

MINUTES

Faculty Senate

Friday, November 1, 2013 9:30-11:30 am

Cohen Center 214

In Attendance: Anstadt, Bacigalupi, Benford, Brazzeal (Trent Brown, alternate), Brooks, Buzasi, Carlin, Carothers, Condori, Croshaw, Epple (Allison Bacigalupi, proxy), Erdman, Felton, Finley, Foote (Martha Rosenthal, proxy), Gilbert, Gunnels, Hung-Simons, Kakareka, Krome, Nguyen, Paine, Pavelka, Perretti, Renard, Rosenthal, Stecher, Torres (Claude Villiers, proxy), Urakawa (Amy Towne, alternate), van Duijn, Venglar, Villiers, Zhao.

Absent (without Alternate/Proxy): none

Guests: Ronald Toll (Provost), Paul Snyder (PIP), Tony Barringer (Academic Affairs), Luis Vargas (Student Government), Jennifer Baker (Academic Affairs)

Media: Eagle News representative.

Summary: VP of Administrative Services and Finance, Steve Magiera, presented information on operating budget and answered questions from faculty regarding cost of fingerprinting, funding building on campus, and the Buckingham property. Jennifer Goen from Government Relations addressed the Senate and talked about legislative activities and Eagle Advocacy. Faculty Senate discussed what actions to take regarding a faculty position on a policy for smoking on campus. The Senate voted to use existing survey data that shows that a majority of faculty support a ban on smoking on campus as evidence of faculty opinion on the issue. A motion was made for the Faculty Senate to support a ban on tobacco and smokeless tobacco products on campus which will be discussed at the next meeting. Several changes to the Excellence in Scholarship Award guidelines and criteria were presented and will be voted on at the next meeting. Provost Toll presented data on faculty attrition rates from the last three years.

Agenda Item	Responsible	Discussion	Action/Vote	Follow-up
1) Gathering	Shawn Felton	Felton recognized media in the room (Eagle News) and Student Government representatives observing.		
2) Approval of Minutes from October 18.	Shawn Felton	No corrections.	Motion to approve. No objections, motion passed.	
3) Open forum with Mr. Steve Magiera, VP for Administration and Finance	Steve Magiera	Felton introduced Magiera. Explained that several questions were submitted in advance to the senate secretary and some were not appropriate for his area. Those will be forwarded to the right people for answers. Also explained that he asked Magiera to present some information about the budget in general. Felton asked for a motion to suspend rules governing time limits on agenda items. There was a motion, it was seconded and approved. Magiera started off with a presentation of the budget that	A motion was approved to suspend the rules on time.	

- was previously given to the Board of Trustees.
- Displayed an organizational chart to explain what offices he supervises.
 - Slides on operating budget slide: 3 lines of revenue make up E&G: general revenue (from the state), lottery money, and tuition and fees. Additional revenues that don't go into E&G: athletics, student fees, concessions, financial aid (gets dispersed to students that are eligible), contracts and grants, and auxiliary revenue (biggest portion is housing).
 - Expenses of the Div. of Admin Services add up to \$46 million. Things under general expenses include physical plant and computing licenses. Benefits for employees go in Dept. of Admin Services instead of Academic Affairs. Carry Forward money can be used to do many things except build buildings, but you can add on or renovate up to 2 million.
 - PECO money has been dropping in recent years; revenue is less due to the places it comes from (gas tax, landline phones). \$497,000 was given to us for PECO last year; this is earmarked for the Buckingham campus demolition.

Kakareka: If there is no PECO money, if we want to build something we have to get 100% funding for the project?
 Magiera: Yes. Add on to this that the stats used to have matching gifts program that encouraged donors but those two programs have been suspended in recent years. This is making it much harder to get gifts that will actually get buildings built.

Felton: asked question sent in from faculty about the new fingerprinting and background check policy and how much it cost to implement last year and what the projected cost would be for next year.

Magiera: The original estimate of the startup cost for implementing the policy was \$55,000. It ended up costing \$87,000 last year to do the fingerprinting. This year we are budgeting \$25,000 and we think that will be more than enough. Breakdown of the \$55 per person cost; \$40 goes to FDLE, \$15 is kept back for the police department to pay for printing, staff, etc.

