USF System Faculty Council
Meeting minutes
September 25, 2014 at USFSP, BAY 220

Present: Greg Teague (President), Trish Hunsader (Vice President), Jim Curran (President USFSM), Philip Levy (President USF Tampa), Deanna Michael (President USFSP), Barbara Lewis, Steve Lang, Karin Braunsberger, Kaya van Beynen, Richie Reich, Valerie (Jody) Harwood, Kofi Glover (Provost’s Office), Kim Wilmath (President’s Office), Scott Rimbey, Claudia Dold

Regrets: Chris Davis, Steve Permutth, Arthur Shapiro

Guest: Regional Chancellor USFSP, Sophia Wisniewska and Regional Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs Han Reichgelt

Meeting called to order.
Minutes Approved.

Regional Chancellor of USFSP Sophia Wisniewska, welcomed everyone. She stated that the Strategic Plan, Vision 20/20, was approved at the Board of Trustee meeting on September 4, 2014. The implementation process began this week with a town hall meeting with the USFSP community and the first meeting of the Implementation committee. Deanna Michael, the faculty senate president is a member of the implementation committee. She also discussed the problems she sees resulting from the recent lean budget years. This year is a one of rebuilding. She understands that there is faculty concern about the number of administrators, but she believes that there is a need to rehire staff positions. USF St. Petersburg is in a great location and has a bright future. She also announced that 2015 is the 50th anniversary of USF St. Petersburg. There will be celebrations throughout 2015.

Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs Han Reichgelt introduced two topics to the SFC: The Strategic Plan process and the need for a level of Banner control for curriculum independence.

Strategic plan: The administration needed to get BOT approval for the Vision 20/20 Strategic Plan and did not want to go public without that approval. During the past week there have been productive meetings to create work groups and identify champions for each goal. The administration also needed to select and align metrics for measuring the 6 goals, but the lack of an IR director complicated the process. Greg Teague added that it was important for BOT to be aware the strategic plan is a working document. ACE discussion was based on this need. Steve Lang added that communication was difficult because the document was completed in summer and the metrics are from the BOT and BOG data requirements.

Banner: Because all of the institutions share a single version of Banner, curriculum changes are difficult. One institution “owns” course submitted by that institution. Because the courses are often shared, when one institution changes its curriculum, it changes the course for all of the institutions. The example given was in biology. Regional Vice Chancellor Reichgelt proposes that the separation of
programs among the institutions would allow curriculum changes. If separation of Banner is not possible due to expense—perhaps curriculum could be separated through naming. Trish pointed out that the common course numbering system complicates the development of autonomous curriculum. Regional Vice Chancellor Reichgelt gave Degreeworks as an example of the need for Banner separation in reporting and curriculum. Graduation requirements are about coding. Currently, USFSP advising and scheduling staff must code and recode because of course changes made in Tampa or Sarasota. The same occurs in Tampa and Sarasota when USF St. Petersburg programs make changes in courses “owned” by St. Petersburg. Trish Hunsader pointed out that pre-and co-requisites are major problems when they are added or changed. Regional Vice Chancellor Reichgelt made note of this aspect of the problem to look into it for USF St. Petersburg. He added that the cost is being debated. Steve Lang gave the example of his on-line graduate course. A pre-requisite was added by a program in Tampa. This addition drove down the enrollment in the course. Trish Hunsader added that it is a regular part of the curriculum committee to check the web pages for course proposals and changes to give the Deans a heads-up on changes. She reminded the SFC that pre-requisites cannot be changed if the change is not submitted to the SUS system. Kofi Glover reminded the SFC that the BOG does not recognize the USF system, but we have a system without the system infrastructure and suggested that Han contact Bob Sullins about curriculum coordination. Greg Teague asked whether General Counsel examined the License issue for Banner? Vice Chancellor Reichgelt replied that their office was on the list of people to contact.

Kim Wilmath reported on the USF system STEM initiative. The organization of a small steering committee with representation from each institution is at the beginning stages, and there is not a lot to report. There is a meeting in the afternoon to narrow the definition of STEM for the working group because of varying definitions. For example, NSF and the BOG have different definitions. The committee needs to define how they are going to approach it. Broader committee or committees that would include local community members as well as USF system members to connect the community and the institutions with a focus on work and partnerships. Who would be good people to develop committees and ties across the region? The Committee will look to all institutions for connections to inclusive membership. The group is creating a survey to get administration, faculty, and outside interested partners working together. Barbara Lewis reported the survey of administrators at USF Tampa and USF Health. The organizing committee for this survey looked at surveys done in the past for the administrators and climate. The committee had not begun analysis yet because the survey had closed only two weeks ago. The survey was administered through Canvas, and there was no attempt to collect demographic data through the survey. Steve Lang and Deanna Michael explained the USFSP Faculty Senate used Survey Monkey and created their own survey. The survey does not contain any demographic information, and in 2014, the Faculty Senate did not report the N. The statements are condensed into two or three statements of what is done well and what needs improvement. Only the means are downloaded. The rest is read from the site and deleted when the reports are finished. Only the questions are kept. This approach ensures that the survey responses are not considered as public records. Responses are increasing, but there are still questions of faculty trust in the process.

