Steering Committee Meeting
Minutes
September 29, 2015
BOT Conference Room, 2pm – 4pm

Members Present: Chris Beetle, Ron Nyhan, DilyS Schoorman, Mike Harris, Morton Levitt, Susan Dyess, Kevin Wagner, and Michele Hawkins (Acting Provost)
Guests: Ed Pratt, Deborah Floyd, Paul Peluso, Russell Ivy, Debra Szabo, Steven Bourassa, Yuan Wong, Mary Ann Gosser, Tania Tucker, James Cunningham, John Hardman, and Susan Fulks.

1. The meeting was called to order at 2:03pm by Chair, Dr. Chris Beetle.
2. The UFS Steering minutes from August 25, 2015 were approved with no objections from the committee.

3. President’s Report:
   a. Kim Dunn, Faculty Athletics Representative, will be speaking at the Senate meeting on October 9th to discuss some of the things happening in Athletics.
   b. At the Senate meeting, a call for nominations will be held for the Steering Committee as Yolanda Gamboa has resigned. Ideally a quick election will be held; a couple weeks for nominations and a week for elections.
   c. An update was given on the SPE policy; the comments from faculty are flowing in. The Provost will be accepting comments up until the committee meets again, which is should be within two weeks. The committee will review the comments and take them into consideration while continuing to draft the policy.

4. UPC Consent Agenda: no objections from Steering; the consent agenda is approved by majority vote.

5. UPC Action Agenda:
   a. College of Arts & Letters
      • Peace Studies
         o Dr. Kevin Wagner motions to move to the Consent Agenda. Dr. Ron Nyhan seconds. After a majority vote, the motion carries.
   b. College for Design and Social Inquiry
      • Urban and Regional Planning and Urban Design
         o Dr. Susan Dyess motions to move forward with a positive recommendation from Steering. Seconded. After a majority vote, the motion carries.

6. UGC Consent Agenda: no objections from Steering; the consent agenda is approved by majority vote.
7. **UGC Action Items**

   a. **College of Education**
      
      • Certificate Program: Teacher Leadership
        
        o Dr. Susan Dyess motions to move forward with a **positive recommendation from Steering**. Seconded. After a majority vote, the motion carries.

   b. **College of Engineering and Computer Science**
      
      • Transportation Certificate
        
        o There are some concerns with the language in the proposal. Dr. Mike Harris points out there is a typographical error in the doc that reads “four credits” when it should be “four courses”.
        
        o It is decided that the appropriate people will be notified of the error and asked to make the correction before Oct. 9th.
        
        o The original motion from the UGC to move forward with a positive recommendation is denied by majority vote. Dr. Dilys Schoorman motions to send forward to Senate **without recommendation from Steering**. After a majority vote, the motion carries.

8. **Business Items:**

   a. **Ph.D in Integrative Biology**
      
      • Item is tabled

   b. **Community Engagement Committee**
      
      • Dr. Chris Beetle apologizes for discussing this item at the last Senate meeting without addressing the Steering Committee first. It is protocol to bring the item to Steering before bringing it to Senate.
      
      • Dr. Dilys Schoorman begins a discussion on the concerns that were brought up at the Senate meeting. Dr. Mike Harris asks about the responsibilities of the committee and the role of the members. Dr. Ron Nyhan, Chair of the President’s Task Force on Community Engagement, explains the role of the committee (to be made up of faculty), which is to comment on, and have a significant role in deciding on what is asked of the faculty and how its asked. The other issue the committee will discuss is how to define Community Engagement as part of faculty assignments. It is the goal to broaden the definitions of Teaching, Service, and Research as they relate to Community Engagement. He uses Service Learning as an example of Community Engagement. He would like this committee to capture what the faculty wants before it goes to the Task Force, which goes to the President.
      
