



The Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-1480

FACULTY SENATE, 1480
Phone: (850) 644-7497
FAX: (850) 644-3375
www.fsu.edu/~fasenate

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
FEBRUARY 16, 2005
DODD HALL AUDITORIUM
3:35 P.M.**

I. Regular Session

The regular session of the 2004-05 Faculty Senate was held on Wednesday, February 16, 2005. Steering committee vice-chair Jim Cobbe presided in the absence of the Senate President.

The following members attended the Senate meeting:

N. Abell, J. Ahlquist, M. Allen, A. Arnold, T. Baker, C. Barrilleaux, G. Bates, C. Beeler, S. Blumsack, M. Bonn, A. Boutin, B. Bower, F. Bunea, D. Clendinning, J. Clendinning, P. Coats, J. Cobbe, C. Connerly, M. Cooper, D. Corbin, T. Crisp, C. Darling, L. Dehaven-Smith, S. Fiorito, L. Flynn, J. Geringer, P. Gielisse, N. Greenbaum, V. Hagopian, H. Hawkins, L. Hawkes, E. Hilinski, C. Hofacker, W. Leparulo, S. Lewis, S. Losh, E. Madden, C. Madsen, N. Mazza, D. Moore, R. Navarro, P. Orr, S. Palanki, A. Payer, D. Peterson, J. Peterson, P. Rikvold, A. Sang, D. Schlagenhauf, D. Seaton, M. Seidenfeld, S. Sirmans, S. Southerland, J. Standley, K. Stoddard, Jeanette Taylor, John Taylor, G. Tyson, E. Walker, C. Ward, J. Whyte, J. Wulff, M. Young.

The following members were absent. Alternates are listed in parenthesis:

R. Atkinson, V. R-Auzenne, J. Baker, J. Bowers, M. Childs, S. Carroll, R. Coleman, F. Davis, J. Dexter, P. Doan, J. Dodge (**M. Crossley**), L. Edwards (**J. O'Rourke**), L. Epstein, R. Fichter, J. Grant, C. Greek, D. Gussak, M. Guy, T. Hart (**J. Gathegi**), R. Herrera, D. Houle, D. Jordan (**A. Archbold**), A. Kalbian (**K. Erndl**), B. Kemker, D. Kuhn (**J. Fiorito**), W. Landing, V. MacDonald, T. Matherly, D. Odita, S. Pfeiffer (**H. Li**), D. Pompper, D. Rice, N. Thagard, Q. Wang, B. Warf, K. Yang.

II. Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of the January 19, 2005 meeting were approved with one correction.

III. Approval of the Agenda

The amended agenda was approved with one change so the President may be moved up in the order.

IV. Report of the Steering Committee, J. Cobbe

The steering committee has met three times since the last Faculty Senate meeting. Unfortunately, our monthly meeting with the President and Provost was cancelled because the Provost was indisposed and the President was summoned at short notice to the Governor's office. However, we did at one of our other meetings have a wide-ranging discussion with the Provost, touching on potential organizational changes in Westcott, methods of grade reporting, the Chiropractic proposal, guidelines for course syllabi on the web, and implementation issues regarding Omni.

We met with Dean of Undergraduate Studies Karen Laughlin and Dean of the Faculties Anne Rowe to discuss the revision of the faculty handbook, which is progressing. It was agreed that the various draft chapters would be given to the steering committee for comment as the drafts were completed, rather than waiting for the entire text to be drafted. We also discussed final examination policy with them, and suggested that they should collect data on what actual practice was regarding final examinations in undergraduate courses before exploring possible changes in University policy.

Regarding the Chiropractic proposal, the steering committee wishes to commend the GPC and particularly its Chair, George Bates, for the manner with which it dealt with this controversial proposal, which we believe reflected very well on the continued strength of faculty governance at Florida State University.

We met with Vice President Lee Hinkle for a presentation and discussion on the proposed revised University logo and the new branding initiative. We have invited her to make a brief presentation on these initiatives to the March 16 Senate meeting.

We had a long and very wide-ranging discussion with Ike Eberstein, who we were inviting to chair the proposed task force on issues concerning non-tenure track faculty. Ike has not yet agreed to serve as chair, but we are going to request data from the administration and explore the appropriate detailed terms of reference for this proposed task force with him again later in the year. The steering committee would welcome suggestions as to what issues concerning non-tenure track faculty the task force should address.

