



FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
MARCH 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, March 18, 2015. Faculty Senate President Gary Tyson presided.

The following members attended the Senate meeting:

T. Adams, S. Aggarwal, E. Aldrovandi, E. Alvarez, A. Askew, H. Bass, B. Berg, B. Birmingham, M. Blaber, J. Broome, M. Buchler, E. Chicken, J. Cogle, M. Cui, A. Cuyler, J. Fiorito, S. Fiorito, R. Gainsford, J. Geringer, K. Goldsby, T. Graban, M. Gross, K. Harper, E. Hilinski, M. Horner, K. Howard, J. Ilich-Ernst, C. Jackson, L. Jakubowski, M. Kapp, T. Keller, A. Kercheval, E. Kim, W. Landing, S. Lewis, S. Losh, T. Luke, C. Madsen, D. Maier-Katkin, T. Mariano, K. McGinnis, J. McNulty, M. Mesterton-Gibbons, R. Miles, R. Morris, I. Padavic, E. Peters, N. Rogers, P. Rutkovsky, K. Salata, V. Salters, K. Schmitt, L. Stepina, M. Stewart, J. Telotte, J. Turner, G. Tyson, S. Valisa, E. Walker, S. Webber, C. Weissert, W. Wise.

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

J. Adams, J. Ahlquist, M. Akiba, C. Alexander (**T. DeVall**), A. Avina, F. Berry, C. Bolaños, R. Brower, K. Brummel-Smith, W. Deng, R. Dumm, C. Edrington, K. Erndl, K. Fishburne, J. Gabriel, A. Gaiser, C. Hofacker, D. Humphrey, S. Johnson, J. Kesten, J. Larson, U. Meyer-Base, D. Moore, J. Ohlin, O. Okoli, J. Reynolds, V. Richard Auzenne, R. Rodenberg, S. Rutledge, J. Schwenkler (**S. May**), D. Slice (**P. Beerli**), J. Sobanjo, J. Standley, O. Steinbock, F. Tolson, S. Tripodi, O. Vafek, D. Von Glahn, W. Weissert.

II. Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of the February 18, 2015 meeting were approved with one amendment in the Faculty Senate Steering Committee report.

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 two times (February 25th and March 4th) since our last Faculty Senate Meeting on February 18th. We met once with Interim Provost, Dr. Sally McRorie and Interim Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement (VPFDA), Dr. Janet Kistner (March 4).

At the Faculty Senate Steering Committee (FSSC) meeting on February 25th Bridget, who represented FSU at the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) meeting in San Diego reported on the agenda items that were covered.

Also during the February 25 meeting Graduate College Dean, Nancy Marcus and Graduate Policy Committee (GPC) Chair, Dr. Lee Stepina discussed the policy of awarding graduate credit for 4000-level courses toward graduate degrees. Subsequently, the GPC proposed a policy that was meant to address the concerns of the FSSC.

Also attending this meeting were the Undergraduate Policy Committee (UPC) Chair, Dr. Jennifer Koslow and Dr. Bruce Janasiewicz who presented the history and concerns of 27 courses and their renumbering saga. More concerning this process will be presented to the Faculty Senate today.

At the March 4th meeting the Interim VP for Faculty Development and Advancement and the Interim Provost, reported that:

1. FSU has a slight net increase in faculty hires over last year.
2. FSU met our metrics for this year, however other universities managed to improve more than we did and thus surpasses us in the rating scale.
3. “Performance-oriented Budgeting” is a term used to describe the university’s strategy to spend money in a way that get us more points on the state’s performance metrics.
4. Criminal background checks are going to be required beginning Fall 2015 for all faculty and not adjuncts and will include fingerprints.
5. The final topic was the possible reorganization of PIC. More on this to come.

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

V. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Elections Committee, Liz Jakubowski

1. Nominations for the University Committee on Faculty Sabbaticals

There were no additional nominations for the University Committee on Faculty Sabbaticals.

