



FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
FEBRUARY 18, 2015
DODD HALL AUDITORIUM
3:35 P.M.

I. Regular Session

The regular session of the 2014-15 Faculty Senate was held on Wednesday, February 18, 2015. Faculty Senate President Gary Tyson presided.

The following members attended the Senate meeting:

T. Adams, S. Aggarwal, C. Alexander, E. Alvarez, A. Askew, A. Avina, H. Bass, B. Berg, B. Birmingham, M. Blaber, J. Broome, R. Brower, M. Buchler, E. Chicken, J. Cogle, M. Cui, R. Dumm, K. Erndl, J. Fiorito, S. Fiorito, K. Fishburne, J. Gabriel, J. Geringer, K. Goldsby, T. Graban, M. Gross, K. Harper, E. Hilinski, M. Horner, K. Howard, J. Ilich-Ernst, L. Jakubowski, M. Kapp, T. Keller, A. Kercheval E. Kim, S. Lewis, T. Luke, T. Mariano, K. McGinnis, J. McNulty, M. Mesterton-Gibbons, U. Meyer-Base, R. Miles, J. Ohlin, O. Okoli, E. Peters, J. Reynolds, V. Richard Auzenne, N. Rogers, S. Rutledge, K. Salata, K. Schmitt, D. Slice, J. Sobanjo, O. Steinbock, L. Stepina, M. Stewart, S. Tripodi, G. Tyson, S. Valisa, E. Walker, S. Webber, W. Weissert.

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

J. Adams, J. Ahlquist, M. Akiba, E. Aldrovandi, F. Berry, C. Bolaños, K. Brummel-Smith, A. Cuyler, W. Deng, C. Edrington, R. Gainsford (**W. Fredrickson**), A. Gaiser, C. Hofacker (**D. Kim**), D. Humphrey, C. Jackson, S. Johnson, J. Kesten, W. Landing, J. Larson, B. Lee, S. Losh, C. Madsen, D. Maier-Katkin, D. Moore, R. Morris, I. Padavic, R. Rodenberg, P. Rutkovsky, V. Salters, J. Schwenkler (**S. May**), J. Standley, J. Telotte, F. Tolson, J. Turner, O. Vafek (**J. Murphy**), D. Von Glahn, C. Weissert, W. Wise.

II. Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of the December 3, 2014 meeting were approved as distributed.

III. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as distributed.

IV. Report of the Steering Committee, S. Fiorito

The Faculty Senate Steering Committee has met six times (December 11th; January 14th, 28th, 29th; February 4th and 11th) since our last Faculty Senate Meeting on December 3rd. We met once with Interim Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement, Dr. Janet Kistner (2/4) and once with the Honors Committee Consultant (1/29).

The Faculty Senate Steering Committee (FSSC) discussed a resolution opposing concealed weapons on state university systems campuses initiated by the Advisory Council of Faculty Senates (AFCS). The FSSC has developed a draft of a resolution that will be presented today at the FS meeting.

We reviewed the 2013 Memorandum of Understanding between the Charles Koch Foundation and the FSU Board of Trustees. Though no formal vote was taken prior to the Faculty Senate President's response to Dr. McRorie, a majority of Steering Committee members concurred that the MOU does not interfere with faculty governance, nor does it restrict academic freedom of faculty or students. Faculty Senate President wrote a response to Dr. McRorie that conveyed the Steering Committee's majority opinion on December 12th, 2014.

We also approved minor changes in the criteria for courses satisfying the oral communication competency requirement sent to the FSSC for approval by the Undergraduate Policy Committee (UPC) Chair, Dr. Jennifer Koslow.

The FSSC continues to suggest/submit names for Senate Committees that still need members, the Provost Search Committee and the Robert O. Lawton Committee.

In relation to the Graduate Policy Committee (GPC) we discussed the change in policy regarding the number of 4000 level courses that can be counted in a student's graduate program. Clarification was requested of the graduate college.

We discussed the memo from Billy Francis and Janet Kistner regarding the policy of competency credit. Some issues were brought before the FSSC in order to help support our veterans.

We had conversations about the procedures and policies and size of the committee that approves tenure upon appointment and will continue with those conversations in order to clarify the policy.

The Distance Learning Committee has been reinstated and will meet this semester to discuss issues such as the support of ODL for online course, Bb issues and extra fees charges for online and distance courses. Stacy Sirmans, from the College of Business is the chair of this committee.