We were told that collective bargaining with the UFF is, in the administration's view, progressing well, and the administration expects that only one or two more meetings will take place.

The representatives you authorized to meet as a conference committee with representatives of the Student Senate to resolve differences over the proposed new Academic Honor Code held two meetings with the students, and at the second we were able to resolve the remaining differences. You will recall that the Senate approved the new code back in the Fall. The only changes to what you agreed then in this compromise text to which the student representatives agreed are (a) the XF is omitted as a possible penalty less severe than suspension, and (b) the wording of the multiple submission clause is revised. The steering committee believes that from a faculty point of view these two changes are of no substantive importance, and urges that the Senate approve the revised proposed new code. Therefore, on behalf of the steering committee, I now so move.

The motion passed unanimously.

V. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Undergraduate Policy Committee, S. Lewis

Senators should be aware that the requirements for the Computer Skills Competency were changed as a result of the SACS review last year. This change occurred immediately after the UPC had increased the standards used to measure students' acquisition of computer skills appropriate to their majors. As a result of these two events, all undergraduate programs must identify the computer skills competencies needed by their graduates and the courses in which these skills are measured. All courses previously approved for the Computer Skills Competency designation have been asked to provide evidence that they include a capstone activity that is used to measure the acquisition of specific competencies and that evaluation is guided by a well-defined rubric.

So, the Computer Skills Competency Sub-Committee of the UPC has been, and will be, busy approving courses in this area for a while. On behalf of the Undergraduate Policy Committee, I would like to inform the Senate that the following courses have been approved for the Computer Skills Competency designation:

CGS 2060	Computer Literacy I
CGS 2065	Computer Literacy II
CGS 2100	Microapplications for Business and Economics
NUR 3167	The Research Process for Professional Practice
DAN 4418	Survey of Dance Technologies

Thank you.

b. Graduate Policy Committee, G. Bates

The GPC has been quite busy this year. We met seven times in the fall and have approved 3 new masters programs, one in science teaching, one is biostatistics and one in aquatic sciences. We also conducted 5 program reviews all in the College of Engineering and all were approved to continue. We met in January to discuss the Chiropractic program and we will also be doing 6 program reviews this spring. One of the main things the policy committee does is to approve new program proposals and to review existing programs. I would like to take a moment to thank the people who conduct these reviews:

James Brooks	Nancy Marcus
Peter McClaren	John Geringer
Ralph Dougherty	Sissy Carrol
Emily Haymes	Winnifred Adolph
Srinivas Palanki	Lois Hawkes
John Sobanjo	David Levenson
Christopher Tam	Dan Vitkus
Chuck Zhang	Santa Arias
Raj Arora	David Houle
Jay Baker	Tricia Young
Joe Donoghue	Mark Pietralunga
Flip Froelich	Dennis Moore
Jim Zheng	Dan Maier-Katkin
Jack Quine	Lee Stepina
Elizabeth Platt	Barney Twiss
Pam Perrewe	Joyce Carbonell
Peter Kalu	Walter Tschinkel
Sanford Safron	Mary Karen Dahl
Peggy Hsieh	David Kirby
Dianne Speake	Ralph Berry
Bill Cloonan	Howard Baer
Barry Faulk	

These people have spent a great deal of their time conducting these reviews and we all owe them our thanks.

I wanted to give you an overview of what went on in regards to the Chiropractic program. I will set the stage by telling you how programs are approved. Ordinarily programs are initiated by the faculty then they are discussed within the appropriate department and college and then are sent forth to the administration. When it reaches the administration it is also simultaneously given to the GPC to review. The approval is a 2 step process.

First the program is given approval to explore a new program. Then they go back and flesh out the program and then they come back a second time for final approval. I was notified in November that we were going to need to review this and the time was not long enough to do a two step review. The proposal was not given to us until early/mid December so I arranged for meeting in the earliest part of January. At the same time the Steering Committee thought it was good idea to hold an open faculty forum.

We met on January 10 and discussed the Chiropractic Program. We voted to assert our right to have time to review it. We passed a motion directing the BOT not to approve the program until the GPC had time to study it. The BOT passed a similar motion directed at the BOG. The BOG killed the program. A very positive outcome of the events surrounding the Chiropractic program was that the University administration and the BOT explicitly acknowledged the faculty's role in the approval of new programs and that the GPC is the final faculty body that approves new graduate and professional programs.

c. Teaching Evaluation Committee, E. Walker

This is our annual information report (See Addendum 1). We currently have 2 seats that are unfilled so if you have colleagues that are chomping at the bit, please forward those names to me.