      • Dr. Mike Harris mentions another concern about the doc; the last line of the doc implies that the CEC will report to the UFS or Task Force when asked. Dr. Harris’ concern is the implied obligation to report the deliberations of the committee to
the Task Force rather than just the Senate. He feels the Task Force can create their own report to send to the President, if they so wish. Dr. Beetle, hearing out the concern, will change the language in the doc to remove any obligation to report to the Task Force. The primary authority to report to will be the Senate.

- Dr. Schoorman would like to know about the Provost’s involvement in this committee and task force, especially with regards to P/T. Dr. Ron Nyhan mentions that the Provost is represented on this task force and committee.

c. **UFS Resolution on Faculty Speech**

- Dr. Beetle cleared up some confusion about the events that took place at the last Senate meeting regarding the issue of Faculty Speech. He drafted this resolution to address the issue and to encourage a clearer interpretation of the Collective Bargaining Agreement article. Dr. Beetle then reads through the resolution to the Steering Committee and explains why there needs to be a resolution.
- Dr. Beetle asks the Steering Committee whether they have identified things in the document that they would like to see changed.
- Dr. Harris and Dr. Wagner both commend Dr. Beetle for his efforts in drafting this resolution. They each point out that the language as it exists is left to interpretation, which is the issue at hand. Dr. Wagner argues that it’s not being interpreted the way it was originally intended to be used. Dr. Harris argues that this be directed to university policies and procedures as well as the collective bargaining agreement to attempt to conform to the principles that are outlined in the resolution, instead of the Senate dictating what the collective bargaining agreement should do. Dr. Wagner thinks what we really need from the Senate is to ask the administration exactly how this language should be interpreted.
- Dr. Schoorman offers the idea that the language in the resolution referring to striking the article from the CBA ought to be removed or changed, or rather request an explanation of how it should be interpreted.
- Dr. Ron Nyhan disagrees and thinks the language in the CBA does need to be addressed. He brings up a point that the language is not limited to the press, it relates to community interaction as a whole. He thinks, however, the resolution language to strike the article from the CBA is too harsh.
- Dr. Dyess and Dr. Levitt both agree that this should go before the senate as this is concerning the faculty, and both the senate and the union make up the faculty.
- Dr. Nyhan and Dr. Harris suggest changing the language in the last paragraph before presenting to Senate.
- Dr. Harris motions that this moves forward as amended. Dr. Schoorman seconds. After a majority vote, the motion carries.
9. Open forum with the Provost
   a. Dr. Michele Hawkins is Acting Provost for this meeting. Dr. Schoorman mentions the SPE policy and some concerns surrounding the document. There is a group discussion on the intentions as perceived by the faculty, followed by discussion on the peer-review element of the document. Dr. Wagner asks how the committee members were chosen, but the answer reveals that there was no concise way of choosing. Some members were appointed, others were chosen.
   b. Dr. Harris asks Dr. Hawkins what to expect with regards to the metrics. Dr. Hawkins plans to get the colleges involved more in coming up with ways to help students graduate. She also mentions that some additional metrics have been introduced, including a metric that measures how many transfer students graduate. There is discussion about the new admission requirements and how that will affect the metrics; we expect there to be no significant changes. The theory behind that is with better students, we’ll have better results.

10. Good of the Steering Committee
   a. Dr. Ron Nyhan addresses Steering to talk about GRIP and the potential of not receiving funding this year. Dr. Hawkins clarifies by saying GRIP is under consideration to receive funding this year, but it has yet to be determined. Dr. Nyhan asks the Steering committee to support the program so that it may continue this year if it does not get included in the nonrecurring funds allocations.
   b. Dr. Kevin Wagner talks about FAU putting out their first political poll last week. There was a lot of good coverage on that and they expect to get out another one in January.
   c. Dr. Dilys Schoorman brings up the ongoing concern about the doctoral dissertation committees and visiting members being required to go through the affiliate process. Dr. Deb Floyd speaks to the issue by informing Dr. Schoorman about the revised Form 1. Dr. Floyd invites Dr. Schoorman to contact her if she has any questions or issues about this.

Meeting adjourned at 3:46 p.m.