

MINUTES

Faculty Senate Leadership Team
Friday, February 20, 2015
Cohen Center 213

In Attendance:

Senate President: Shawn Felton Senate Secretary: Penny Finley Faculty Affairs Team: Cecil Carter Graduate Affairs Team: Claude Villiers Undergraduate Curriculum Team: Ara Volkman Library Team: Phan Zhao (absent) Technology Team: Charles Fornaciari (absent) Program Review Team: Elizabeth Murray Planning and Budget Advisory Committee: Halcyon St. Hill Academic Affairs: Dr. Tony A. Barringer UFF-FGCU President (ex officio) Beth Elliott	Senate Vice President: Sandra Pavelka Senate Parliamentarian: Van Duijn van Duijn Institutional Affairs Team: Dorothy Rae Graduate Curriculum Team: Carolynne Gischel (absent) Student Affairs Team: Barb Hess Grants and Research Team: Danielle Rosenthal General Education Council: Eric Otto/Carolynne Gischel (absent) Appointments Team: Heather Snapp
--	---

Summary:

Agenda Item	Responsible	Discussion	Action/Vote	Follow-up
1) Gathering	Shawn Felton			
2) Approval of Minutes of	Shawn Felton			
3)		<p>Bylaw Changes</p> <p>Grants and Research Team- Danielle Rosenthal has suggested the removal of the requirement that the chair must be of the associate level.</p> <p>St. Hill – Rank does matter as much as experience in handling grants and research. This points to the same predicament as was discussed by the GAT. The election of people to teams should be people who are qualified, not necessarily brand new faculty without knowledge of writing grants. We may be removing the incentive for going up for promotion if an assistant professor can hold any role.</p> <p>Barringer – The experience seems to be the key factor, not the rank.</p> <p>Elliott – If people are given so many committee assignments, they are not able to progress. This committee requires someone of a higher level.</p> <p>Anna – procedurally this election comes from the college level. The bylaws of the team might not solve this problem.</p> <p>After much debate, it was agreed that one minor change would be accepted and the whole issue of rank would be discussed further at a later time.</p> <p>PRT – Elizabeth Murray – Language changes. Adding four elected members from CAS. Changes in responsibilities and duties to include language about compliance with the Board of Governors' Reg. 8.015. Removal of language giving them the duties of reviewing all programs. The Program Review process is a 3 year process and included also a list of steps that the team goes through.</p> <p>Felton – for the record, we only needed to clarify and make the PRT duties transparent to the entire university and the team has done a wonderful job.</p>		

		Barringer – questioned where in the steps is the selection of the external reviewer and could it be made clearer how the selection is made. Suggestion to write into step 1 that the PRT chooses the reviewer for clarity in the process.		
4)	Mary Krome	<p>Senate Adhoc Team on Schedule Changes Dr. Krome is responding to the proposed scheduling changes brought to senate in September by Dr. Toll. Her Adhoc team has been working since November. The desire is to have the SLT look at the report to ensure credibility before it goes to full senate. The faculty felt that the committee should look at the proposal for either a 7 or 7:30 start. Many other issues came out of looking at these choices. schedule change issues faculty input in delivery of courses</p> <p>Recognized that 1) buildings need to be used to their maximum potential 2) faculty is responsible for curriculum 3) inconsistent interpretation among colleges of scheduling. Krome also summarized all of the issues involved in the committee's decision and showed the committee's proposed 7:30 schedule.</p> <p>Elliott – This proposed schedule offers more sections than the current university schedule. (25 time slots per week) Staff members felt this was feasible for library, labs, etc. Students on the committee were also agreeable. We also looked at all other university schedules. We should not have the scheduler dictate how curriculum is delivered.</p> <p>Krome – Faculty feel that a statement is needed. Krome shared the proposed faculty statement regarding course scheduling.</p> <p>Barringer – the document should not read that the administration is at odds with faculty goals referenced in the document. Exceptions and waivers have always been available.</p> <p>Krome – college level implementation has been a problem.</p> <p>St. Hill – the wording “perception” should indicate that this is not necessarily the case.</p> <p>Felton – we do not want this to be adversarial.</p> <p>Barringer – with this wording this may be taken as pointing to the administration being at odds with faculty. That is not the case and the wording should reflect that.</p> <p>St. Hill and others– offered suggestions on rewording the statement to be less negative toward administration.</p>		
5)	Julie Gleason	Student Involvement – This presentation was cancelled due to a conflict in Julie Gleason's schedule.		
6)	IAT	Textbook Affordability – not discussed because of lack of time.		
7)	Dr. Tony Planus	<p>Metric System Review of his support of the use of the metric system and a call for this academic university to adapt the metric system. He showed a video that featured the FGCU speed limit signs posted in metric values from a 2011 news broadcast and another leading to the metric conversion act. He is not pushing for conversion, just for awareness and information for a system used by most of the rest of the world besides the U.S.</p>		
4) Old Business	Claude Villiers	<p>GAT- Graduate Faculty Classifications This is a call for feedback from SLT for the document with changes in the graduate faculty classifications which may lead to a policy. One main component is who can teach Graduate Courses or PhD or Masters dissertations. There is room for exceptions. The committee</p>		

