

9-16-2011

## College of Arts & Sciences Council Meeting : 2011 : 09 : 16

University of South Florida St. Petersburg. College of Arts & Sciences.

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digital.usfsp.edu/coas\\_college\\_council\\_minutes](http://digital.usfsp.edu/coas_college_council_minutes)

---

### Recommended Citation

University of South Florida St. Petersburg. College of Arts & Sciences., "College of Arts & Sciences Council Meeting : 2011 : 09 : 16" (2011). *College of Arts and Sciences: College Council Meeting Minutes* . 37.  
[http://digital.usfsp.edu/coas\\_college\\_council\\_minutes/37](http://digital.usfsp.edu/coas_college_council_minutes/37)

This Other is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences (COAS) at Digital USFSP. It has been accepted for inclusion in College of Arts and Sciences: College Council Meeting Minutes by an authorized administrator of Digital USFSP.

# CAS Faculty Council Meeting

## 16 September 2011

Faculty Council Members *present*: Chris Meindl (Chair), Sheramy Bundrick, Dawn Cecil, Paul Wang, Julie Armstrong, Armando Hoare, and Neil Matthiessen.

Faculty Council Members *absent*: Seth McKee and Barnali Dixon.

Visitors: Chris Davis (faculty Senate President); Susan Allen (CAS Rep. to Faculty Senate); Deby Cassill; Melanie Riedinger-Whitmore.

Dr. Meindl called the meeting to order at 1:35pm

Dr. Meindl announced that Department chairs decided that they preferred to control ALL College travel money; the Faculty Council will not have a small pot of money to distribute to special cases. Dr. Hoare asked what was the basis of giving all travel money to Department Chairs; both he and Dr. Allen observed that in the 2010-2011 school year, the Faculty Council decided that most of the CAS travel money should be allocated to Department chairs based on the total number of full-time faculty—and that a small percentage would be retained and ultimately distributed by the Faculty Council (to special cases the Council deemed appropriate). Dr. Meindl pledged to ask the Dean.

Dr. Meindl asked about the idea (proposed in 2010-211) that the Faculty Council assemble an ad hoc *tenure and promotion task force* to carefully analyze the University's tenure and promotion process, especially the role of the College (given the development of Departments). Dr. Allen added that the report of this proposed ad hoc committee would not be due until the end of the school year, so this was not an item that required immediate attention. Given the workload for today, the Faculty Council agreed to consider this issue in more detail at its next meeting.

Dr. Meindl asked about the idea (proposed in 2010-2011) that the Faculty Council assemble an ad hoc *General Education committee* for the purpose of carefully reviewing the structure and content of General Education here at USFSP. Dr. Allen reported that that Faculty Senate's standing General Education committee had not yet been formed yet, but it might be wise to have at least one person serve on both the ad hoc CAS Gen Ed committee and the standing Faculty Senate Gen Ed committee.

Dr. Chris Davis, the USFSP Faculty Senate President, introduced himself and added that Dr. Ernie Gonzalez was recently assigned the duty of working for the Faculty Senate Gen Ed committee—to provide Administration input, as well as policy advice and guidance to faculty members on the committee. Dr. Davis recommended that CAS appoint strong voices to the Faculty Senate Gen Ed committee. Davis admitted that it was not clear if CAS should appoint one, two or even three faculty members to the Faculty Senate Gen Ed committee; this would be up the faculty of CAS. Council members decided to try and

identify potential Gen Ed committee members within a few weeks and develop a formal charge for the Faculty Council's own ad hoc Gen Ed committee at its next meeting.

Dr. Davis then reviewed structural changes to the USF System Faculty Advisory Council.

Dr. Meindl asked if each Department should be represented on the Faculty Council? Dr. Armstrong said she thought so. The Council decided to table the issue until the next meeting.

Dr. Meindl then asked if the Faculty Council should approve of the proposed Department re-alignments:

1. Art History FROM Graphic Design and Art History TO History and Politics.
2. Foreign Language FROM Language, Literature and Writing TO Anthropology, Criminology, ISS.
3. Biological Sciences FROM Environmental Science, Policy and Geography.
4. Graphic Design TO Verbal and Visual Arts.

Dr. Meindl made clear that he thought the Faculty Council's only role in the Department re-alignment process was to serve as one last forum for faculty to express their views; and that the sentiment of the Council would be forwarded (along with all Department re-alignment proposals and recorded faculty comments) to the USF System Faculty Advisory Committee and the USFSP Faculty Senate.

Dr. Hoare expressed concern that, although proponents of proposed Department re-alignments appeared well represented at the Faculty Council meeting, the Council did not appear to hear the voices of those affected by such re-alignments. Both Dr. Bundrick and Dr. Armstrong contended that nobody was being affected; that most of the Department re-alignments were amicably agreed to several months ago; and that the recent process (suggested by USF Tampa) for vetting Department re-alignments was created to prevent the administration from unilaterally engaging in Department re-alignment without providing an opportunity for faculty to make their concerns about such proposed re-alignments known. Meanwhile, the Biological Sciences Department proposal was not delivered to the ESPG Department until 8 August 2011; but ESPG Faculty were invited to comment on the proposal either electronically or at a Department faculty meeting on 15 August 2011. Moreover, Biological Sciences faculty prepared a document after 15 August 2011 in which they responded to many of the comments from ESPG faculty.

Most Faculty Council members recognized that the Council was in the awkward position of being asked to participate in a Department re-alignment process that emerged after most of the proposed department re-alignments had essentially already occurred—but most members saw no evidence that the proposed Department re-alignments should not take place. Accordingly, 6 Council members voted to approve of the proposed department re-alignments, 1 member abstained, and 2 members were absent and did not vote. The Faculty Council agreed that in the future, it should play whatever role in vetting or approving Department re-alignments that the University's policy calls for at that time.

Dr. Hoare contended that the current guidance from Tampa was inadequate and should be further clarified.

Dr. Meindl agreed to prepare a memo reflecting the Faculty Council's discussion and sentiment toward the proposed Department re-alignments to both the USF System Faculty Advisory Council and the USF Faculty Senate.

The meeting adjourned at 2:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Christopher F. Meindl.