

MINUTES

FGCU Faculty Senate
 Friday, February 8, 2013 9:30-11:30 am
 SU 213 (Student Union Chambers)

In Attendance: Benford, Bottinger, Brooks, Carlin, Condori, Croshaw, Epple, Erdman, Everham, Felton, Finlkey (alternate for Carothers), Gadhamshetty (alternate for Torres), Gilbert, Gunnels, Harrison, Isaacs, Kakareka, Kim, Morris, Pavelka, Randall, Renard, Rosenthal, Segal (alternate for Hoyt), Simpson, Stecher, Urakawa, A. Van Duijn Venglar, Villiers, Zhao

Absent without alternate/Proxy:

Guests: E. Elliott, R. Toll, Snyder, Baker, Vargas, Benefield, Shahul-Hameed, Hung Simmons

Media: D. Breitenstein

Agenda Item	Responsible	Discussion	Action/Vote	Follow-up
1) Gathering: 9:30	Douglas Harrison			
2) Approval of Minutes of 1/25/13	Madelyn Isaacs		Approved as submitted (with minor spelling correction.)	
3) Senate Forum	President Bradshaw	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spent last couple of days in Tallahassee meeting with legislators and local delegations Mentioned new BOG members from SW Florida and recent appointment of Dudley Goodlette to FGCU UBOT all as helping FGCU advocacy efforts. Budget looks better. Miromar Lakes agreement – doesn't change FGCU footprint and do have easement for road when have money. Did change the Miromar Lakes footprint and what they will build. Miromar is talking about a University Village concept. They have shared some concepts about what would enhance life of students, faculty and staff. FGCU already adding 500 beds in new building in South halls and amenities for students living in that area. Current plan is no road connecting with Miromar directly but perhaps bike and foot paths. (Everham was at meeting with Miromar – presenting at open meeting with planning group on Monday morning. Miromar wants to sit with faculty and students to get their input into the future development.) Will be building pool in south residence hall area. Going forward SUS will have to explore new ways of building without PECO money. BOG task force studying this. Questions about differentiated tuition. Questions about shared governance statement and how to move forward and enhance the process now. Bradshaw – it does involve tension as the nature of the process. Cited examples including collective bargaining and Planning and Budget Committee. Talked about 		

		<p>faculty disengaging and changing policy review time frame to be when classes are in session. Suggestion that there is disconnect between what admin is doing and what faculty are doing. Talked about considering changing the policy review time frame and when it occurs to maximize input and cited recent process of review and revision for criminal background check policy. Cited that several admin have recently been teaching.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cited example of restructuring and adopting 10 of the recommendations from task force, even though there had been tension during that process. • Question was asked about revisiting the 10 day advanced notice for policy review in policy on policies and pres. agreed to relook at that policy. • Suggestion that administration be invited to sit in on classes and learn first hand what the faculty do. 		
<p>4) Old Business a) Action Item: Academic Affairs Advisors in Faculty Senate</p>	<p>Executive Team</p>	<p>Discussed two options presented and pros and cons. First, change definition of who is eligible to serve as faculty, pro is that advisors are eligible as any other faculty in a unit. Con of this is that there may not be advisors on Senate. Second is to set up advisors as a separate unit which ensures representation but puts a huge service burden on a small unit.</p> <p>Brought two options to advisors who recommend the first option where they can stand for Senate as any other faculty member.</p> <p>Brought forward By-Laws change proposal which includes Advisors I,II and III (and made other changes to bring this in line with CBA changes made since this was last written.)</p> <p>Advisors have determined to delay evaluation instrument for advisor supervisors as waiting for the determination of Senate.</p> <p>Discussion post motion: about trying to do this but to also ensure that there will be good chances in each unit for an advisor to be elected and included in information sharing and representation.</p> <p>Presented for first reading to go back to colleges for feedback and then consideration at next meeting.</p> <p>Everham – complimented the process Exec team used to engage Advisors and discussion.</p>	<p>Action Item Motion to accept recommendation (of Felton, Isaacs, Van Duijn) Renard/ Everham second. Motion passed.</p>	
<p>5) New Business a) Action Item: Proposed</p>	<p>Jaffar Shahul-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy change to help bridge programs that support graduate programs (a couple of 	<p>Action Item Motion to accept</p>	