		<p>created a table to summarize roles, functions, and qualifications.</p> <p>Elliott – The document would eliminate her and several other COE faculty with full professors who under this new document would be blocked from teaching in graduate programs.</p> <p>VanDuin - We are advocating a document that we will be automatically out of compliance with for SACS. He gave examples from his college where clinical people must teach higher level courses and offered other examples of classification of clinical people as instructors that contradict this classification.</p> <p>Villiers – Request for a summary of van Duijn’s reasons for problems with this document. He needs the committee to fully understand these issues.</p> <p>St. Hill – There are two things of important that we must remember 1) Every faculty member should have opportunities to teach based on qualifications and not receiving rank. This limits the institution and opens the doors for supervisors to use this as a way to assign courses. This needs to be struck.2) This traditional model is one that SACS may call for, but our university is not traditional and the document limits us.</p> <p>Murray – Spoke to some of the issues involving nursing and limits of faculty with the degrees to match this table of requirements.</p> <p>Rae – People coming from research universities feel strongly about teaching these courses. The fact should be whether people can teach or not. We are at a numbers crunch and many will be retiring. It is a good goal, but we are too new to be able to meet all of these requirements.</p> <p>Elliott – more examples of how there are not the faculty available that meet these qualifications and that we would be out of compliance.</p> <p>St. Hill – This should not be a goal because other universities have these requirements. This will not work for us.</p> <p>Felton – This is a good use of SLT airing of ideas before it comes to full senate.</p> <p>Barringer – It might be better to bring the schedule proposals to senate without the proposal statement.</p> <p>Felton – To summarize – The background charge looks good and the alternative schedule seems to meet with your approval. We the senate support the work of the adhoc team. The third document is the one in question. How do we proceed with this statement?</p> <p>Elliott – I am not certain why the document is controversial. The group worked to sanitize this document and did not intend to inflame anyone. The faculty have a right to say what they feel.</p> <p>Barringer – I feel it is too early to bring this forward. As a person reading this, I see it as being divisive.</p> <p>Discussion suggesting removing the line having to do with the line including “the perception among faculty that we have little input....” Or a shift “faculty want to make sure that they have a voice....” It was decided to remove the terminology to make sure that inflammatory language is not used.</p>		
5) New Business	Dr. Shawn Felton	Faculty Senate President’s Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Several news media published the uncorrected resolution. The official resolution has now gone out to media. 		

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Criminal justice committee passed the guns on campus resolution with a 3-2 vote. ▪ The next committee is the Education Committee where it may face opposition. ▪ This is being attacked from all areas. Do not get discouraged about it passing another committee. We are still working hard. ▪ Adhoc Committees have finally almost been populated. The one promotion document and the faculty classification committee are still waiting for a CAS ranked faculty member to join. ▪ The Tobacco Free Committee will be meeting with Dr. Rosenthal as a member of that committee. ▪ Report from Tallahassee – Being on the good list of the PBS leads him to believe that positive results will come from our seeking of the \$4.2M. ▪ FGCU Day – March 24th ▪ May 3rd –Commencement RSVP needed by April 15th for one of the 3 ceremonies. ▪ Thanks to those involved in the survey of chairs and deans for a release from February 23 – March 18. ▪ Thanks to Dr. Toll for the basketball box for a great night watching the women's team win last Thursday. ▪ Emergent Technology Groundbreaking ETI (11 am) ▪ Celebration of Excellence will now be in an online process. ▪ Travel Awards – February 23 ▪ PDG funds close on February 28 ▪ Town hall for online -strategic task force will be Monday S 111 – Adobe connect Feb. 25 		
6) Standing Reports	Team Reports	Team Reports were not given due to lack of time.		
7) For the Good of the Order				
8) Announcements				

Next Senate Meeting: March 13, 2015, 9:30 am – 12:00 Noon; Cohen Center, Rm. 213
Next Senate Leadership Team Meeting: March 27, 2015, 12 Noon; Cohen Center, Rm. 213