2. Nominations for the Grievance Committee

There were no additional nominations for the Grievance Committee.

b. Undergraduate Policy Committee, Jen Koslow

In the mid-1990s, the state mandated FSU to take a set of courses we taught at the 3000-level and drop them down to 1000-2000-level in order to match courses offered at the community colleges. FSU (and other universities) took a set of these leveled courses and decided that the courses would continue to meet 3000-4000 level requirement. The list grew and over time stopped matching between different college dean’s offices and graduation. In the last year, a CAAD sub-committee worked to consolidate the various lists and remove those courses not originally approved by the FSU Faculty Senate, remove some approved courses which were deemed

unnecessary, and add one course which did not exist at the time of the initial leveling. This list would then be used by all colleges. The graduation office in the Office of the Registrar will be the official keeper of the list. (See addendum 1.) Based on the sub-committee's recommendations, the UPC proposes keeping these choices on the list as meeting the 3000-4000 requirement. (Department curriculum committees have approved this list.) Based on the subcommittee's recommendations, the UPC also proposes removal of intro courses from list of courses meeting 3000-4000 level requirement. Implementation is proposed effective catalog year of Fall 2015. Deans have discretion to make exceptions as appropriate.

How many students does this effect and how badly will affect them?

Gary Tyson: I move that we approve this modification to the list effective fall 2015.

The motion passes.

c. Graduate Policy Committee, Lee Stepina

The GPC sent the Faculty Senate a number of measures including changes in the residency requirement, changes counting 4000 level classes toward degrees, and maybe the Steering Committee was not happy with them because they didn't get on the agenda.

Gary Tyson: Ok, so one challenge is that the Steering Committee hasn't meet very much recently because of a variety of activities going on. However, we do have some issues we'd like to talk about, and we'd rather talk about them with the GPC than try to resolve it with the Senate as a whole. The one that was—I guess I can bring it up a little bit but I still think it's a GPC issue—the one we were really concerned with was this idea of graduate credit for a graduate degree. I think everyone believes there should be some restrictions on classes for graduate degrees. But some of our disciplines actually allow undergraduate courses to be allowed as credit in that degree program. We have a 30 or 32 hour requirement and then the question was is that a 30 or 32 hour requirement at 5,000 or 6,000 or is that a 30 or 32 hour requirement and then there is a possibility that some of those courses be at the undergraduate level. In looking at what's out there, most departments treat the 30 and 32 as has to be at the 5,000 and 6,000 level but not all. We want to make sure that those departments that chose to allow one or two three credit hour courses at the 4,000 level to be considered acceptable toward the 30 or 32 credit hour limit graduate course get to have their say in this before we bring it to the Senate. We can do it either way. I think it's better at the GPC meeting.

Stepina: The GPC has taken it up twice after Nancy and I meet with the Steering Committee and presented to them and then came back. The GPC feels that a graduate degree is a graduate degree. After talking to the Senate Steering Committee the GPC felt that it should still remain one class. That's where we are at.

Stepina: We do have another couple of things that did not make it onto the agenda.

Tyson: We'll go back to item four – reports to the standing committee –

Stepina: We made a bunch of changes to the bulletin, and that's not really functional for me to try and show you all of those because they look something like this. Well, that's page one. So let me bring up a couple things. One is we looked at provisional students versus conditional students, and we also looked at the residency requirement. What we did on the provisional graduate students. As you can tell I was totally prepared for this. There is a requirement, and this is what it was. As you can see from this, students have to be physically on campus for a minimum of 24 graduate semester hours a credit a year.

Stepina: So 24 graduate semester hours of credit in any 12 consecutive months. We did a review of other universities, and a number of universities do not have this. And our feeling was that students have different types of activities that take them off campus. Perhaps they go abroad. Perhaps they go to another university for another semester. In order to be continuing to develop academically—because that's the point of this policy because we want to make sure that they are moving along and that their academic development is continuing. But we felt that was possible in other ways beyond physical presence here especially given the availability of opportunities away from campus. We propose dropping that and going to something called scholarly engagement. Scholarly engagement ensures graduate students benefit from and contribute to the complete spectrum of educational, professional, and enrichment opportunities provided by a comprehensive research university. And then it lists some of the other ways to meet the scholarly engagement requirement: interact with faculty peers in ways that might include enrolling in courses and seminars, and so on. The goal is to prepare students to be scholars who can independently acquire knowledge. The purpose of scholarly engagement is to ensure that doctoral students are active participants and immerse themselves in the global scholarly community. So in other words, we are going to get rid of you have to be here physically but we are requiring that students be academically engaged. So a student who was here doing 24 hours, this wouldn't apply to them because they are doing coursework and so on. But part of the GPC review would consist of looking at—and this is what is already there and this is new—what steps do programs take to facilitate and ensure that students are active participants and immerse themselves in the global scholarly community? This would only apply to students who were not meeting the 24 hour requirement. This is something else that would be inserted in the college requirement annual review and doctoral student policies. Again, it should communicate the assurance of timely progression and consider ongoing engagement. That is the plan. Questions?

