

## MINUTES

### Faculty Senate

Friday, February 07, 2014 9:30-11:30 am

Cohen Center 214

**In Attendance:** Anstadt, Bacigalupi, Benford (Arianna Pinello, alternate), Brazzeal, Brooks, Carlin, Carothers, Condori, Croshaw, Epple, Erdman (John Herman, alternate), Felton (Jo Stecher, proxy), Finley (Vickie Johnston, alternate), Foote (Billy Gunnels, proxy), Gilbert, Gunnels, Hung-Simons, Kakareka, Krome (Gizelle Perretti, proxy), Nguyen, Paine, Pavelka (Martha Rosenthal, proxy), Perretti (Mary Krome, proxy), Renard (Arianna Pinello, alternate), Rosenthal, Stecher, Torres (Long Nguyen, proxy), Urakawa, van Duijn (Mollie Venglar, proxy), Venglar, Villiers.

**Absent (without Alternate/Proxy):** Buzasi, Zhao.

**Guests:** Nora Demers, Eric Otto, Paul Snyder (PIP), Beth Elliott (UFF-FGCU), Ron Toll (Provost).

**Media:** Eagle News.

**Summary:** A draft of a new Academic Amnesty Policy was sent back to the Student Affairs Team because of concerns that it was unclear how it should be interpreted. Supporting Secretary from Academic Affairs, Ashlyn Gibbs, was recognized for her contributions to the work of the Senate with a resolution. The General Education Council presented its plans to form a Competency Assessment Team to coordinate assessment of the Gen Ed program. Nora Demers presented some information on land donations and development in the university's history.

Agenda Item	Responsible	Discussion	Action/Vote	Follow-up
1) Gathering and Approval of February 7, 2014 Agenda	Billy Gunnels	Motion to approve agenda (Bacigalupi, Venglar second).	Agenda was approved without objection	None.
2) Approval of Minutes of January 24, 2014	Anna Carlin	Motion to approve minutes (Bacigalupi, Venglar second).	Minutes were approved without objections or correction	None.
3) Old business: Action Item: Revised Academic Amnesty Policy	Barb Hess, Allison Bacigalupi	Bacigalupi stood in for Barbara Hess during the discussion.  Venglar : CHPSW was very supportive of the policy.  Brooks: had some suggestions for amendments. When students come to the academic standards committee for readmission, even if the committee approves readmission they must have done it by the deadline. Removed the word tentatively from item 3 on the document.	Carothers made a motion that we send this document back to the committee. Motion seconded by	The Academic Amnesty Policy will go back to the Student Affairs Team for

		<p>Clarification: Item 3 talks about setting conditions for amnesty and that the student must agree to those conditions. The student must then fulfill the conditions of the agreement to be awarded amnesty.</p> <p>Brazzeal: CAS feedback pointed out that academic standing policy doesn't have indefinite suspension anymore. Last paragraph needs to be changed to just say that the student will return to good academic standing.</p> <p>Carothers made a motion that we send this document back to the committee because there is still a lot of confusion about the language. Concerned that the academic standards committee will be interpreting and implementing the policy. Motion seconded by Brooks.</p> <p>Anstadt: would like to make sure that the comments from today be brought back to the committee.</p> <p>Vote on the motion: 28 for, 3 abstentions, 0 against. Motion passed.</p> <p>Brazzeal: would strongly encourage the SAT to continue to include Eric Strahorn and Allison Bacigalupi in the discussion on the policy.</p> <p>Carothers: my concern is that the policy is university wide and needs to include perspectives from different groups (admissions, academic standards, advising, etc.) into this policy. Would like to allow the chair of SAT the ability to make the decision.</p> <p>Hung-Simons asked if there any advisors on the Student Affairs Team, since this policy affects them. Gunnels and Carothers clarified the process by which members of the teams are elected and the composition of teams determined by the bylaws. Colleges make their own rules about eligibility for election to a team.</p>	<p>Brooks.</p> <p>Vote on the motion: 28 for, 3 abstentions, 0 against. Motion passed.</p>	<p>further revision and review.</p>
<p>4) New business a) Action Item: Resolution of Appreciation for Ashlyn</p>	<p>Billy Gunnels</p>	<p>Gunnels introduced the resolution. Motion to suspend the rules to vote on the resolution today. Motion passed with no objections or abstentions.</p> <p>Discussion on the motion: Just a small correction to capitalization. People thanked Ashlyn for her hard work. Provost spoke and thanked her, complemented her on</p>	<p>Motion to suspend the rules to vote on the resolution today. Motion passed with no</p>	<p>None.</p>

