

COPH Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes
April 30, 2004

Dr. Suzanne Perry-Casler, Interim Secretary of Faculty Assembly, respectively submits these minutes.

The meeting began at 10:10am.

1. Approval of the March, 2004 meeting minutes

The number of faculty attending this meeting was less than the required number to reach a quorum. The March minutes will be addressed during the next Faculty Assembly Meeting.

2. Discussion of APT Guidelines. Dr. Coulter facilitated this discussion.

The COPH Faculty Affairs Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Guidelines (10th draft) were distributed. The format was changed so that it is easier to follow. Initially the discussion focused on comments received from faculty on the composition of the committee section. The section now reads: The committee shall be made up of one faculty member from each department who is elected from within the departments and sufficient faculty members who are elected at large by the Faculty Assembly to maintain an uneven number of members numbering at least seven persons. The committee elects the Chair of the committee. *Membership is limited to tenured faculty appointed at USF for 2 years.*

Please note currently there are five departments with one faculty member representing each department and two at large faculty. The at large faculty number will be adjusted by number of departments.

The application for promotion or tenure was also discussed - see page 6. The University System respects this system on tenure. Five external letters of recommendation are now required. The issue of internal reviewers was discussed. Foremost, internal reviewers have never been clearly defined. Several faculty liked the idea of having internal reviewers because it hold faculty accountable for their work at USF. External reviewers should evaluate your scholarly activity, your contribution and service to USF and community work. It was suggested that we obtain letters that clarify other things for external review instead of just scholarly activity including; USF advancement, community involvement, and collaboration efforts.

Additional comments on who should be internal reviewers and their role were provided. The reviewers should have a high level of participation on campus. Their role should be expanded to more than just a research reviewer. Internal reviewers should be a person familiar with the applicants' work where substance can be highlighted. They could be a person the applicant has collaborated with on projects. In comparison, external reviewers may provide documentation of our research and work at other universities. Clearly, external means outside the university. A clear definition of 'internal' is also needed.

Internal reviewers from the college are also on the APT committee. This could be a redundant process. As such, it was also recommended that we avoid internal college reviewers and obtain internal reviewers outside of the college. Internal and external letters are needed and the role of the internal and external reviewers must be clarified.

The question on reviewers was extended to faculty with dual appointments. What kind of review applies in this case? For example, COM could have different expectations than COPH. The issue of having people come to USF with tenure also needs to be discussed. Tenure is a rare privilege. Should a one-year honeymoon period be enforced to evaluate merit? To date, only one faculty member has been hired with tenure in COPH. Of concern here is that senior faculty may consider the one-year period an insult. We could lose some recruitment opportunities. We need flexibility here. Possibly in extraordinary circumstances we could waive this policy. Future discussion should take place as to hiring chairs and deans without tenure for one-year.

Methods offered to get around the one-year period include having a leave of absence granted from the previous job, or redesign the process and offer a five-year contract. If tenure is met in three years the five-year contract is not valued. We need to decide if we want some modification here. The recruiting process currently reflects a give and take confidence – an understanding that we will give them as much as they give us. Dr. Coulter will rewrite this section reflecting flexibility. Some alternative method and legal counsel is needed here. We need to decide if everyone fits under these guidelines - current faculty and new faculty. New guidelines should be a benefit for new-comers.

3. Status of VP Search. Dr. Stockwell facilitated this discussion.

The search committee met last week. Résumés will be reviewed in June 2004. It is expected that 92 phone interviews and 30 face to face interviews will be conducted in June. Eight to 10 candidates will be considered for the first cut. A town hall meeting of faculty will be held to determine the second cut. It is expected that by July 2004 the candidate for the position will be selected.

4. Process for faculty participation in major initiatives of the college. Drs. Gulitz and McDermott facilitated this discussion.

An outline of the COPH Executive Committee Meeting Minutes, from April 21, 2004, was provided to facilitate this presentation / discussion. Please note that the COPH Steering Committee participated in this Ex Com meeting.

The handout of the Ex Com minutes includes a draft of the following major areas:

- The purpose, function, and structure of the Ex Com
- Types of changes that should go through the process with the intent to advise the Dean on issues of importance to the COPH.
- Process for faculty participation in major programs / initiatives of the college

The governance process was discussed today. Faculty did not need to vote today on this draft.

It was established that faculty expressed distress in the past about the process regarding COPH initiatives. A major concern arises on how to increase faculty input on initiatives in COPH. First, what constitutes an initiative was discussed. Second, it was established that a governance review is needed as part of the process regarding the types of changes that should go through the drafted process. Initiatives included:

- Adding or changing academic units
- Creating a new college-wide center or program
- Realigning any major programs
- Programs that commit large resources
- Office campus programs that commit other departments or units

Stepping on toes of departments to start an initiative was discussed. To prevent this concern a new concentration, as an example, needs a greater body participating in the review process. The initiative needs to be brought forth to the Faculty Assembly for discussion. The confusion arises when determining where does the initiative go to after the Faculty Assembly. To decrease the confusion we must also be cautious of developing a whole set of rules which can be cumbersome and lead to micromanagement of problems/changes. The process needs to be simple and not complex. In addition, it was recommended that a champion must be identified to facilitate the initiative – a person or group, whichever works best. A process is also needed to float ideas around before spending a lot of time on it. It must be determined if the initiative has the potential of being implemented. Flexibility is also important in that separate initiatives (steps approach) may be implemented to pursue a major initiative - with the process ending with the Faculty Assembly.

