Meeting began at 10:07am


Guest: Graham Tobin, Provost’s Office
Recorder: Tracey Cayson

1. Call to order and President’s report
   A. Provost Wilcox is in the process of establishing a system-wide Faculty Advisory Council website. In the interim, each campus will provide updates to their respective faculty.

   B. Liz Larkin reviewed a draft memo that was submitted to the President and the Provost containing recommendations for faculty appointments to the Advisory Councils. She had a conversation with the Provost regarding the recommendations and believes the response to the memo will be positive and should be received soon.

   C. The administration is open to the idea of System Faculty Advisory Council member representatives moving into the UBOT Workgroups.

2. Richard Plank made a motion to accept the October 6, 2010 FAC Minutes as submitted. The motion was seconded by Huntington Potter. The motion is carried.

3. The Revised Draft FAC bylaws were discussed.
   A. Clarification was given regarding whether the by-laws supersede the charter. Per General Counsel, both documents work in tandem. The charter is equivalent to a constitution and the by-laws are equivalent to procedures and guidelines.
B. In the last paragraph of the section Membership and Duties, the first sentence should read: The Executive Vice President for the USF System (or designee) shall have a standing invitation to attend FAC meetings.

C. Huntington Potter made a motion proposing that the FAC by-laws remain in effect for six months (until April 1, 2011) and then automatically expire. The FAC can revisit the by-laws at that time in the event changes are needed. The motion was seconded by Elizabeth Bird. The motion is carried.

4. The System FAC document composed by Elizabeth Bird was distributed for review.
   A. Issues determined at the level of the accredited (or to-be-accredited) institution and the implications were discussed.
      1. Recommendation: Add to this list the issue of academic misconduct.
   B. Issues determined at the System level and the implications were discussed.
      1. Recommendation: Change Item 1 to read “The USF System should decide where doctoral programs will reside.” This item will be added as a future agenda item.
      2. Recommendation: Add as future agenda items honorary degrees and faculty awards.

5. The MOU regarding major organizational restructuring was discussed. Huntington Potter, Philip Levy and Elizabeth Bird will work together to develop a draft policy statement and procedures regarding major organizational restructuring. Greg Teague will assist with follow up when he returns next Tuesday.

6. Items for the next agenda: discussion regarding future meetings, policy regarding organizational restructuring, review the re-worked document from Elizabeth Bird.

Meeting adjourned at 11:49am

Next Meeting: Monday, October 18th on USF St. Pete Campus at 10:00am-12:00pm, Bayboro Hall, Room 208

Appendix A USF System Document Bird
System FAC

Liz Bird, Vice-President, October 2010

Last meeting, we agreed (I think) that the challenge for the system is to:
1. preserve and develop the autonomy and distinctive academic mission of each USF institution, while
2. preserving a standard of quality that is consistent across the university system

I think we also agreed that it would be best not to address issues piecemeal, but within some structured discussion.

I suggest that we begin compiling ideas for issues that we agree should be handled at each level, and can then discuss the practical implications of this, if any. In some cases, we’d be simply confirming what’s already in place. These are just suggestions to start discussion; many more issues could be added.

Determined at the level of the accredited (or to-be-accredited) institution

1) Faculty issues, including:
   • Appointment
   • Tenure and promotion standards, criteria, procedures
   • Assignments – teaching, research, service load etc.
   • Academic grievances
   • Faculty governance structures including senates, councils etc.
   • Maintaining SACS standards (e.g. that at least 60% of teaching is done by regular faculty, and that all faculty are credentialed to teach the classes assigned).

Some implications:

• Would suggest that USF Health T and P files should go through Provost’s Office before going to President (they don’t now)
• Would confirm there is only one Faculty Senate for USF Tampa/Health. Colleges can have their own faculty councils, but all are governed through the USF Tampa Senate.
• Would mean the FAC should not consider faculty requests to “adjudicate” disputes with administration etc. These should be handled at the institutions, or (if related to conditions of employment) by the UFF.
• Would mean that all current Tampa Senate Committees that currently include representatives from other system units would no longer do so, unless this committee is determined by the FAC to represent all System faculty (e.g. perhaps the Research Council).

Determined at the System level:

1) Doctoral programs may only reside at USF Tampa.

Implications:

• We may need discussion about how participation of non-Tampa faculty on doctoral committees in Tampa may be facilitated and encouraged.
2) Honorary degrees should be awarded by the System.

Implications:

- No college, division, or campus could award Honorary Degrees. This might also apply to the current awards like Presidents Medal etc.
- The charge of the current Honors and Awards committee would be changed. It would become a Tampa committee, to determine research and teaching awards for Tampa. There would be a new Honorary Degree committee charged by the FAC to coordinate nominations (or the FAC could become the body that does this). Typically at systems, any unit (college, campus etc) can nominate, and the degree would be conferred at nominator’s commencement.
- We could discuss whether we want to see some additional awards be system-wide – e.g. a system-wide Research or Teaching award, above and beyond campus awards. If so, these could also be handled by the FAC/Honorary Degree committee.

3) There should be standards for program development, and mechanisms for ensuring quality control and avoiding duplication. Right now, it is unclear how that is done, although the ACEAC may be that body? However, some clarity is needed. First we need to gather information about what is already in place.

Implications:

- FAC could make recommendations about standards for degree creation (e.g. minimum number of faculty required to propose BA, MA, PhD.
- FAC could propose procedures through which new programs are evaluated in terms of duplication, need, resources etc.
- This does not replace existing campus-based approvals processes (undergraduate or graduate), but does ensure an overall quality control component.

4) Procedures for restructuring, reorganization etc. should be standard across the system.

Implications:

- The MOU signed with Health, and the MOU (now expired) with Academic Affairs could form the basis of developing SOP across the entire system. FAC could develop a document and propose this; only the System President can make it happen.