Gibbs		<p>quality work.</p> <p>Vote on the resolution: all approved; no objections or abstentions.</p>	<p>objections or abstentions.</p> <p>Vote on the resolution: all approved; no objections or abstentions.</p>	
b) Information and Discussion: General Education Assessment	Eric Otto, General Education Council	<p>Otto: Revised mission and purpose and new model was approved by the Gen Ed Council. Next steps include the formation of the Competency Assessment Advisory Team. This would function like the Colloquium advisory team. The CAAT would reaffirm or revise the competencies for Gen Ed. Gen Ed needs to know which courses are assessing which competencies. For Civic Identity competency will need to create the objectives underneath that competency. In Fall 2014, the CAAT would create an assessment program for Gen Ed. Fall of 2015, start coordinating assessment of Gen Ed, report outcomes of Gen Ed assessment, also provided professional development for assessment. Membership of the CAAT: council or team under Undergraduate Studies, made up of voting faculty members. Faculty representing different outcomes, different numbers for different competencies. Appointment would involve the Gen Ed council, Director of Gen Ed, and Department Chairs.</p> <p>Venglar: support faculty involvement in this process. Will there be terms for the people on this council? Otto: We were thinking 3 years, to have similarities with Senate Teams.</p> <p>Condori: have you decided for sure on your membership numbers? Otto: we see it working a little like Senate, with a larger group talking about assessment in general, and then subgroups looking at competencies.</p> <p>Brooks: you mentioned having math faculty on the quantitative reasoning team, would they not be on critical thinking? Otto: if we had math courses proposed for critical thinking, then we would want to include math faculty or make sure that math faculty were consulted.</p> <p>Urakawa: how often would the team meet? Otto: right now, there is going to be a bit of work to get things set up. In the future, we aren't sure what the schedule will be.</p> <p>Condori: will you be choosing which courses meet which</p>	None.	None.

		<p>competencies? Otto: people would propose their courses as one of the competencies. Faculty members that teach the course would know which courses meet what objectives. The question is how do you know what faculty members will be on each team if you don't know what courses will be in each category? Otto: We have an idea of which courses teach critical thinking, etc. We would want to have people from all disciplines represented.</p> <p>Paine: the appointments process for this team seems to be administratively driven. The membership will be determining where assessment will happen in the Gen Ed program. Will students then be able to choose a Gen Ed course program where they can avoid being assessed in a competency? Otto: students wouldn't know which courses do what. But yes, we would probably be sampling with our assessment. Paine: when administrators are selecting members of the committee, then it looks like administration is in charge of curricular engagement. Concern that faculty may not have access to this Gen Ed process. Otto: we have heard this concern before. The Director of Gen Ed will be a non-voting member and the team will have its own bylaws. I understand that right now it is just my word, but I want to reassure you that we don't want to give away control of the curriculum.</p> <p>Provost Toll: Would like to make it clear that his office is not involved in the General Education Council or changes in Gen Ed.</p>		
<p>c) Information Item: Land Donations and Unintended Consequenc es for FGCU</p>	<p>Nora Demers</p>	<p>DRGR= density reduction groundwater resource. The DRGR creates limits on development in the area.</p> <p>Late 90s, when people wanted a university in SW Florida, Keith Arnold was out representative at the time. There was an RFP for land donations for a university, 21 proposals came in and evaluated the proposals using statutory language on locating universities. The current site came up as 21. They decided to reevaluate with a new matrix and this site came up number 1. There was a subsequent lawsuit using the DRGR. Roads are constructed to open up land to development and typically built with tax dollars. Demers distributed a handout with information. Explained past appropriation of money for Coconut Road interchange for I-75.</p> <p>Pointed out that we turned down the PEG donation to the university. The past does not have to determine the future. There will always be groups that want to give to the university to achieve their own interests.</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>None.</p>