We received a report recently from the chair of the Science area which enumerated from his sample of a number of reports in his department. He thought there was a distressingly high number of problems.

I wanted to remind you that part of the original motion implementing the SPOT system was a principle that teaching evaluation should be done well and would be solely based on course evaluation data. We are now poised to move the focus off of SPOT forms etc. to more substantive conversation about other initiatives to supplement that information with other means of teaching evaluation.

d. Liberal Studies Coordinating Committee, D. Johnson

There were two charges given to the Liberal Studies Committee. One was a total liberal studies review and the other was the FIGS program. The later was given the green light and the former was sent back for revision and reconceptualization. We decided to shepherd the FIGS program through its first year before reconsidering the issue of FSU liberal studies offering.

I would like to thank on behalf of the committee, Dean Karen Laughlin's office for doing a tremendous job in setting all this up. This is a list of all the things that are taking place. (See Addendum 2.)

In addition to FIGS the committee is currently developing an evaluation instrument before the FIGS program even gets off the ground so we can evaluate things like who signs up for the program and how successful it is.

VI. Special Order, Office of National Fellowships, J. Spooner

Thank you for having me here today to share with you about the Office of National Fellowships. This is the last stop on a month long tour of meeting with different groups around campus. I am glad to have the faculty be the last group because you are very near and dear to my heart and are the most important group in terms of servicing our students.

When I interviewed for this job one of the words I kept pounding over and over again to the different committees I was talking to was the need to facilitate the different resources on any

campus to help our students to be successful. I come to FSU from Chipola College where I was a faculty member in the English department and worked with the honors program and national scholarships. One of the reasons we were successful is that we and the ability to combine resources together all for the benefit of being advocates for our students. We have some of the most outstanding students in the world. My job is to let the rest of the world realize that that is a possibility. One of the most important things we do in this office is to promote. We promote the kinds of opportunities that are available for our students, in particularly undergraduates. We are working very hard with faculty, administration, advisors to raise the profile of the possibility of students applying to national fellowships. The most enjoyable part of my job is the mentoring and tutoring as well as the teaching of students. I left a tenured position to take this job and the only reason I did that is that I realized that teaching really continues when you work with students in the application process. The one on one collaboration that takes place between students and faculty in this process is very important. I am looking forward to working with you. While our office will provide students with resources, faculty become instrumental in helping students succeed. Once our students gain this kind of national recognition, we want not only every student, faculty and staff member to know about their achievements, we want the whole world to know.

VII. Old Business

There were no items of old business.

VIII. New Business

There were no items of new business.

IX. University Welfare

a. Omicron Delta Kappa, A. Leysieffer

I am the advisor and faculty secretary to Omicron Delta Kappa which has been on FSU's campus since 1950. I am here to represent this very prestigious organization. ODK is a national leadership honor society for men and women. It was founded in 1914 at Washington and Lee to recognize and encourage superior scholarship and leadership by men and women of exemplary character. Membership in ODK is by invitation only and is a mark of highest distinction and honor. Where students apply, the faculty, administrators and staff have to be nominated by their peers. I want to recognize three who are being invited: Valliere Richard Auzenne, Anne Rowe and Kirby Kemper.

b. Updates on Bargaining and Related Matters, J. Fiorito

On January 7th 2003, despite the legal clarity of the well-established successorship doctrine, every one of Florida's eleven newly autonomous Boards of Trustees asserted that faculty no longer enjoyed UFF representation or the contractual protection of a collective bargaining agreement. Florida law and the successorship doctrine emphasize employee choice in employee representation. Yet the Trustees took it upon themselves to decide this matter for employees, including faculty. Based on that presumptuous arrogance, but probably at the direction of others, university administrations acted out their bits in the statewide attack on faculty representation.

At FSU, faculty members were told they could not discuss union representation in their offices or via e-mail, even though faculty offices and university e-mail are forums for nearly every other imaginable topic. Payroll dues deduction for UFF members was halted, despite clear authorizations signed by individual faculty members that had not, but easily could have been rescinded. The FSU administration refused to meet with UFF-FSU chapter leaders despite long-standing consultation arrangements, and refused to

process grievances of individual faculty members attempting to exercise their contractual rights to defend themselves from injustice.