Magiera on Buckingham property: The Safety and Facilities Committee has gone out to the property and is working on a presentation on master planning for the campus. Don't expect much to happen here because of lack of PECO money.

Felton: Complemented Magiera for slowing things down regarding action on the bus line to campus and asked Magiera to talk about what is happening with public transport.

Magiera: When you complete a master plan, you have to do a community agreement to negotiate impacts on county. When we did our master plan, we had plans to build more buildings,

		<p>but ended up not building them. We paid for impacts for buildings we didn't build. With these agreements, we are supposed to be paying for impacts, not specific services. We paid in \$250,000 a year specifically for a bus line, when it should have just been put toward impacts (adding lanes, signals, etc.). The county wanted to cancel the bus line because it was the worst performing line (according to their data). FGCU hosted a meeting with community partners and they were not willing to pay into the funding for the bus line. The county ended up deciding to continue route 60.</p> <p>Erdman: Without PECO money, what are our options for funding our own buildings? Magiera: We are unable to take on debt of our own. We don't have control over our tuition and where the tuition revenue goes.</p> <p>Felton: Asked Magiera to talk about some of the safety measures taken on campus. Magiera: Housing spent money to put cell phone boosters in housing to make sure that cell phone coverage is good. We added phones back into classrooms for safety. Our blue phones are getting old and we are looking into replacing those or putting in new tools like sirens (UF has these). Also mentioned the text alert system. Pavelka: added that she is the co-chair of the Regional Domestic Security Task Force, K-20 Campus Security Committee (under the Dept. of Homeland Security.) We update the campus security plan every year.</p> <p>Magiera: The PBC Budget Committee does have quite a few faculty representatives. One thing the Budget Committee does is come up with for spending priorities for money that may come in and admin follows those recommendations closely. We will be looking at performance based funds; how to spend those and how to get another good award next year.</p> <p>Brooks: Could you talk more about the Buckingham area and whether faculty members with expertise in land planning are involved in the strategic planning process. Magiera: I don't know who exactly is on the Safety and Facilities Committee. The Buckingham campus was a former mental health care facility and some of the buildings are quite old.</p> <p>Felton: The faculty reps on Safety and Facilities Committee are Marguerite Forrest and Margaret Banyan.</p>		
4) Old Business a) University Committee Survey	Dr. Carolynne Gischel	Senators have until Monday to get information back to the SPIE.		
b) Update: Smoking on Campus	Billy Gunnels	Gunnels talked about the history of the smoking policy discussion; last left in senate saying that when there was further movement on the issue that we would talk about it	Venglar made a motion to use the	Follow-up: Senators should get

Survey		<p>again. As of yet, the faculty, through Faculty Senate, has not taken an actual position on smoking policy. Gunnels restated some of the results from the faculty survey taken a couple of years ago, which showed that a majority of faculty agree with banning smoking on campus. SAC is starting their conversation about smoking next week. Student Government has been working very hard to get a survey out there to get clear information about what current students what.</p> <p>Rosenthal: This issue came up probably 10 years ago in the Senate. At the time, I spoke out against a ban; protecting personal freedoms is important to me. I have since changed my views. Now I would strongly encourage us to support a complete ban on smoking on campus. Rosenthal provided many statistics and information supporting the idea that smoking is dangerous and unhealthy; the susceptibility of young people to tobacco addiction. Also cited examples of other smoke free campuses. A ban will prevent some people from starting or relapsing when trying to quit, and also improve the cleanliness of the campus environment.</p> <p>Stecher: Talked about medical evidence supporting dangers of smoking and second hand smoke. Shared anecdote of a student who resisted being told where to smoke and said that we need to do something about smoking policy and enforcement.</p> <p>Erdman: Brought up problem of vapor/ e-cigarettes. What will we do about those?</p> <p>Felton: Brought us back to the question of whether to use old data or to do a new survey to inform faculty opinion.</p> <p>Benford: Is there a reason that we didn't do anything with the data at the time it was collected? Gunnels: It was going to be used to continue the conversation with students and staff before any stance was taken.</p> <p>Anstadt: We are seen as leaders on campus, so we should be leaders on this social justice issue. Use the old data and we could maybe update it.</p> <p>Paine: I assume we have access to the instrument that we used previously, would like to know the cost, practicality and comparability to other surveys going out to students to consider doing a new survey to say we have current information.</p> <p>Rosenthal: I don't think we need to do another survey, we have done it before and we got a clear answer from the majority supporting a ban. E-cigarettes are also unhealthy; we should include all tobacco products in a ban.</p>	<p>existing survey data to inform our opinion on a smoking ban. Rosenthal seconded.</p> <p>Motion to extend 10 minutes (Rosenthal), passed.</p> <p>Vote to use the old survey data to inform faculty opinion on smoking policy: 27 for; 4 against; 2 abstentions. Motion passed.</p> <p>Motion made by Rosenthal: Faculty senate should support a ban on tobacco, smokeless tobacco products and e-cigarettes.</p>	<p>information from constituents regarding this motion for a vote at the next meeting.</p>
--------	--	--	--	--