		<p>Paine: do you know if the 40-60 acres that PEG promised to title those back to the university have been? Demers: I know it is progress. Toll: those 40 acres were an obligation from the previous developer, it is in the works.</p> <p>Time extended for 5 minutes.</p> <p>Villiers: colleagues have asked me why I am against sustainability. That is not the case. I just think things are more complicated than they might seem. My recommendation is that when people present these kinds of things (like the current topic), bring the full picture not just a small piece of it.</p> <p>Toll: Clarifying on the bidding war on the university site; those were the donors bidding for the choice. The donors were sweetening the deal to try to be chosen. This was not the state bidding for it.</p> <p>Gunnels: just to follow up on Villiers' comment. We are the voice of the faculty; if people have more information to bring on issues please go through the established channels to bring the information to the attention of the Senate.</p>		
<p>6) Standing Reports a) Provost Report</p>	<p>Provost Ronald Toll</p>	<p>Deans searches update: we had candidates on campus in the past couple weeks. Toll has been collecting feedback from on campus and off campus constituents and calling references for the candidates. During the month of February, will be calling people, pulling together input and then go into internal decision making process and talk with the president. There will probably be week or so after an offer is made to allow the candidate to negotiate and visit again. Expect to make an announcement on or around March 1 on both of these searches.</p> <p>Tallahassee update: President just returned from the capitol. Toll will go soon and then 2 or 3 more times this semester. Just a reminder, don't use your FGCU email accounts to contact people in legislature, use your personal email.</p> <p>Legislation: remember the textbook affordability bill that came down previously? There is a new bill coming around that will be even more strict. This one says that you need to retain a textbook for at least 3 years, which I understand is not realistic. It also has a provision that has the President signing off on individual textbook adoptions. We need to rally together against legislation that is ill-conceived. I have presented to the CAVP and we have some ideas about to</p>	<p>Motion to extend time 5 minutes passed.</p>	<p>None.</p>

	<p>suggest changes.</p> <p>Retention Workshop: thanks to those of you that were there. We want to make this an annual event. Would like to get more faculty there next time and will work with Senate Leadership to get more people there. Retention is everybody's business. Especially now that the school is being rated on performance and things like retention.</p> <p>Stecher: The next retention conference is tentatively scheduled for January 30, 2015.</p> <p>FGCU received a 2 million dollar gift to endow faculty development on this campus. This kind of gift is virtually unheard of in higher education. I has an opportunity to share some information about our New Faculty Academy courses at the AACU conference and received emails from others following the conference asking for more information. I would like to expand the academy for returning faculty and create cohorts of differing years of experience. I think this gift and commitment to faculty development and high quality teaching is an important restatement of our mission as an undergraduate teaching institution.</p> <p>Carothers: I don't understand why we are creating multiple avenues for funding in professional development and diminishing our faculty voice in evaluating our colleagues' professional development activities.</p> <p><i>Motion to extend time 5 minutes.</i></p> <p>Toll: TLAI is focused on improving teaching and assessment. It is not a funding entity; it has provided educational opportunities for faculty. On PDFG: Every year I have increased the funding. Should there be more money, yes. The pitch to Mr. Lucas (for the gift) was to support teaching and learning at the university. This reaches out to all of our faculty and adjunct faculty.</p> <p>Anstadt: Will this new initiative cover distance education for faculty who would like to attend virtual conferences? Toll: Yes, that will be part of it.</p> <p>Carothers: TLAI is like common core and PDFG is like electives where faculty may do what they want.</p> <p>Stecher: Comparing TLAI and PDFG is like comparing apples and oranges. What we want to do at conferences is different from learning how to be more effective teachers. The new</p>		
--	--	--	--