UFF legal counsel advised FSU and UFF members that this was clearly contrary to law, but we knew that asserting and defending faculty rights would take time. Rather than wait for eventual justice, UFF planned a statewide organizing campaign to demonstrate that faculty did indeed want UFF representation. Two years ago, I expressed to this body some resentment at having to spend time and resources, mine, that of hundreds of other FSU faculty, and thousands statewide, to defend well-established faculty rights. I did say I'd get over it.

My recovery was helped along greatly by the overwhelming support for UFF representation expressed by over 1100 faculty members at FSU and over 6500 statewide who during the fall of 2002 signed authorization cards stating they wanted UFF representation. It was helped along further by the overwhelming representation election victories in the fall of 2003, where FSU faculty voted 736 to 33 for UFF. Still, legal vindication had to wait until this past Monday, when an appellate court decision unanimously reversed a split decision of the Public Employees Relations Commission (PERC) that supported the BOT anti-faculty position. The court said:

“PERC’s ruling that [Trustees] were not successor employers ... was error. A rule allowing state government to alter terms and conditions of employment unilaterally based solely on reshuffling in the higher reaches of the bureaucracy [is contrary to the Florida constitution and statutes]”

The practical and remedial implications of this ruling are still being worked out, but the ruling is an unquestionable and extremely significant win for faculty rights. Much work remains to be done.

Hundreds of FSU faculty have joined UFF. They recognize that defending faculty rights can be expensive, and that it is neither wise nor ethical to expect others to assume that burden. We're hopeful that the new FSU collective bargaining agreement will show genuine respect for FSU faculty and seriously addresses faculty concerns, including salary problems.

We're not there yet, but we are getting close. Through our most recent bargaining session last Friday, we've reached tentative agreement on 24 of the 32 articles that we expect to comprise the new contract. Four of the eight unresolved articles are part of the “minimal changes formula” I mentioned at previous Senate meetings, and should be resolved fairly quickly. In three other unresolved articles, we've narrowed our differences to a fairly small range of issues. And then there's salary.

Our UFF-FSU faculty team presented a comprehensive salary proposal last June. It was carefully designed to address serious salary problems that FSU faculty face everyday and that take a deadly toll on faculty morale. The administration team presented a counteroffer in October, but in our faculty team's view, we have yet to receive a serious proposal. We expect a discussion that shows respect for faculty concerns and produces a systematic plan to address them.

As we seem to be on the verge of agreement on nearly all non-salary issues, serious discussions on salary should begin very soon. FSU faculty are among the most talented and hardworking in the state, indeed, in the nation and the world, and deserve salaries that reflect their contributions. I hope you will support UFF and our faculty bargaining team in this conviction, and urge your faculty colleagues to do the same.

I thank Vice-President Cobbe and other Senators for their time, and I will be glad to take any questions or comments if time permits. I'd also like to point out that details of both

teams' salary proposals and overall bargaining progress, the recent appellate court ruling, and bargaining settlements at other state universities are available at the UFF-FSU Chapter web site, www.uff-fsu.org.

X. Announcements by Deans and other administrative officers

a. Dean of the Faculties, A. Rowe

I want to reiterate what Jack said concerning bargaining—that we are working toward an agreement. We have worked very well. I have a brief response to what Jack said about the First District Court of Appeals and this is just to elaborate just slightly. On February 14 the First District Court of Appeals did reverse the order of the Florida Public Employee Relations Committee and remanded the matter back to the commission for further proceedings consistent with the courts opinion. I do want to comment though that the court did not find that Florida State University had committed an unfair labor practice and we think that this decision is not expected to delay current negotiations between the UFF and Florida State University. We will be meeting on Friday of this week and again next week.

b. Senior Vice President of Finance and Administration, J. Carnaghi

On Friday we will be issuing our fourth payroll from the new OMNI system. According to the numbers I have seen, it is beginning to resemble the system we were using prior to the new system. Things are beginning to settle down. While this is promising, it is not to suggest we have solved all our problems, rather we are moving in the right direction. I'd like to give you a status report on 3 items that seem to be surfacing more than others. One is the tax withholding matter, second appointments of OPS staff and third travel reimbursements.