Short - turn around must also be considered. This may be difficult with regard to college wide issues / initiatives. For example, it is predicted that the Lakeland Initiative for constructing a building that houses nutrition and obesity teaching and research efforts is to be completed in 5 years. COPH has been asked if they want space. COPH has one month to respond. Consideration must be given to what kind of FTEs will this generate. COPH priority settings must be identified. What do we want? Where is our trajectory for the future of COPH? Where are we going? USF is in the same boat as other Schools of Public Health. We must be careful because it is easier to say no than yes. We could also discontinue obsolete programs to make room for new initiatives such as Lakeland.

EX Com and the Steering Committee agreed that a workgroup must be established to move this forward. The summary of the EX Com meeting shows multiple ways to do this. Initiatives must go through Faculty Assembly and EX Com but we do not know how exactly how to do this yet. Of concern is that we cannot have a Faculty Assembly meeting every time something comes up. Examples to address this concern are to use email, and also place hardcopies in the faculty mailboxes for faculty to review and make comments.

Additional issues related to faculty participation are that we need to be more sensitive in how we make decisions in the future. We need to involve faculty more. When changing programs /degrees, the need for money arises and everyone needs to talk about it. Also, things are changing more rapidly now. Fast decisions are required. We need flexible responses that will enable us to respond more quickly to opportunities. The Faculty Assembly needs to have discussions on these concerns. The faculty acknowledged that the summary presentation on faculty participation regarding the initiative process was very well presented.

A comment was expressed that the Monday Letter provides an excellent avenue to obtain knowledge about what is going on the COPH. The Dean's office received a thank you for providing the weekly newsletter. It was also stated that the EX Com minutes will be sent to faculty to review and provide comments. Hopefully, this will generate valuable discussions between the administration and faculty. It will change the image that faculty are not involved. Everything does not have to be presented to Faculty Assembly. Use of the Steering Committee may prove beneficial in utilizing more effective ways to make decisions. We do not want to lose opportunities by taking a long time to discuss issues.

The contention is that it is still not clear what constitutes an initiative. Discussions are needed here that focus on monetary issues, resources, time factors. Possibly the Steering Committee or Faculty Assembly can develop a scanning process about information in our environment. We could use the Monday Letter to get a rapid response. There should be a section on "Issues Under Consideration" in the letter where faculty can respond and join in on the discussion.

A comment on the EX Com membership was raised. There is no student representation. We have a responsibility to our students. Students could select a representative. Student representatives are on the Board of Trustees. This was discouraged because of the issues discussed. An alternative approach is that EX Com could have a special meeting and invite student representatives from other departmental committees. However, students would not have the same level of authority as faculty. We could also conduct an open forum, press conference style, that encourages everyone to be part of the dialog. A student advisory committee could be formed to deal with issues related to EX Com agenda items.

A detailed strategic plan is needed for the college. We could see how the initiative(s) fits into our Strategic Plan. We could look at initiatives that are within our priorities. This may help the process go faster. A list of areas related to levels of prominence is published at USF – college by college. COPH has listed 10 areas. All other colleges had one or two listed. People have done extraordinary things for the public's health and need recognition.

However, a lot of what we have done as faculty is reactions to issues / entrepreneurial for initiatives. How can we set priorities that govern these types of approaches? Maybe we can look at priorities in a different way. Where do we want to go as a college? A common goal is to increase our resources. These are not considered as topic areas but looking at how we can up-grade our rank and where we are going as a college. This may promote the creation of faculty lines where academics and resources are relevant issues. Academics and resources could be divided here as two separate issues. Our priorities could enhance our efforts to brag about our strengths – such as advocating for policy change and promoting better health for Floridians. Clarity on how to get initiatives up for consideration is needed, along with, how to develop an expedited process. It is recommended that an actual workgroup and convener for pulling an initiative together is needed.

The undergraduate program is an issue under consideration. How do we make this happen? Inverted governance has occurred since the beginning of administrative governance. As such, we need to sort out what faculty governance means to COPH. This problem exists throughout USF. We could

request the Provost office to do a workshop with faculty on what faculty governance is and how to implement it. Related to this discussion, comments were offered regarding faculty participation in Faculty Assembly meetings. The comments circled the contention that if you do not attend and participate in the process you should not complain. However, having this process is just a sign that we are doing things to improve faculty governance. Some faculty do not come to meetings because they think they are a waste of time. A suggestion offered to address this issue was to do what the Senate does – if you miss two meetings you are off the list. A final suggestion was offered stating that the Faculty Steering Committee, Chairs, EX Com and faculty subcommittees could each appoint a person to collectively, as a group, represent the college during meetings on initiatives. Health Policy and Management needs to be represented in this process.

5. Reports of Standing Committees

Due to lack of time, the Standing Committee reports will be addressed during the next meeting.

6. Scheduling of future meeting.

The next meeting is scheduled for 6/25/ 2004.
10:am – 12:00pm. Room 2016.

7. New business

Due to time running out, new business items will be identified and discussed during the next meeting.

8. Adjourn

This meeting was at 12:00 pm