How many students does this affect? Is this a problem?

Stepina: We heard from membership of the committees that sometimes students had taken a break and not taken their 24 hours. And in some cases it could have been for any number of reasons, but in other cases it was because they pursued some outside opportunity, or they turned it down because they wouldn't be meeting the residency requirement. So there are people out there. There are some people who just sort of drop out and disappear, and this doesn't cover them. This only covers people who are engaging in things that help with their academic development. Do we know how many people that is? If you don't have a policy, you don't know how many people would like to use it. We really can't say, but the members of the GPC being 24 people – a number of people raised those kinds of issues.

Man: Does the phrase “in any 12 month period” mean in every 12 month period or in some 12 month period?

Stepina: In terms of the 24 hours?

Previous man: Yes.

Stepina: It means in all 12 month periods. So basically “all” is taking 12 hours – you can take the summer off if you want – take 12 hours in fall and 12 in spring. Yah. I think there needs to be flexibility and judgment in terms of faculty members and departments having discretion.

Man: Do we still have the 24 hours also then?

Stepina: No. That’s lined out.

Man: One example from our department [inaudible]. People do take 24 hours. They take 9-9-and 5 in the summer. [inaudible]. So if you take 12-12 or 9-9-and 5, you only get 23. So somehow you have to take either more in summer [inaudible]. So basically in any one year period, you have to have 24 hours. [Inaudible].

Tyson: So when this one came to the Steering Committee, I don’t think there was any concern about this one. It is a relaxation of this requirement. If this were at the undergrad level, we might want to get concerned about it. Again, for some reason the Board of Governors would like the system to be consistent. That is less a concern at the graduate level, and your last item if you don’t meet the residency requirement, then you have to demonstrate something is actually a really nice marker to put in the field. You can look at this both ways. One procedural question and then we can get this. You didn’t get this before this meeting. If you feel that you need to read this in more detail, we can delay it. If you are comfortable with the description we have here which is pretty complete, we can do ahead and look at it now. Does anyone really want to push this to April? If not then... ok. Good. We’ll do it then.

Woman: We are just talking about the one residency requirement, right?

Tyson: Yes. The residency requirement.

Schmitt: To add a little more information. Maybe a few more examples. Maybe some people would appreciate a few more examples. For example if someone had an opportunity to serve a semester as part of a grant or scholarship, the National Science Foundation maybe or one of our research laboratory, they are not physically present on FSU’s campus. That’s part of the residency. And second, and another thing is it’s not tracked by the registrar’s office. [Inaudible].

Tyson: Any further questions? Otherwise we’ll bring this to a vote.

Man: Can you restate the motion?

Stepina: The motion is...

Tyson: To replace the current language on residency with new language that is less prescriptive.

Stepina: Right. To drop the residency requirement completely for doctoral students and create a policy that as I read you on scholarly engagement – which was this. [Inaudible voice]. Yah what we are planning on doing is going to individual units and getting them to put together a brief policy on that. But it's hard. In some areas you can anticipate what these opportunities are going to be for students because they regularly occur. And others it's harder to anticipate. Sandy?

Sandy Lewis: Sandy Lewis, member of the Steering Committee. I read this thinking this was a move towards allowing online Ph.D. programs. Is that part of the [-]?

Stepina: That never came up during our discussions.

Lewis: So could a degree program chose to have an online program where students were never physically on campus? They were always scholarly engaged or whatever-

Stepina: That is not what we envisioned. A department could do that but that online graduate program would have to be approved by the GPC, and I can't see us ever—I should never say never—I can't foresee us ever approving an online doctoral program. That's just not the nature of that degree. But good point.