First, tax withholdings have both a long term and a short term answer to it. On the long term, we are exploring options and discussing matters with technical operating staffs at Georgia Tech, Princeton, Utah and Southern Methodist who have similar contracting issues. When we have enough information we will assemble a small group of faculty members and deans and we will work together to agree upon a fix for our under withholdings. We must find a solution that fits the majority of faculty tax issues. There are 3 axioms that we must abide by; one is that it has got to be legal, second we can't violate the warranties with the PeopleSoft system and third we must be able to afford the changes that we make. I am confident that we will be successful. What do we do in the short run? If you have a comfort level with your computer and your employee self guide that you should have in your department, the section marked e-pay, page 5, you can go in and you can change your taxes. If you are uncomfortable with that, I will give you a name and a phone number. They will come out to you armed with what you were paying in taxes bi-weekly before the new system. We will walk you through and help you make the change. Call Sue Andres at 644-5052.

Second is the hiring of OPS employees. Beginning next week, HRS staff will begin visiting colleges and departments to get feedback on a design called OMNI Express. This used to be a simple process and now takes hours. We think we have redesigned something to help and we need input. I think you will see some marked improvements.

Third, travel reimbursements going to savings accounts instead of regular checking accounts. We don't really know why it's happening but we are sending the checks and banks seem to handle it well. Credit unions are struggling. We are giving the institutions the codes they are to use and someone is putting it in one account as apposed to the other. If people are having problems, call the institution and it should be fixed. If you are not getting that response from your institution, call Bill Agner at 645-1815.

XI. Announcements by the Provost

Provost Abele was unable to attend today's meeting.

XII. Announcements by the President

The Provost has had gall bladder surgery and is doing well.

Most of you have read about the governor's budget recommendations. I don't recall in my time in higher education where I have seen a worse budget notwithstanding when the state was in some kind of economic crisis. The Board of Governors (BOG) recommended about \$80 million of general revenue for undergraduate enhancement. The governor picked up \$20 million which is unacceptable. They recommended a change in the major gifts program which basically caps the amount of a major gift but the most egregious part is that if it is not matched in a given year then the legislature has no obligation to match it there after. If people know that their gift is going to be matched then they will wait sometimes 3 or 4 years. More importantly is that the governor has moved the state university system out of the administrative funds program. That says when they say that state employees get a % raise, that does not apply to the university system. We will get about \$2 million of that \$20 million and a 1% pay raise is about \$2 million. You have balanced your budget on students and tuition and they are recommending a 7% tuition increase. They are not recommending any of the flexibility issues, the Garnet and Gold guarantee, that FSU and UF have asked for. They did provide funding for the health insurance premiums for the employee but not for dependents. It is a pretty bad package. But it is the governor's budget and the legislature can choose what it wants to do. We have asked that the BOG at least defend their budget but they have chosen to defend the governor's budget. It's not a good picture going into a session particularly when we are faced with a \$2 billion spending windfall of revenue from the hurricanes. The bad news is that they were devastating; the good news is that there has been a lot of construction revenue. One of the most egregious parts of that has been the fight with the Chiropractic deal which you realize is pretty much over. We were told that no matter how whatever body voted that there would be no retribution. We went to Gainesville and everyone voted their conscience. Twenty minutes later they brought the governors PECO request which had our Biology Building and the Panama City Building and the PO&M funding. \$14 million was cut and redistributed. The only university that took a cut was FSU. I don't think there was any tie to the Chiropractic issue so they tell me. They have a series of guidelines they go by which says fund the buildings that are under construction first and build them out i.e. Biology and Panama City, then put new dollars up for the new buildings based on the priority of that building using academic buildings first. So they take \$14 million first which means we can't complete them and give it other universities to plan new buildings. So they have violated their own principles. Then we come back to Tallahassee and there were people saying that since we didn't do the Chiropractic School we are going to take our money back. If you remember we already paid for that once since last year the governor vetoed about \$18 million of projects and said we could take it from the \$9 million. I don't believe we will lose the \$9 million this year which has been committed to the classroom building. We will probably resubmit to them a priority of those dollars based on Chiropractic not being here and the possibility of a alternative medicine research center. We also have a commitment from the state to give us the Gunter Building which is full of asbestos. We believe some that \$9 million could be used to clean it up. There are some other projects on campus that we could finish up with the \$9 million.

