion unanimously passed.

It was agreed by the SEC members that accountability measures are in such a state of flux that it was not possible to take a position at this time.

## **OTHER**

- a. As Acting Secretary, Nancy Jane Tyson announced that a vacancy on the Senate for the College of Visual and Performing Arts has been filled by Professor Kim McCormick.

Professor McCormick is an Assistant Professor in the School of Music who volunteered to fill that position until the spring election. She was nominated by Senator Sang-Hie Lee also from the School of Music.


- b. Vice President Susan Greenbaum raised the issue of the investment by the Florida Retirement Fund Investment Group (FRFIG) in the Edison Schools which is a failing enterprise. The FRFIG is putting \$183 million into the Edison Schools at a point where their stock has gone down to \$2 a share. She thinks the fiduciary responsibility of the trustees to the well being of state employees as ultimate retirees from this system requires some kind of response from the Governor, Tom Gallagher, and Charlie Crist, who are the trustees of that fund. Vice President Greenbaum asked that this issue be raised with the full Senate and the Governmental Relations Committee. This is also a moral issue of public money towards private education. President Bird asked Vice President Greenbaum to prepare a motion to be presented at the October Faculty Senate meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:18 p.m.

**UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA**  
**Undergraduate Council**  
**MEMORANDUM**

Date: September 29, 2003

To: Elizabeth Bird  
President, Faculty Senate Executive Committee

From:   
Glen H. Besterfield  
Chair, Undergraduate Council

Re: Prohibition of Exploitation in the Classroom and Workplace

The USF Undergraduate Council reviewed the recently prepared policy entitled “Prohibition of Exploitation in the Classroom and Workplace”. The majority of the members of the Undergraduate Council present at the meeting were in favor of a structured and well-documented policy on prohibition of exploitation in the classroom and workplace. In other words, no one disagreed with the intent of the policy. However, in its present form, the Undergraduate Council is unable to support the policy on “Prohibition of Exploitation in the Classroom and Workplace”. Some of the committee’s comments are listed below.

- It would be inappropriate to give a blanket approval of a policy statement of this sort without seeing the procedural details.
- No penalties, ramifications, remedies, sanctions, etc. are listed in the policy.
- The judicial process of filing and deliberating a complaint has not been addressed, except with whom the complaint should be reported to. Where will this policy be published? Should it be filed in writing? Is there a time limit to file a complaint? Is there a committee formed? To what administrative level can the complaint be taken? Is there an appeal process? At what point is action taken? These are just some of the questions that should be addressed.
- The examples cited should be eliminated from the policy altogether or encompass all scenarios. For instance, there are examples regarding “faculty against graduate students”, but no examples of “faculty against undergraduate students” or “graduate students against undergraduate students”. Many of the examples are also very vague and are subject to interpretation.
- Possibly the most severe criticism of this policy is that it could be subject to abuse by any party.
- Finally, of concern is that the policy could infringe on teaching pedagogy and hamper teaching excellence and effectiveness at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

The Undergraduate Council is in favor of a well-defined policy on prohibition of exploitation, and will work towards that end.