		<p><i>A motion to extend 5 discussion minutes was passed.</i></p> <p><i>Venglar made a motion to use the existing survey data to inform our opinion on a smoking ban. Rosenthal seconded.</i></p> <p>Discussion on the motion:</p> <p>Buzasi: Many of us weren't here two years ago. I'd like to know how many faculty are the same from two years ago.</p> <p>Toll: 85 have left in the last three years and there have been about 120 new faculty members in the last three years. Out of about 450 total faculty?</p> <p>Brooks: Would like to get feedback from others about whether we should use the old data.</p> <p><i>Motion to extend 10 minutes (Rosenthal), passed.</i></p> <p>Pavelka: I agree that we are leaders on campus and we can send a clear message. A ban will support our mission of environmental sustainability.</p> <p>Carothers: The issue isn't going away until there is a ban. We'll keep talking about it until people that don't want other people to smoke get their way. Don't forget all of the other purposes that smoking serves for people, let's try and find ways to satisfy those needs in other ways if we are going to ban smoking.</p> <p>Vote on the motion on the floor (to use the old survey data): 27 for; 4 against; 2 abstentions.</p> <p>Motion made by Rosenthal: Faculty senate should support a ban on tobacco, smokeless tobacco products and e-cigarettes.</p>		
<p>5) New Business a) Presentation by Jennifer Goen, Director of Government Relations</p>	<p>Jennifer Goen</p>	<p>9th semester at FGCU; before coming here worked in a number of offices of state legislators. Thanked faculty for what they do at the university, that is what we get to talk about in Tallahassee and you make this a great university and members are always impressed with what is happening here at FGCU.</p> <p>Last legislative session, we asked for \$13.5 million, and got \$6 million in appropriations for recurring funding, one of the biggest appropriations in the SUS. We are having difficulty with PECO funding and some people are working on finding new ways to generate revenue for PECO. The state revenue is growing, so this has meant a little less restriction in budgets.</p> <p>Goen has two new staff; and executive secretary and an assistant coming from a state reps office.</p>		