Tyson: Exceptions are allowed.

Stepina: Just create exceptions?

Tyson: That's technically what we do by not monitoring the credits.

Stepina: I think what this does is it gives departments and different programs the ability to make decisions on what's appropriate rather than the backwards way of having to go through some process or other with the registrar to make an exception. I think giving someone the opportunity as this faculty has grown and the impact of this faculty on the academic community has grown, I think there are more and more of these opportunities that are available. That can be extremely useful for doctoral student's research and for their knowledge and for their future. I'd rather not make it an exception. I'd rather make it more of a positive thing that engagement is something that's out there and available.

Is there any provision about the time? What about if you are off campus for three years?

Stepina: That would be up to the program to decide whether that was appropriate or not.

Man: But shouldn't that be something the university should have a say in instead of each department?

Tyson: That's a fundamental question for the Faculty Senate. My answer is usually, no. But I think in this case we ought to discuss it.

Man: [Inaudible]. I suggest [inaudible] a presentation of all the details. [Inaudible]. Because I can't make a decision. [Inaudible].

Stepina: It's not like a doctoral student can come to your office and say I'm going to take the next two years and travel the world and I promise that I'll be academically engaged. That's why we are giving the departments control of this.

Man: No. It sounds like it. I somehow think the execution is unfinished.

Stepina: What else would you like to see?

Man: Well like my first questions. What is the answer to that?

Stepina: The answer to that is it's up to the department. [Inaudible talking]. I'm pulled in different ways on this thing because there is a group of people who want to have a regulation and there is a group of people who wants to have the faculty have as much control as possible, and I'm in that group.

Man: Residency requirements [inaudible]. Designed to say in some one year period [inaudible]. That seems bizarre to me. [Inaudible].

Susan Fiorito: So I'm chair of the Curriculum Committee. You do not – if it's the same doctoral program – and this is building on Sandy's comment about an online Ph.D. If you have the same Ph.D. program, all you have to do is add a delivery mode to your course. It can be approved course by course. It does not have to go through the Curriculum Committee. It does not have to go through and be approved as a new program. I didn't even think about it until you said something, Sandy. This could create online Ph.D. programs without anything else being changed – same courses, all you have to do is change the mood of delivery for it. It does not have to go through any other approval. It's the same doctoral program. It wouldn't be a new program. It would be the same doctoral program. The mode of delivery is changing. That's it. So I agree that we have to be a little more cautious.

Tyson: So let me see if I can wrap this up because we have other stuff to do. This body's time is the most valuable around. You can see the complexity of it. There are a lot of unintended consequences in these policies. I really think maybe we should send it back to the GPC since we are also going to do the number of graduate credit hours. Both of those have a lot of tendrils to them. I promise to come to the next GPC meeting. Let's see if we can resolve some of these larger issues. And we'll have the UCC this month although it was supposed to be last month. We'll have the UCC. Susan, if you can make it. We'll try to address it there before we bring it here. I'm a little torn about this because this conversation in the Faculty Senate is the type of thing we should be discussing. What is the role of residency in the product we offer? What does a graduate degree mean in terms of the level of courses taken? These are kind of fundamental questions that a faculty senate should bring up. But we also want to get out by 5:00. So my suggestion is let it go back to the GPC. We'll be involved as well, and we'll see if we can bring something back as a discussion item for next year's senate which is next month.

Man: [Inaudible]. I wonder if, in addition to [inaudible], we could put something into this measure which would explicitly prohibit online Ph.D.s? Because that would solve the problem.

Tyson: I don't know what we mean by residency. What is the value of residency? And think about the tendrils' quote.

Stepina: I think if we don't want to have online doctoral programs, then that is an issue unto itself. One way of making sure we don't have that is to prevent online as the sole delivery of instruction.

Tyson: Do we have a consensus to have this go back to the GPC?

Many: Yes

VI. Special Order: Liberal Studies Update, Matthew Shaftel

The *Liberal Studies for the 21st Century* Curriculum that was approved nearly two years ago will go into full implementation in Summer C of 2015. Due to the tremendous efforts of the Liberal Studies and E-Series boards, individual faculty, chairs, advisors, mapping coordinators, orientation staff, and countless others, we are ready to meet the needs of our incoming students this coming Summer!

