

**Florida Gulf Coast University
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**

Friday, February 12, 2016; 9:30-11:30am; Cohen Center, Room 213

In Attendance:

Dr. Shawn Felton – President	Dr. Sandra Pavelka – Vice-President	Dr. Arie van Duijn – Parliamentarian	Dr. Tom Felke – Secretary	Daniel Acheampong
Kazuo Nakatani	Fan Zhao	Jo Stecher	Brendan Bevins	Trent Brown
Dean Croshaw	Alex Sakharuk	Win Everham	Joe Kakareka	Patrick Niner
Sulekha Coticone	Martha Rosenthal	Mike McDonald	Eric Strahorn	Jamie MacDonald
Steven Rokusek	Robert Triscari	Olivia Hung-Simons	Vickie Johnston	Kimberly McDowell
Danvers Johnston	Jorge Torres	Claude Villier	Rob Erdman	

Absent (without Alternate/Proxy):

Lan Jiang	Mary Krome	Jacqueline Van Duijn	Tom Hair	
-----------	------------	----------------------	----------	--

Guests:

Dr. Kathy Miller	Dr. Nora Demers	Dr. Halcyon St. Hill		
------------------	-----------------	----------------------	--	--

Media:

None				
------	--	--	--	--

Summary:

Agenda Item	Responsible	Discussion	Action/Vote	Follow-Up
1) Gathering	Dr. Shawn Felton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting called to order at 9:31am 		
2) Approval of February 12, 2016 Agenda	Dr. Shawn Felton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments 	Motion to Approve: Rosenthal; Second: Coticone	
3) Approval of January 29, 2016 Minutes	Dr. Shawn Felton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments 	Motion to approve: Rosenthal; Second: Acheampong	
4) Faculty Senate President's Report	Dr. Shawn Felton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submission dates for all Excellence Awards have now passed; no submissions in three categories – Senior Research, Junior Instructor, Senior Instructor; may need to examine reasons why submissions are not coming in on 		

		<p>these categories</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Legislative update: Target Gap Funding in the Senate budget; Student Success Initiative in House budget Conceal Carry on campus has been tabled in Senate and not likely to move forward this year• Deans & Chairs survey is ongoing; faculty asked to check on reporting lines• Professional development fund grant (PDFG) is currently open; close date is February 29th at 11:59pm• Fitness for duty policy is being reviewed• BOT committee on presidential delegation of authority met on 2/11/2016 and made recommendations to BOT• Next BOT meeting on 2/23 starting at 8:30am• Research Day abstract submissions are due on ; Research Day is April 8th• New grant award out of ORGS; small grant award replaces MDRI• Everham – Reiteration of concern on deadlines for Research Day; Concerned about issues with reporting lines for Chairs/Deans• Pavelka – Working		
--	--	---	--	--

		toward making a few revisions concerning language around Director versus Chair/Dean		
5a) Guest: Dean of the Library	Dr. Kathy Miller	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Library visits have increased as have use of electronic resources; usage of print resources is down 40% • Biggest issue is work space for students; library added live maps for computer usage • Library NEXT Campus-wide conversation on March 15th • Everham – Seems like there is a need to balance big, open space with smaller, constrained spaces for group work • Miller – Agreed. • Strahorn – Does print usage count in library usage? • Miller – Yes, it does. • Strahorn – Have you looked at any studies on what happens when moving texts off-site? It seems it inhibit research. • Miller – Excellent point and we will be mindful of this moving forward. • Kakareka – Any statistics on how often rooms are used? • Miller – Yes, we use an app called ‘Dibs’ and usage has been high • Coticone – Have 	<p>Motion to extend time 5 minutes: Rosenthal; Second: McDonald</p>	

		<p>students been surveyed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Miller – Yes and no. Have surveyed students and they largely discuss space though we have not asked about specific options. Will be conducting an ethnographic study soon. • Demers – Any statistics on percentage of books never used? • Miller – About 40% of collection has never been touched. • MacDonald – Discussion of space is very important as students are moving into other academic spaces as a result; compressing journals could be a viable option to create space based on experience • Miller – Compressed some journals already and looking to J Stor to see viability of doing so with others • Sakharuk – Will the library be taking suggestions on books to keep? • Miller – Yes, talk with your librarian to discuss options. • Stecher – Any headway on selection of a CHPSW librarian? • Miller – Search is actively moving forward and Skype 	<p>Motion to extend time 5 minutes: Rosenthal; Second: MacDonald</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

		interviews are about to be held		
6a) Old Business: Furniture Senate Resolution (Action Item)	Dr. Nora Demers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of resolution • Baker – There is a group looking at the issue of providing furniture/space for students and moving students out of hallways • Everham – Space is at a premium and need to consider student needs • MacDonald – Need to be careful about ADA and possibly consider change to language about hallways • Strahorn – Furniture is nice but students feel it is uncomfortable • Rosenthal – Support replacement of furniture in classroom and study areas but not hallways • Brown – Are there fire marshal concerns about where we want to put furniture? • Pavelka – Need to prioritize replacement on classroom furniture • Demers – Looking to maximize ADA and get students off floor in hallways • Felton – • Baker – SFC did a complete walkthrough off all space and have put together a subcommittee to examine what space can be converted • Toll – Is there a 		

		<p>problem with the current mechanism in examining space? What does this resolution accomplish?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Everham – Inclined to vote for resolution if it brings forward a conversation on space/hallways • Niner – Did the resolution in 2011 bring about any change? • Demers – PSAC felt that the resolution could be helpful; Think this is a good piece of shared governance • Strahorn – Resolution seems to reinforce current processes and is not groundbreaking • Pavelka – Agree that this seems to be a good piece for shared governance • Rosenthal – Seems redundant to have another committee since once already exists • Everham – Need to use voice to move these items forward to funding list • Toll – Need to consider use of voice in totality versus on isolated resolutions to retain importance of voice • Demers – Willing to revise resolution if need be • Acheampong – If last 	<p>Motion to extend time 10 minutes: Acheampong; Second: Hung-Simons</p>	
--	--	---	---	--