Tied directly to this is the relationship of the universities and the Boards of Trustees to the BOG and the lawsuit that was filled. One of the reasons we were being hard headed about Chiropractic was that we wanted it off the table so that when the lawsuit came to the courts it was resolved whichever way. We did not want the coffin on our doorstep. We were somewhat successful in that. The problem is that when we get into that lawsuit there are things that have significant impacts on universities. First there is a provision if the BOG prevails that they would have jurisdictions over all DFO's. So that means the Foundation, Boosters, etc would have to go the BOG with a spending plan. They could say that if you want to build a classroom building and

you don't put up half the money from your foundation we aren't going to put up PECO money. That is a very dangerous place to put universities.

If you recall when I first got there we had some challenges with the economy and the money not being there. The Presidents Council came together and we went out and we did emails and editorial tours. We had a plan to influence the outcome. With the exception of FSU and UF everyone just backed off and sat on the sidelines. I am hopeful that we can prevail on some of our colleagues to be a little more active. UCF has begun to figure it out since they are dependent on E&G and enrollment dollars.

Anne Rowe is still working on the collective bargaining issue. We hope to have that soon. I think they are down to 3 or 4 issues.

We are also going to the city about the master plan. They have decided to go into that master plan and build the Symphony Project across from the music building. We are in the process of protesting that. We are not against the project or some kind private program there but this is a 10 story facility and takes up every square inch of the property. On the bottom floor they are proposing some kind of commercial development such as restaurant. Our issue is what the commercial space is and what they are going to do with it. They will be condo's which will start about \$300,000. We have tried to explain that this doesn't make a lot of sense. In order to get the master plan approved, we paid the city about \$2 million with the understanding that there would be some sort of FSU facility. There is a second phase of the Symphony Project that is a rental property maybe for graduate students.

We need to rethink the bus service and clean up the buses and make them look better for the students who are riding them. We need to recognize alumni village, the MAG lab and the new fraternity house are on Ocala. We need to rethink the bus systems in terms of FSU.

We will probably bring the Civic Center an offer in the next few weeks. The city will have to become partner in that, more so than they would like or we will wind up in litigation with the developer.

If you haven't been to Seven Days of Opening Nights, I hope will do so. Most of the shows have sold out and people seem to be accepting the programming very well. The PRISM concert last night was outstanding.

We have 2 dean searches going on now. Music is down to the final 5 and they are bringing 2 back so we will have a decision shortly. Business is accepting applications now. I think there will be a couple more opening soon as some are retiring.

Many of you have worked with the provost and his reorganization plan. I think we have come to closure on what to move and where to move it. I appreciate the comments the Steering Committee made. I think that his illness this week shows why we need to do this. Larry has done an outstanding job. He is an excellent excellent provost. But when you have that many people reporting to you it is more than one person can handle.

The trustees seem pretty happy. We will have a conference call in March. We don't expect any major issues there. It is a prelim for the Legislature. Their big meeting will be after the Legislature in May.

Our freshman class has been admitted. It is one of strongest classes ever with a 3.8 GPA and 1200 SAT and 20 hours of CLEP, dual enrollment, IB etc. coming with them. We still retained a 30% FTIC enrollment. IT is a little bit smaller class than some expected but we are still on target with the total number that the BOG assigned us. We did not freeze enrollment. We complied with the letter of the total law.

We still plan on going with the laptop initiative in 2006. We are a little worried on how we are going to do that but we are working through it. We will also look at the Garnet and Gold Guarantee and flat rate tuition at that point. It will require some legislative help.

A question was asked about enrollment. We have 5,830 accepted. There are not many students who are in limbo. We are not admitting anyone else. We don't think 1000 more students will show up.

A question was asked about raises. We have set aside a pot of money. We have some other options that will take some difficult decisions that the committee will have to deal with. What's bothering me is that we believe that you look at the total package. UF has negotiated a very lucrative package for faculty but they don't have the money to pay for it. We want to do a pay package for everyone. We want to protect the people here. We don't want to freeze positions or not fill positions. We want to protect the departmental budgets, named professorships etc. We don't want to do something and then come back to you and say we can't pull it off. We've looked at other Universities and they can't do what they said they are going to do or they've made 3 or 4 year commitments out that I don't believe are going to happen.

You have read about Convergys and DMS in the paper. That is not our fight. We were told to develop our own payroll system. We were told to make sure that the system would talk to the Convergys system downtown. So we did. But the problem is that their system is so screwed up that it doesn't accept it. Everyday we are finding people being dropped from their insurance. It's usually retirees or a dependent. We don't know about it until you go to the doctor or the pharmacy.