The Division of undergraduate students brought to campus a consultant, Dr. Greg Lanier, who is the Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Director of the university Honors Program at the University of West Florida to evaluate and make recommendations to improve our Honors program. The FSSC met the consultant and the entire committee to discuss our Honors program.

We met with the VP for FD&A, Dr. Janet Kistner when the Interim Provost, Dr. Sally McRorie was unable to meet with us. However, Dr. McRorie did provide comment to each of the following items on our agenda and Dr. Kistner clarified any of our questions. These items included:

1. Criminal background checks are being required on all new employees consistent with other SUS institutions

2. The reorganization of the Provost's staff and their responsibilities regarding the interdisciplinary Task Force Findings
3. The Provost indicated that FSU will continue to build the number of tenure track faculty at a faster pace than specialized faculty.
4. Finally the Provost said that there will be a retreat for Deans and others to look at the Current "Big Ideas" and determine if any are ready to be eliminated, modified or if we need new ones added.

This concludes the minutes of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee. I would be happy to respond to questions.

V. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Undergraduate Policy Committee

As one of the standing committees of the Faculty Senate, the Undergraduate Policy Committee is charged with considering University-wide policies on undergraduate academic affairs. Every college has at least one representative and we meet every month, typically the Wednesday before the Faculty Senate meeting.

One of the tasks of the UPC has been to participate in the Quality Enhancement Reviews. QERs, in case anyone here hasn't been through one of them yet, are a tool designed to ensure that the university fulfills and maintains its mission. At the foundation of each QER is an extensive self-study of the academic degree program under review.

Prior to this year, the UPC had a subcommittee that engaged in a limited review of submitted materials for the QER. This is because most of the UPC's time was spent reviewing liberal studies courses. With the adoption of a new liberal studies curriculum and the creation of a new liberal studies board, those responsibilities have been lifted from the UPC, allowing the UPC to focus on policy. The purpose of the UPC program reviews is to ensure that FSU's undergraduate academic degree and certificate programs are academically sound; assist the program faculty and administration in improving through timely review; and provide an independent forum in which program students can bring issues to the attention of the faculty, and program faculty can bring issues to the attention of the University administration.

The UPC currently evaluates programs based (at a minimum) on the following materials: (1) The binder of material provided by the program for the QER process, which provides a 5-year snapshot of the program's activities; (2) an email survey of undergraduate students in the program by the UPC; and (3) comments and recommendations made by external reviewers as part of the QER. A three-person subcommittee within the UPC, which consists of at least one individual from the college within which the degree program is housed and of at least one from a college outside of the degree program, prepare a report summarizing their observations of the strengths and weaknesses of the undergraduate program based on the self-study. The report concludes with recommendation for how the program could be improved. Degree programs are welcome to appoint a member to the subcommittee; however, it is not required. Upon completion of the report, the subcommittee presents the report to the full UPC for discussion. The UPC invites the program's administrators to be present at the discussion. Afterwards, the UPC subcommittee

finalizes its report and sends its findings to the program's administrators, the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, and the Provost.

This year, in coordinating with the Office of Planning and Programs, which monitors the entire review process, the UPC began four reviews in the Fall semester: Economics, Political Science, Sociology, and Public Administration. This Spring, the UPC is in the process of reviewing: Finance; Accounting; Hospitality; Management; Marketing; Entrepreneurship. Strategy, & Information Systems; Business Administration; Risk Management and Insurance, Real Estate; and African American Studies.

The UPC has completed its review of Economics, Political Science, and Sociology, and is close to completing its review of Public Administration. UPC members have been instructed to think about our process of review so as to make improvements to the process for next year.

b. Graduate Policy Committee

The GPC basically does two things. One is we review the university's graduate policies. Some of the policies originally seem to have been written at the time that guy sitting out on the bench in front of Westcott—I don't mean T.K.—was president. Our goal is – because the university is so diverse especially in its graduate programs and our committee is made up of 23 people from various departments – that we are very careful to try to craft programs that fit the university as a whole. The way to do that – and this is what we did with graduate faculty status and doctoral director status – is to give more decision-making to departments and colleges to come up with solutions within a general rubric of things that apply to their program. We have sent to the Steering Committee a proposal passed by the GPC to remove the residency requirement. It requires all doctoral students to spend 24 hours of class time every year on campus taking classes. And replacing it with an academic engagement policy where if your department has a program where graduate students study abroad or go study at another university they are still academically engaged. Those things vary from department to department and program to program. So you may be seeing that next time.