As always, we need to acknowledge the tremendous work of the 30 faculty members that serve on the Liberal Studies and E-Series Boards. The college and department curriculum committees have also been hard at work reviewing coursework and we are in debt to you for your service. Finally, we owe a great deal of thanks for the tremendous support that Dean Laughlin and Interim Provost McRorie have provided.

So, where do we stand today? We currently have approximately 378 courses that are approved or pending approval, 120 of which are E-Series courses that will help our incoming students to Engage, Explore and Envision. Over the past year, we have had over 2,000 students enroll in E-series courses, and our preliminary study results are remarkable. 88% of the students who filled out course evaluations in the Fall reported that they strongly agreed that the E-series courses encouraged them to think Critically, while faculty reported virtually unanimously that teaching these courses were both fulfilling and re-invigorating. We are still on the lookout for E-Series courses for the Fall or Spring, particularly of the honors variety. Please discuss the possibility with your chair and feel free to give us a call if you have an idea you want to share!

Other areas of the new requirements are also moving forward. We currently have approximately 15 upper-division writing courses approved or pending for our incoming transfer students and I have been receiving a number of questions, which suggests that we will see a good deal of additional upper-division writing coursework over the next few months. Finally, we have 78 courses approved for Scholarship-in-Practice, and we anticipate more of these at the upper-division level as we move into the summer.

The Liberal Studies Course Search is now up and running full-steam ahead for the fall registration period. Check it out at liberalstudies.fsu.edu and you'll be able to see which of our preeminence courses you might like to take in the fall!

One final note, in a time where institutions in Florida and beyond are increasingly being pushed towards homogenization, our joint efforts on this curriculum have allowed us to claim with pride that Florida State University provides a *unique* educational experience that challenges students at all levels to think critically and creatively and that focuses on the skills required for success in the 21st-Century. As always, thank you for your willingness to move FSU forward and for allowing me to serve you and our students.

VII. Old Business

There were no items of new business.

VIII. New Business

There were no items of new business.

IX. University Welfare

a. Dan Maier-Katkin

I have a few topics I want to report. The first is the 25 for 25 Campaign. So far the faculty/staff campaign has reported a total of almost 1,250 gifts of 25 for a total of almost \$366,000 with gifts averaging just under \$300 – an average, of course, which many contain many much smaller gifts but also a few large ones. Of these gifts, 115 arrived directly through the 25 for 25 website for a total just under \$54,000 – an average of more than \$450 per gift. Noting again that an average conceals the magnitude of the range. [-] gifts are more than welcome, and the committee continues to think that the number of gifts from faculty and staff is more important than the amount because each gift reflects a commitment to the faculty and staff to the wellbeing of the university. The campaign was more successful last year than it has been so far this year. That is because the campaign was pretty much put on hold during the long period of the presidential search when everyone was occupied with other things and because the committee was not convinced during that period and time that the faculty and staff were in an especially giving mood. Now that the university has returned to more stable footing, we expect that support will return to its former high level. With that in mind, though it's late in the year, the campaign is about to kick into high gear again beginning with an event at the Scholars Common at Strozier Library at 10:30 a.m. on Wednesday, March 25th. Please consider attending and bringing friends with you. The featured institutions in this year's campaign, like last year's, are the libraries which I wanted to say a few words. I want to remind everyone here of the frightening and dangerous events that took place at Strozier Library this year. This was a dark moment in the history of the university. But, on reflection, there are a couple of positive outlooks. First, the heroism and efficiency of the library student staff and the FSU police. But also the fact that when the shooting took place at around midnight, there were hundreds of students at Strozier Library. Really, as faculty, what more could we want? This is a reminder of the extent to which the library is essential to the life of the university and offers a reminder of their importance to the success of the entire university community and is a reason why we should all consider a gift to the 25 for 25 Campaign and encourage your colleagues to do the same. Of the gifts received last year, the Foundation reports—I'm not sure the library agrees—\$160,000 went direct to the library. Let's see if we can do better this year.

