USF System Faculty Advisory Council Minutes

October 18, 2010
BAY 208, USFSP

Meeting began at 10 a.m.

FAC Members Present: Elizabeth Larkin, Elizabeth Bird, Ellis Blanton, Larry Branch (conference call), Aryn Bush, Malcolm Butler, James Garey (conference call), Sherry Kragler, Philip Levy, Gerald Notaro, Richard Plank (conference call), Huntington Potter, Michael Richard, Arthur Shapiro, Richard Smith, Lynn McBrien (alternate), Christopher Meindl (alternate), Gail Donaldson (alternate), and Graham Tobin (ex officio alternate).

Recorder: Patricia White

1. Call to Order and President’s Report
   No report

2. Approval of minutes from the October 13, 2010 meeting
   Elizabeth Bird made a motion to accept the minutes with one revision: to delete item 4.A.2. The motion is carried.

3. Discussion of meeting dates for the remainder of 2010 – 2011
   Elizabeth Larkin will send out a Doodle link. Members are asked to specify the dates and times they are available to meet. The November 2010 meeting will be held on a Friday. Future meetings will be held on Tuesdays or Thursdays. Times and locations to be determined. Locations will continue to rotate across the four campuses.

4. Future agenda items for FAC (e.g. Councils, awards, etc.)
   Discussion included items on the System FAC document composed by Elizabeth Bird.

   a. FAC sub-committee. A four-member subcommittee will be formed to review the existing Faculty Senate Committees and Councils in Tampa, and to make recommendations as to whether any committee or council should have a system-wide charge or should be re-charged as a USF-Tampa Faculty Senate body. The following FAC members have agreed to serve on this sub-committee: Sherry Kragler (Polytechnic); Phil Levy, Chair, (Tampa); Gerry Notaro (St. Petersburg); and Lynn McBrien (Sarasota). The sub-committee should report back to the FAC at the November meeting.
b. **Decisions on where institutionally to locate doctoral programs should be made at the System level.** Proposals to change program location or create new doctoral programs should be considered by the FAC.

c.

Elizabeth Larkin will forward the following recommendation to President Genshaft and Executive VP for Academic Affairs Wilcox:

**Honorary degrees should be awarded only by the USF System.**

The newly formed FAC sub-committee will discuss procedures for nomination and award of honorary degrees. The new sub-committee will also discuss what, if any, other awards or honors should be made at the System level.

d. **Standards for program development and mechanisms to ensure quality control and to review program duplication.**

Motion was made to create a sub-committee to address the review of degree proposals and look at program development across the campuses. Motion is carried. The following FAC members have agreed to serve on this sub-committee: James Garey (USFT), Richard Smith (USFSP), Elizabeth Bird (Chair, USFT), Elizabeth Larkin (USFSM), and Aryn Bush (USFP)

5. **Policy and Procedures for Proposed Changes in Academic Units of the University of South Florida System.**

A draft of the Policy and Procedures for Proposed Changes in Academic Units of the University of South Florida System (created by Huntington Potter, Elizabeth Bird, and Phil Levy) was presented. Elizabeth Larkin will forward the draft to President Genshaft with one recommendation: Delete the word “any” from item f. in the list of items (under Definitions) to be included in restructuring proposals.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.
Policy and Procedures for Proposed Changes in Academic Units of the University of South Florida System

Preamble:

According to the USF System’s established principles of Shared Governance, organizational restructuring of academic units within member Institutions of the USF System should be implemented only after open dialog and review among faculty and administration. In particular, any policy and procedure should ensure that the academic unit(s) most affected by a proposed major restructuring should be afforded the first opportunity to review and report their recommendations. Those recommendations should 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. Simultaneously, the USF System Faculty Advisory Council (FAC) will review the implications for the entire system, and make a recommendation to the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs. All stages of the review process should be completed expeditiously, within 90 days of the initial proposal.

Definitions:

Major organizational restructuring is defined as any creation, dissolution, merger, or separation of academic departments, schools, or colleges. Proposals for such restructuring must include a detailed written proposal, including at a minimum:

a. A description of the proposed changes.
b. A rationale for the changes.
c. A reasonable statement of the financial and budgetary implications of the changes.
d. An examination of the likely consequences of the changes at the College/School, Institution, and USF System levels.
e. A proposed timeline for the implementation of the changes.
f. A brief description of the nature of preliminary consultations with the academic entities affected by the changes, including a summary of the responses. This will normally report on discussion at the level of the department, center, or institute, if the proposal largely affects such entities.

Procedures:

Each member institution of the USF System may develop its own detailed processes for implementing proposed restructuring, within the parameters outlined above. However, in general the following procedures should be followed:
The Faculty Council (or equivalent) of the most affected College(s) or School(s) will receive the proposal. In Institutions without a representative body at that level, the Faculty Senate will receive the proposal.

The proposal will be discussed at the next meeting of the receiving body. Members of affected academic entities will be invited in advance to comment in writing. The body may vote to approve or to request further information and continue discussion at a second meeting. If necessary, the President of the body may call special meetings to expedite the process, including during the summer months.

The restructuring proposal, together with any commentary or recommendation, will be forwarded simultaneously to the Faculty Senate of the affected member Institution (unless the Senate was the initial receiving body) and to the USF System Faculty Advisory Council. Each body will report to the Administration on a) the sufficiency of consultation, and b) the implications of the proposed changes at the Institution and System levels.

The entire process, from receipt of the proposal to report to Administration, should take no more than 90 days.

It is mutually recognized that the administration holds ultimate authority and responsibility for determining the most appropriate academic structure and organization within the University, including Sec. 447.209, Florida Statute, while the Faculty Councils, Faculty Senates, and the FAC are bound to fulfill their responsibility as advisors on academic affairs to USF Administration.

Appendix B:

**System FAC**

*Liz Bird, Vice-President, October 2010*

Last meeting, we agreed:

1) **Faculty-related issues should be determined at level of accredited (or to-be-accredited) institution**
   - Appointment and retention of faculty
   - Tenure and promotion standards, criteria, procedures
   - Assignments – teaching, research, service load etc.
   - Academic grievances
   - Faculty governance structure, including senates, councils etc.
   - Maintaining SACS standards
   - Academic misconduct procedures and dispensation (student and faculty)
Action item:
- Review the charges of existing Faculty Senate Committees and Councils currently in existence at Tampa. Make recommendation as to whether any committee/council should have a System-wide charge, or should be re-charged as a USF-Tampa body.

Recommendation:
- Form sub-committee to review charges. Must have representatives from Tampa and non-Tampa campuses; should report back to FAC at next meeting.

2) **Subject to statutory requirements, decisions on where institutionally to locate doctoral programs should be made at the USF System level.**
   Proposals to change program location or create new doctoral programs should be considered by the FAC.

Recommendation:
- FAC President should forward this recommendation to the Executive VP for Academic Affairs

3) **Honorary degrees should be awarded only by the USF System.**

Action item:
- Develop procedures for nomination and award of honorary degrees.

Recommendation:
- Form sub-committee to develop these procedures. Sub-committee might also discuss what (if any) other Awards and Honors should be made at the System level.

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

Action item:
- Sub-committee (Potter, Bird, Levy) will develop draft set of procedures for consideration by FAC.

We did not get to:

5) 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.