The other thing we do is reviews of programs – as Jim was talking about. We've been doing this for a long time – even before there was a QER. The question I get asked a lot is: what is the difference between the GPC's reviews and the QER? And certainly in terms of factual data, what we look at in the GPC review has been incorporated within the QER. So the information that the subcommittees need to do their report is in the QER. But the difference in the two reviews is that the QER is the provost's review of a department and the GPC review is a faculty review. It is an academic review that is consistent with our idea of peer review. There are no administrators on the subcommittees that I appoint. The subcommittees consists of three people from outside the program, one representative of the GPC, one faculty representative from the department, and one student representative from the department. The students and faculty member are non-voting members. They take into account the external review by the QER, but the committee makes its own decision and must make a decision to present to the GPC a recommendation about whether or not a graduate program should be continued or in some cases programs have been suspended. And

a set of recommendations for ways to improve the program. I have this unique perspective because I was on the GPC for 10 years during the 90s and early 2000s then I was off from 10 years and now I've been back for 10 years. I have probably read over that time over 100 GPC reviews of graduate programs. So Gary asked me to talk about what trends I see. And some things remain the same. A common recommendation is increased stipends for graduate students. One that we've seen a lot and we still see to some extent is health care for graduate assistants. We've made some steps forward in that area, but we could do better. So some things remain same, but some other things have changed. Given the hardship this university went through in the period around 2009 – what was it? One year we lost 163 million I think or something really unpleasant – but when I look at the reports, and by the end of the semester we'll have done 19 reviews while I've been chair, the quality of graduate student and where they get placed has improved dramatically which says something about the reputation of this university and its graduate programs. I look at the list from last spring or fall where we did five departments in social science – and their placement rates and the quality of schools people are going to has improved dramatically. The negative trend that I've seen on these reports is a shortage of faculty. I was telling Ralph I was going to use Public Administration as an example. Public Administration has about the same number of graduate students they did 10 years ago. Ten years ago they had 15 faculty members and now they have 12. I don't know if they are hiring this year, but with retirements, they are going to be down 10. They are going to be down a third of their faculty. And the departments, especially the doctoral programs that are so labor intensive, are getting whipsawed by people retiring—and luckily for the management department I'm on ORP so I'm never retiring. But a lot of people have been retiring and meanwhile during the recession, we lost a third of our assistant professors. The administration is taking steps and we have a positive flow. We are bringing more people in than we are losing but departments are still suffering from a lack of personnel to work with graduate students. That's what I've seen. Any questions?

VI. Old Business

There were no items of new business.

VII. New Business

There were no items of new business.

VIII. University Welfare

a. Guns on Campus Resolution, Nancy Rogers

Be it resolved that we, the members of the Florida State University Faculty Senate, strongly oppose proposed legislation that would allow concealed weapons to be carried on university campuses by people other than trained security officers. We believe that it would be detrimental to the learning environment on campus and would be incompatible with the central mission of our University. We further believe that it will hurt our ability to attract and retain the best faculty and students.

This resolution passed.

b. Student Senate, Corey Smith

Good afternoon. I don't want to take up too much of your time because I know you guys are trying to get out of here by 5. My name is Cory Smith. I'm one of the undergraduate studies senators. I'm a freshman studying biomedical engineering. What President Andrew Forst is trying to do is bridge the gap between the faculty senate and the student senate so we get a transparency between both senates. So if there is anything that you guys need like monetary-wise from us within your different departments, you guys can come to us, and we can hopefully get that passed. We are just now trying to initiate a really strong connection. If you have any questions for me after senate concludes, just come talk to me afterwards. Thank you.

Tyson: One quick question I have for you now. Can you give us the one minute version of the student resolution on guns on campus?

Smith: Oh, yah. So we had a very lively debate about it. Originally what the text said was kind of similar to what you guys have. But when it says "opposes" we actually have "vehemently opposes" because in legislation that is the strongest vocabulary you can use for that. That eventually got amended because the Panama City senator was actually for this bill, so it didn't really reflect the whole opinion of the student senate. So the whole bill passed with the senate consent with some other resolutions for the hearing.

c. United Faculty of Florida Update, J. Proffitt

We've been very busy since the December Faculty Senate meeting!

Bargaining

On February 11, the UFF-FSU bargaining team began negotiations with the BOT team regarding market equity distribution. At that meeting, the teams agreed on ground rules, and the UFF-FSU team presented our proposal, which is largely based on the 2007 joint labor-management report regarding market equity (you can find this report on our website). The next bargaining session is scheduled for March 11.