		<p>This session: will be asking for PECO funding, appropriations, and will share some information about how we plan to spend our performance based funding to support student success.</p> <p>Eagle Advocacy: encourage people to join. If you are in Tallahassee, or there are members of the legislature on campus, please let Government Relations office know so that we can communicate with you and make sure that we are speaking with one voice.</p> <p>Paine: The work you do is noticed and appreciated.</p> <p>Toll: I want to thank Ms. Goen; I have seen her open doors that were previously closed because she has built up relationships.</p> <p>Goen: President Bradshaw does a fantastic job in Tallahassee; he is open and honest and has developed good relationships.</p>		
b) Faculty Seating Commencement Survey	Shawn Felton	The Registrar asked if faculty has a preference about how they are seated. They offered 4 different layouts for consideration. Carlin will send out the survey today, please get it done before the end of next week (Nov. 8).		All faculty complete survey by Nov 8.
c) Proposed Changes to Excellence in Scholarship Award criteria	Dr. Daniel Rottig	<p>Rottig: The excellence in scholarship award committee has two requests. One is to start a general discussion about splitting the senior faculty scholarship award into two awards; one award for full professors and one award for associate professors.</p> <p>Action item: Change the criteria to letting an associate professor with less than one year in rank apply for a junior faculty award.</p> <p>Action item: make dates in the document consistent.</p> <p>Action item: remove limitation on past award winners</p> <p>The committee found that portfolios were inconsistent or unstructured, had trouble finding pertinent information.</p> <p>Action item: ask for a two page maximum summary of scholarship activities in the last calendar year and a reflection of growth in one page. Also asking for documentation/ examples of current scholarship.</p> <p>Action item on composition of selection committee: guidelines state that the chair of the committee doesn't vote, which would discourage faculty from stepping up as chair. Would like to change this. Also need to fix language to include all colleges and not name specific units.</p> <p><i>Motion to extend discussion time by 5 minutes was passed.</i></p> <p>Rosenthal: Scholarship is better represented by a longer window perhaps like 3 years.</p> <p>Bacigalupi: Suggest that we look at the changes in the</p>	Motion to extend discussion time by 5 minutes was passed.	Senators gather input from constituents for next meeting.

		<p>document individually instead as a group.</p> <p>Krome: Junior faculty may not be supported/nominated by their colleagues. Towne: instructors feel like this is a lot of work to complete the portfolio.</p> <p>Paine: There are references to the "scholarship" missions of their respective colleges, if this is a university award, shouldn't it follow the university mission for scholarship? Rottig: we couldn't find a university mission or statement on scholarship.</p> <p>Toll: Making an observation, I remember that Senate voted to split one of the other awards, which I supported. But senate said they would evaluate this decision after two years, which never happened. We need to streamline this process to encourage more applications. We do not have a university wide understanding of teaching, scholarship, and service. I have asked for the last 6 years for the colleges to work on combining their evaluation and promotion documents with appendices for each college.</p>		
Other New Business?		<p>Kakareka: Would like to suggest that we have HR VP come to our Nov. 15 meeting to address issues with contracts and fingerprinting procedure for candidates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Toll: I can respond to the contract issues. When promotions were approved by BOT, it was for employees that are employed as of a certain date. We had brand new faculty that were given the 3.5% increase that was not approved. That was an error that needed to be corrected; it was a violation of the statute. • Baker: This is the first year that new employees are required to complete the background check, when candidates visit campus they are asked to submit fingerprints and which won't be processed unless they are offered a position. <p>Hung-Simons: Students sit in hallways and cause safety hazards. Also take chairs and tables from classrooms. Felton: Will take the information and see which senate team it could go to.</p>		
6) Standing Reports a) Provost Report	Dr. Ronald Toll	<p>Toll: I was asked about this issue in previous meetings. There is a perception that there was a mass exodus of faculty in the last couple years. A handout was distributed with breakdown of reasons for leaving (on Senate website).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty numbers on the handout includes out of unit people. The "contract terminated or not renewed" category includes visiting professors. People who took other positions: some people left to go to research 		

		<p>intensive schools and some took admin/higher level position.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the attrition number was 0, that would not necessarily be a good thing. When good people leave, it speaks well of the training and support people receive at FGCU. It means that we have the caliber of people that other fine institutions want. <p>Promotion workshop coming up, encourage colleagues to go. It is indeed intended for advisors.</p> <p>Gunnels: The data have shown there are a small number of people leaving, but the people that leave are our stars. Do we want them to leave? Do we know more about why they are leaving? Toll: The exit interview we give is the standard thing that we do for all employees. You always lose the best, because they are the most employable. There are cases where we may not be able to match an offer or the position they are going to doesn't exist here.</p>		
Announcements/ Closing		<p>Felton: Student government sponsored luncheon is happening after this meeting in Sugden Hall, please attend.</p> <p>The standing reports from Student Government and Senate President will be sent out in text. We have been going over our meeting time due to the great interactions and input from faculty.</p>		