		<p>sentence is struck, what is the purpose of the resolution?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demers – Would support moving request to the funding list • MacDonald – Hard to know what to vote for when not sure what else is on the budget priority list • Everham – Feel this is a good place to be as someone will likely come back to Senate to explain the budget priorities • Sakharuk – We are trying to do something we are not sure about due to fire marshal so can we change language to remove ‘hallways’? • Bevins – Can we change it to ‘public spaces’? 	<p>Motion to strike last sentence of resolution: Strahorn; Second: Everham</p> <p>Vote on motion to strike last sentence of resolution: 22 yes, 0 no, 8 abstain (Motion passes)</p> <p>Motion to amend language in resolution: MacDonald</p> <p>Amendment withdrawn: MacDonald</p> <p>Motion to postpone consideration of resolution until next meeting: Strahorn</p> <p>Vote on motion to postpone: 26 yes, 0, no, 1 abstain</p>	
--	--	---	---	--

			(Motion passes)	
6b) New Business: Academic Calendar Development (Action Item)	Dr. Shawn Felton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of previous motion to allow IAT to consider option for bureaucratic days • Strahorn – IAT will be meeting next week to discuss this motion and the calendar that was sent back • Bevins – What is the specific change being made? • Felton – Change would be to academic calendar development guidelines to consider option to use bureaucratic days • Everham – Understand issues related to use of bureaucratic days but impact on classes otherwise is heavy • MacDonald – Received feedback that #9 should possibly be revisited; this is an issue across the SUS not just FGCU • Strahorn – Just to note that #9 uses the language ‘prefers’ • Toll – Strongly suggest not having bureaucratic days • Scanlon – Do not think students will receive the idea of bureaucratic days well • Rosenthal – Do not think decision to not have bureaucratic days came from Senate; this motion 		

		<p>simply allow the option to consider use of bureaucratic days</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strahorn – Allowing bureaucratic days may not be the solution due to how holidays fall; a change to guideline #5 might give more flexibility; if we want even number of days/weeks then the priorities will need to change • Everham – Clarification of current vote; Believe that issues will persist 	<p>Call for vote on motion to allow IAT to consider option for bureaucratic days: Rosenthal</p> <p>Vote on motion: 8 yes, 7 no, 12 abstain (Motion passes)</p>	
<p>7a) New Business: Faculty Rank Classification Ad hoc Report (Information Item)</p>	<p>Dr. Arie van Duijn</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of report recommendations • Everham – Is this a draft report? If there are concerns would the ad hoc team hear them? • Felton – That is the will of the body here • Everham – Three concerns: item #3 impacting ability for teachers; need to have instructors on review committees 		

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sakharuk – Concern that instructors are merely looking to come in and then jump rank • Baker – #3 is for difficult to recruit positions such as those in the health professions • Toll – Instructors have same service responsibilities as all other faculty; difference is solely in research • Rosenthal – Is there an inaccuracy in the report concerning workload of instructors? • Baker – All departments/colleges have some service requirement • Bevins – Advisors fall into the same situation of teaching and having service requirement • Acheampong – Should instructors be judged on scholarship if they are not required to do so? • Johnston – Instructors would like a way to move into a ranked position • Van Dujin - That is feedback that was received from a number of sources. 		
7b) New Business: FPED Pre-promotion Review Procedural Document	Dr. Halcyon St. Hill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Felton – Spoke with UFF President to ensure that this process does not 		

<p>(Information/Action Item)</p>		<p>affect bargaining in any way</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of document by Dr. St. Hill • SLT agrees that Dean should not be included in review • Acheampong – Consider changing language to ‘required’ versus ‘optional’ • St. Hill – Had this ‘optional’ included initially but decision was made to change it to ‘required’ • Everham – Think the document is far away from what is acceptable; what happens under the CBA if no document is in place? Can faculty not move forward? • St. Hill – Yes, faculty would be unable to move forward • Bevins – Idea is good but needs more work • MacDonald – Concerned about increased burden on PRCs; fear downplaying language from CBA; document does not follow process to the point that it may confuse some faculty moving forward for promotion • St. Hill – Review is non-binding; What are your proposing for document? • MacDonald – Believe it needs to be reconstituted in some 	<p>Motion to extend time 5 minutes: Kakareka; Second: Bevins</p>	
----------------------------------	--	--	---	--

		<p>way</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Van Dujin – Concern this is a double-promotion process so would like to hear from Jennifer Baker and Beth Elliott concerning intent of pre-promotion process • Baker – Would be happy to do this at the next meeting • Everham – Concern that CBA says pre-promotion review but FAT has moved to written appraisal process; possibly remove items under #2 as they may have been idiosyncratically created by FAT; believe all required pieces should be removed; bring in Seldin-trained individuals to do reviews 		
8a) Provost Report	Provost Toll	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report 		
8b) SAC Report	Lauren Strunk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report 		
8c) SGA Report	Jessica Scanlon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report 		
8d) UFF Report	Dr. Beth Elliott	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report 		
9) For the Good of the Order		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 		
10) Announcements		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting ended at 12:05pm 	Motion to adjourn: Niner	

Next Senate Meeting: Friday, February 26, 2016 @ 9:30 AM – Cohen Center 213

Next Senate Leadership Team: Friday, February 26, 2016@ 12 Noon – Cohen Center 213