Discussion of the creation of a system committee for administrator surveys for “quality improvement.” Committee membership would be from all institutions.
Committee members are needed for several committees. Greg Teague explained that the Athletics Council is a President’s council. No one from USF St. Petersburg serves on the committee. He requested more than one nomination of faculty who are not already serving on system committees.

There are two CBA-defined committees, Student Assessment of Instruction, and Emerging Technologies and Intellectual Property. In response to faculty and UFF concern concerns about classroom capture and external intellectual property rights, the UFF put a statement into the contract for the system and the union to create two committees with members named by either the UFF or the USF System President (effectively the Provost’s office in collaboration with the SFC & Senates). There will be two other committees. One on student assessment will be a USF Faculty Senate initiated group based in Tampa and focused on eXplorance Blue and the assessment of faculty in relation to the new T&P guidelines. The other will be a system-wide committee charged with drafting a system policy on Emerging Technologies and Intellectual Property. Steve Lang explained that the Emerging technologies committee is necessary because the UFF did not have the answers to include in the contract. Greg Teague explained the CBA committees are to discuss the concerns of the faculty and to forward recommendations to the President’s or USF Senate committees, which will propose policy. There will be nine on each CBA-defined committee. Four and five from the UFF. Kofi Glover added that student evaluations did not start as a criteria for tenure and promotion, but rather to help faculty improvement in teaching; they were not an administrative issue, though UFF sees it as a contract/work issue. He did not see a problem with combined committees. He does not see it becoming a CBA article, but it will probably be a policy issue.

Report from Provost: The provost has been out of town. The only concern was the committees that have already been discussed.

Report from the USF System: STEM initiative is the administration’s focus. The BOG meeting went well for USF; the system strategic goal need to be aligned with the goals of the BOG. The performance metric process will change over the next year. On October 8 there is another workshop at FAU to look at the metrics. Benchmarks may change.

ACFS: Advisory Council for Faculty Senates. There are two representatives from each university. the chair of the Council is the faculty BOG member. Greg Teague and Trish Hunsader are USF system’s representatives. They may learn more about any proposed metrics. When meetings are in Tallahassee, the BOG is very involved. It is a retreat this time; no BOG presence.

Institutional Updates:

USFSM: The search for a Regional Chancellor continues. The Interim Regional Chancellor is doing well. Senate restructuring is in progressing. Constitutional changes are being discussed and will be moving on it as soon as possible. QEP developing.

St. Petersburg: The role of the Provost office in reviewing the T&P criteria to make sure that it conforms to the CBA. The process is for the criteria to move from faculty to Deans (to make sure that the criteria conform to institutional guidelines). The provost office is only involved in assuring that quality is maintained. The T&P revision will be a substantial change as the process is updated.

Tampa: T&P Development issues: Responsibility for next steps lies on the administrative side. Greg Teague is continuing in dialogue with them as an interpreter of sorts, representing the committee that revised the guidelines. A start date has been established; June 5th of this year was the date of
acceptance, which means June 5th of next year (2015) is implementation. All faculty members who have not gone up for mid-tenure review by that time will need to follow the new guidelines. All departments will need to articulate the process and requirements by spring. Communication challenges—some training/information sharing with faculty and stakeholders—global, community partners etc.—to incorporate language in the description of work in those areas. A web-site for developing criteria and for communication about criteria development is being developed as well as a digital application process. Kaya van Beynen explained that the digital application process used at USFSP has had many problems.

SACS—the USF self-evaluation packet just submitted. QEP development. Development teams to enhance student learning. Student learning outcomes—Global Citizens Project is the focus of USF Tampa’s QEP (see http://www.usf.edu/qep/about-qep/index.aspx).

The library has started to examine Digital humanities. Chuck Connors is initiating a discussion about how to share information and coordinate the process. Looking at other universities. Grassroots push for what faculty want to know and how to make it happen.

Revised Senate Constitution was submitted to the President. Last one was not signed by the President—an error in procedure—so existing language had not been vetted but had been assumed. In Florida, faculty senates are advisory, and some language carried forward had previously suggested otherwise. The document is being revised and will again be voted on by the faculty, then submitted for her signature.

Responsibility center management budgeting process. The budget advisory group is putting together a model for the deans to implement this process. This model should mean greater responsibility for the revenues at the college level and more transparency about budget.

There is also an important initiative for communication from senators to faculty. The plan is that, through social media, senators will be able to open discussions about the SACS QEP and other policy initiatives.

Other business:

The SFC web page will be updated.