Consultations

We have had two consultations with FSU administrators since the last Faculty Senate meeting. At the December 10 consultation that included President Thrasher and other FSU administrators, we discussed market equity, hiring plans, pre-employment criminal background checks, and the legislative outlook for 2015. I should note that the original criminal background check discussion I had with administrators in the fall suggested that all faculty would be subject to criminal background checks, but we resisted and pointed out that it would have to be bargained if applicable to current bargaining unit members. The minutes from our December consultation are posted on our website.

The primary focus of the January 14 consultation was a UFF-FSU presentation regarding the goals and objectives of our market equity proposal. Our next consultation is scheduled for March 4.

Luncheon

Our December luncheon with President Thrasher was well-attended and informative. Our next luncheon, scheduled for next Thursday, February 26, will feature Jeff Wright, Director of Public Policy Advocacy of the Florida Education Association, who will preview the 2015 Legislative session. Lunch is free for UFF members and their guests, \$12 for all others. If you are interested in attending, please email me at jennifer.proffitt@gmail.com

Legislative Committee Weeks

UFF-FSU is carefully following several bills, including guns on campus and secrecy in president, provost, and dean searches. We are now analyzing a new bill about college affordability that includes among other things the textbook affordability proposals similar to last year's bill, including the requirement that professors use the same textbooks for three years among other problematic proposals.

The concealed weapons on campus bill passed along party lines in one House Committee and one Senate Committee. The secrecy in president, provost, and dean searches bill that would exempt portions of president, provost, and dean searches from public record and meeting requirements, including the names of those who have applied and the vetting of these candidates, passed at its first Senate Committee. The UFF-FSU chapter has passed resolutions opposing the guns and secrecy bills. You can find our resolutions on our website, uff-fsu.org.

IX. Announcements by Deans and Other Administrative Officers

There were no announcements by Deans and Other Administrative Officers.

X. Announcements by Interim Provost McRorie

Hi, everybody. It's good to see you. I very briefly want to talk about the Board of Governors meeting tomorrow which is scheduled to address the College of Engineering issue. You may have read about this in the paper. Our administration and that of FAMU have been working closely together to try and come up with an official plan that will bring a lot of incremental improvements to the college as it now stands. There is a commitment to guiding principles and a plan of action – a one page thing that is going to be presented to the Board of Governors tomorrow. And unless something happens, which you can't ever tell, we expect that it will be discussed and approved. This will involve several different things that are changes to current practice. One of them is that by April 1, 2015 a 12-member, permanent joint college governance council will be established comprised of the presidents or their designees, the provosts, the vice presidents for research, the chief financial officers of FAMU and FSU, the dean of the joint College of Engineering, and two student representatives appointed by their respective student government association presidents of the two universities will be included as ex officio, non-voting members. The chancellor of the BOG will also be a voting member of the governance council, and the chancellor may also designate a representative. There has been a long-standing governance council for the college, but it has not meet regularly for some time and has not been functioning particularly well. So this is intended to make that council much more effective in the dual oversight of the college. To that point, the joint council shall meet at least quarterly. The joint council shall receive reports at least semiannually on the following topics – and may require additional reports at its discretion. Topics include: recruiting, enrollment, and graduation by gender and ethnicity; adequacy and consistency in academic preparation and achievement,

budget and expenditures; research funding and activities; faculty hiring, promotion and tenure, and integration; and technology transfer and commercialization activities. These are all crucial matters to the success of the college. Another part of this action plan is the creation of a new budget entity for the joint college will be pursued during the 2015 legislative session to include all operating funds for the joint college including the appropriate amount of PO and M – plan operation and maintenance which covers upkeep, maintenance, and repairs and those kinds of things. This will be a new budget entity that will be transparent. And that's a very good thing. A multi-year plan must be adopted and presented to the Board of Governors by June 1, 2015 to address the renovations and repairs for buildings A and B and the completion of building C. The joint college should integrate academic and student affairs activities that have been separately administered by FAMU and FSU, so that a true joint college of engineering is established. And finally by March 1, 2016, the joint college must submit a report to the Board of Governors documenting the completion of all those things. So this plan will be presented tomorrow, and we expect it will be acted on affirmatively by the Board of Governors, but of course that will be subject to their discussion and judgment. Any questions about this?

Man: Was there a faculty representative on that council?

Sally: No. Other questions? Ok. Thank you very much.

XI. Announcements by President Thrasher

President Thrasher was not in attendance.

XII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:54 p.m.



Melissa Crawford
Faculty Senate Coordinator