XIII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:09 p.m.



Melissa Crawford
Secretary to the Faculty

Teaching Evaluation Committee
Report to the Senate
February 16, 2005

Originally a task force in 2002-03 charged with recommending changes to the system of student evaluation of courses, the Teaching Evaluation Committee was established as a standing committee of the Faculty Senate in 2003-2004.

Current membership is:

John Geringer, Music	Cecil Greek, Criminology
Bonnie Greenwood, Human Sciences	Rebecca Miles, Social Sciences
Pat O'Sullivan, Social Sciences	John Sobanjo, Engineering
Eric Walker, Arts and Sciences	[2 seats unfilled]
Ex officio: Dean of the Faculties, Coordinator of Instructional Development, Coordinator of Assessment Services	

Ongoing agenda items:

1. The SPOT system. The new SPOT system has now been run for three terms in the regular academic year (Fall 03, Spring 04, Fall 04) and one summer term (Summer 04). Now that we have data from multiple terms, the committee is beginning to study the results and compare them to the archive of SUSSAI results and SIRS results. The preliminary sense is that, on the whole, not much has changed.
2. Reliability of SPOT data. In a spot-check of SPOT reports, a Science Area chair in Arts and Sciences recently reported finding an alarmingly high rate of what he termed "flaws" in the reporting and interpretation of data. The committee will be in conversation with Assessment Services and with the Provost's office about such questions, on your behalf. Please report other problems with the system to the chair or to any other committee member.
3. SUSSAI data online. The SUSSAI portion only of the SPOT reports went online in Fall 2004. Although intended for a student audience, the ready availability of this information has given SUSSAI numbers a new lease on life, which was not anticipated or intended by the Teaching Evaluation Task Force. We will continue to monitor this information source.
4. Uses of SPOT data. The committee will continue to be in conversation with staff from the Provost's office about the use of SPOT data in the promotion and tenure process and in annual evaluation. In particular, we will be focusing conversations on what is widely known as the 90/30 system and its effectiveness in recognizing outstanding teaching and identifying problematic teaching.
5. Other means of teaching evaluation. When the Senate passed the SPOT system, included in the motion was a charge always to supplement student course evaluations with other forms of evaluation. The committee wants to focus efforts in this area, such as exploring connections for FSU with the Peer Review of Teaching Project, a pilot program funded by the Pew Charitable Trust at Indiana, Michigan, Nebraska, and Texas A&M, whose goal is to "make visible the intellectual work of teaching."

Eric Walker, Chair
Department of English
ewalker@english.fsu.edu



UPDATE

- Formal Course Number approved; HUM4924 and HUM1920
- 30 FIG Leaders were selected from a pool of over 70 applicants and interviewed by John Dahlrose
- HUM 4935 (HUM4924) has a current enrollment of 30; taught By Dean Karen Laughlin
- 25 sections of HUM1920 on the CSM for Fall 2005
- Alice Earp has met with Kim Barber of the Office of Admissions and Records regarding FIG clustering and registration issues
- FIG Clusters are in the process of being formed
- FIG flyers are in the PREVIEW packets and Orientation
- Alice Earp will be meeting with the Admissions Tele-counselors to discuss FIGs
- Alice Earp will meet with the Orientation Leaders to discuss FIGs

Sample Clusters

FIG Course Search Pre-Education EC/EE

Course Number	Section Number	Course Ref Number	Capacity	Building & Room	Meeting Days	Beginning Time	Ending Time
EDF1005	1	00934	30	STB 0304	T R	9:30 AM	10:30:00 AM
PSC2801	1	03412	20				
HUM1920	1	06761	0				
PSY2012	4	06168	204	LON 0201	M W F	10:10 AM	11:00:00 AM

FIG Course Search Psy. of the Mind Report

Course Number	Section Number	Course Ref Number	Capacity	Building & Room	Meeting Days	Beginning Time	Ending Time
HUM1920	1	06761	0				
PSY2012	4	06168	204	LON 0201	M W F	10:10 AM	11:00:00 AM
PHI2100	1	03279	99	LSB 0006	M W F	9:05 AM	9:55:00 AM
PSB2000	1	03403	194	LON 0201	T R	2:00 PM	3:15:00 PM