		<p>faculty that have gone through the academy course are learning a lot.</p> <p>Kakareka: Question about BOG report and the how we are doing with performance metrics. Toll: We are number 1 in the SUS in masters students employed and one other metric. What we don't have is huge numbers. When you look at the trend lines, we are doing very well. You will see areas of strategic emphasis. STEM is one of those and I'm glad to see that they have broadened their focus.</p>		
b) Student Government Report	Billy Gunnels for Luis Vargas	<p>Student Government: have been in contact with the NYT rep and talked about redistributing print papers. Still working on getting unlimited access online.</p> <p>Scantron dispensing machines are available, please let students know.</p> <p>Working on parking resolutions and will be sending out a survey on parking to students.</p> <p>Students will be releasing a statement on smoking policy soon.</p>	None.	None.
c) UFF Report	Elizabeth Elliot, UFF-FGCU President.	<p>Bargaining continues. A UFF Social will be on Feb 17 and open to all (members and nonmembers).</p> <p>UFF Florida is looking at some legislation coming down the line: There is a proposal/bill coming from a group in Orlando to eliminate 4 year degrees from state colleges. Pension reform is back on the table, including a plan to reduce the pension from the lawmakers.</p> <p>Anstadt: bargaining is to continue the current contract?  Elliot: Articles on salaries and benefits. Anstadt: Is this a complete revamp of the contract? No, it will be a continuation for a year, except for those 2 articles. The entire contract will be open for 2015, not that we will bargain for every piece of it but it will be open.</p>	None.	None.
d) Senate President's Report	Billy Gunnels for Shawn Felton	<p>The Lucas gift (for faculty development) is a phenomenal opportunity. PDFG should be better funded, but this is great for us, since we asked to justify our teaching effectiveness and show growth for evaluation and promotion. The faculty development programs from the center will have a direct impact on our students.</p> <p>Ad hoc committees update. Shared Governance, coming along with a policy, met with Provost this week. The Senate Teams Review Team will bring recommendation to senate</p>	None.	None.

	<p>leadership at the next meeting.</p> <p>Marketing presentations by consultant being held next week: Monday February 10, 9-10:30 and 1-2:30 in Cohen Center. Please encourage colleagues to attend.</p> <p>Perceptions of chairs and deans survey will be going out in the next few weeks. Have straightened out problems with reporting lines. There was some concern about low representation last year. Gunnels personal opinion is that should not be a reason not to do it. Please fill it out, encourage others to fill it out.</p> <p>Eagle Advocacy event was held Jan 29. Retention conference was great event, would like to encourage more faculty to attend next year.</p> <p>Budget committee of the PBC is close to finalizing the priorities for next year. We don't know what the final budget will be until late June or July.</p> <p>Bradshaw will return to Senate on March 14 with chairperson of the BOT Robbie Roepstorff. The meeting time will be extended for March 14 from 9:30-12. Susan Evans will be at our March 28 meeting and Michael Rollo will be there April 11.</p>		
<p>Announcements:</p>	<p>Stecher: Following up on Chris Simoneau's presentation from the last meeting, I've been thinking about faculty involvement in advancement. Stecher and Felton would like to propose a Faculty Senate scholarship, not necessarily endowed (since that would take a large amount of money.) Perhaps it could be for a student involved in student government. The idea needs to needs better developed and we welcome input and interest from others.</p> <p>CAS Reps: Faculty Retreat on Feb 19.</p>		

**Next Senate Meeting:** February 21, 2014 9:30-11:30 am. Cohen Center 214

**Next Senate Leadership Team Meeting:** February 21, 2014 12:00- 1:30 pm. Cohen Center 214