Changes to General Graduate Academic Policies, first reading	Hameed	<p>programs in the COE).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion – the purpose is to allow these specialty programs to transfer more readily to a full master’s degree program by expanding the internal transfer limits. Each candidate would have to be approved by the College Dean so it would avoid students amassing credits without making application. Elliot explained how this helps COE programs. This would have to meet the general rule of 7 years for degree credit. • 	<p>proposed changes Isaacs motion to accept, Villiers second.</p> <p>Bring back to colleges for vote.</p>	
5) New Business b) Action Item: Resolution in Opposition to Differential Tuition Based Upon Academic Majors	Patrick Bottinger	<p>Motion to respond to differential tuition proposal. Idea that we need to change the title – differential tuition should be applied to high demand programs rather than to low demand programs.</p> <p>Friendly amendment to change proposal name to “Opposing Differential Tuition based upon academic majors as Recommended by the Blue Ribbon Task Force.”</p> <p>General feeling about this in health profession (without formal feedback) is that there is support. Recognize that not everyone is designed to enter a targeted profession. Should encourage leadership in Tallahassee to engage faculty in discussions about higher ed reform.</p> <p>Add citations to the three “knowing” statements to strengthen the document with academically founded research citations.</p>	<p>Action Item Motion, Bottinger second Gunnels</p> <p>Go back to Colleges to get feedback for vote at next meeting.</p>	
6) Old Business Follow up item: Faculty Senate Strategic Planning discussion	Douglas Harrison	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewed process to date and requests of Senate to drive the conversation and provide final feedback about priorities. • Requested five minutes to deliberate during a recess. • Discussion – listed 4 priorities of evaluation of senior admin, faculty role and process for selection of chairs and deans, addressing impact of class size and enrollment growth, role of faculty in relation to adjuncts. • CAS – added an issue about the proper role of instructors as faculty. Doesn’t come up much for other colleges. • Also, dissatisfaction in how faculty voice is received and what shared governance actually is. • Discussion of motion – would suggest options regarding an ad hoc team as well as possibility the FAT. • Discussion of motion to refer to executive team for action (refused friendly amendment to add priorities shared governance issues and issues about role of instructors to allow these be added separately to priority list). • Discussion to add priorities about role of shared 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Motion to request senate executive team to explore and report back to Senate on options for addressing the status and role of adjuncts and for additional future discussion. Venglar/Condori 2. Motion to extend time Erdman/Condori for 5 minutes. 3. Simpson/Isaacs – motion to postpone indefinitely. Postponed. 4. Isaacs/Gunnels second - Motion to refer list of items generated 	

		<p>governance and role of instructors. Faculty want to be part of decision-making process and not just the information gathering process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion 8: Motion to direct SET to explore Senate options to address the dissatisfaction among faculty about how faculty voice is received in decision making, what shared governance actually means, and how it can be better implemented to the satisfaction of all. Passed. • Motion 9 Everham/Rosenthal – Motion to direct SET to add to its list of priority items an item that provides Senate with recommended options for addressing and clarifying the role and workload of instructors. • Clarified that Senate Exec will come back with options for addressing the six priorities added. 	<p>by Senate Executive Team (SET) for strategic action planning (see attached PPT) back to SET for SET to identify and make recommendations to Senate on options for each item, as well as clarifying item 4, role of adjunct faculty vis a vis faculty. Passed 5.</p> <p>Condori/Erdman – five minutes</p> <p>6. Kakareka – motion to call the question. Passed</p> <p>7. Motion by Gunnels for 5 minutes. Passed</p> <p>8. Renard/Gunnels motion for 5 minutes passed</p> <p>9. Rosenthal/Everham motion. Passed</p> <p>Everham/Rosenthal motion passed</p>	
<p>7) Standing Reports a) Provost’s Report</p>	<p>Ron Toll, Provost</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drop in meetings being set up with two for staff and two for faculty. • Gen Ed – affirming good work of faculty looking at Gen Ed. There had been some voiced concern that Provost would censor the report done by faculty and read his note to Assoc Chancellor transmitting the faculty’s work to BOG with support. Give recognition to shared governance where it works. • Performance Based Funding – wants to engage faculty in the discussion. Asking faculty to look over the matrix sent from BOG about institutional performance. FGCU not afraid of these metrics. FGCU leads in several already (employment of graduates, for example) but there is concern about how these will be applied. Will be leading AVP forum response to Chancellor Brogan. This affects us as FGCU so need to have an expanded conversation and will plan to discuss at next Senate. 	<p>Motion to extend 5 minutes.</p>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of Mission Drift related to faculty academy and the reaffirmation of the teaching mission of FGCU. Several ways to evaluate teaching – understanding what good teaching looks like with emphasis on portfolio development and focus on outcomes not only inputs. Also discussed SAI’s and role as one of many indirect measures for evaluation of teaching. Has told Deans and Chairs that SAI’s is not an end all or do all or magic cutoff for excellence in teaching with SAI. He is embracing this and asking Deans and Chairs to embrace this. Also talking about role of SAI as formative and not summative activity. Asking Senate to move SAI to electronic form to move away from paper based format for variety of reasons- currently 18% are electronic SAI’s, can increase turn-around times for faculty from 8 weeks to 2 weeks; greater sense of anonymity for students; growing as a University and moving to electronic SAI would be more sustainable; knows that electronic SAI leads to decreased response rates and more variation in the data. Will provide Senate with data gathered by his staff about SAI’s - Plotted SAI values against years of teaching experience which shows flat lines – SAI not discriminating among best teachers and thus is better formative and not summative instrument. Requesting that we all work within our teams and Senate to help move to electronic SAI and reestablish its value. • Suggestion that students do the SAI and then can get grades to solicit greater participation. Will discuss among Senate Exec how to best get suggestions like this. Concern about getting SAI for small enrollment classes • For Gen ed revision – Kris DeWelde came to departments several times and engaged a number of time; shared governance has an obligation to engage for faculty so faculty have to participate to be critical of the process. • Shared governance requires us to engage about performance funding so it is good for Senate to engage. • Complemented faculty academy effort,. • Does SAI in electronic form allow for faculty added questions, if not, can it be done? Will have more flexibility in that regard. 		
b) SGA Report	Luis Vargas, SG VP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report in writing. 		
c) UFF Report	Beth Elliott, UFF Pres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report in writing. 		
d) Senate President’s Report	Douglas Harrison	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report in writing. 	Information/ Report	
8) For the Good of the Order				

9) Announcements		a) Relay For Life – FGCU planned event run by students and looking for faculty involvement. Scheduled for March.		
Future Meeting Dates		Next Senate Meeting: February 22, 2012, 9:30 a.m. Senate Leadership Team: Today, February 22, noon-1:30		

MLI 2/8/2013
Approved 2/22/2013