I have a second, very brief report which is on the ad hoc committee on honors education that Gary created in the beginning of February. We formed an ad hoc committee to discuss problems and issues related to FSU's honors program and explore possible solutions – some of which might involve the library actually. Other members of this committee, in addition to Gary and me, include Don Latham, Jim Mathes, Joe O'Shea, Paul Marty, Matthew Shaftel, and two honors students. The committee has met twice and plans to meet again next week. We hope to complete a report before the end of this academic year. So far, it is possible to report that there appears to be a consensus on the committee that a reconstructed honors initiative would add substantial value to the university as well as improving the experience of our strong students. The committee's first report is expected to deal principally with admissions and curriculum issues for honors students. Stay tuned. More to come.

Tyson: Thank you very much. Two quick notes on that. 25 for 25 – we've worked hard to make it non-coercive. We want to keep it that way, but it helps the overall campaign if the Foundation can brag on the investment that faculty make as well. We've also picked the library as you will see in a bit. One of the reasons we picked the library is they have some financial challenges that we need to address.

b. FSU PD Resolution, Peter Beerli

In Recognition and Profound Appreciation of Exemplary Service by the Florida State University Police Department

Whereas on November 20, 2014 the Florida State University Police Department responded promptly to a dangerous situation at the Strozier Library on the campus of Florida State University; and

Whereas the Florida State University Police Department acted decisively upon arrival to contain and secure the situation despite great personal risk; and

Whereas these actions of the Florida State University Police Department may have prevented further injury or death of members of the University community; therefore

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of Florida State University formally acknowledges and extends its profound appreciation to the Florida State University Police Department for its timely and professional action to secure and ensure the safety of the campus community.

The resolution passes.

c. United Faculty of Florida Update, Jennifer Proffitt

Bargaining

The UFF-FSU bargaining team has been in negotiations with the BOT team regarding market equity distribution plans. As noted at the last meeting, on February 11th, the UFF-FSU team presented our proposal that is largely based on the 2007 joint labor-management report regarding market equity. The BOT team presented its

counter-proposal at this past Monday's meeting. The next bargaining session is scheduled for March 27.

Consultations

At our March 4 consultation with President Thrasher, Interim Provost McRorie, VP Kistner and other FSU administrators, we discussed market equity as well as legislative and budget issues. Our next consultation is scheduled for May.

Luncheon

Our luncheon with FEA's Public Policy Advocacy Director Jeff Wright was very informative and well-attended (and the food was great, too).

Government Relations

UFF-FSU is continuing to follow several bills, including guns on campus and secrecy in president, provost, and dean searches. Both of these bills seem to be racing through the Senate and are moving quickly through the House. As noted last time, we are watching the textbook affordability issue closely; it has not yet moved in either chamber.

The concealed weapons on campus bill passed along party lines at Monday's Senate Higher Education Committee and passed 11-2 at today's House Higher Education and Workforce Subcommittee meeting. 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 will be heard tomorrow at 1:00 at its last Senate Committee stop. It passed its first hurdle in the House last week. The statewide UFF passed resolutions opposing the guns and secrecy bills last month.

X. Announcements by Deans and Other Administrative Officers

a. University Libraries, Dean Julia Zimmerman

While we are waiting on the technology, I will just say thank you so much for letting me be here and letting me talk about this issue with all of you. I want to thank you of the Faculty Senate for being the champions for high academic standards at FSU. It often gets lost in the noise of other events and bodies of our university, but it makes a huge difference that you are here championing academic high quality. I also want to thank you for making the 25 for 25 a library focused fundraising campaign. It is enormously affirming for all of us in the libraries at FSU to know that the faculty are thinking of us and realize that we do need this kind of support. You know what they say about libraries: you belong to everyone and so you belong to nobody. Our fundraising challenges are kind of like that. We don't have alumni though I can tell you we have 90% of FSU students coming through Strozier Library every semester. The other seven libraries on this campus are used very heavily as well. And finally, while I have the podium, and I want to say thanks to the senate library committee. I've been working with them closely in the seven years that I've been here, and I couldn't ask for a better group of people year after year for advice and support. I really do appreciate all they've done. The chairs this year of course have been Matthew Goff and Alysia Roehrig. Both have just been top notch.

In the interest of time, I'm going to skip the first part of my presentation which is just sort of an overview of some of the programs and services we've initiated for the faculty in the past few years. I'll say a little bit about it. We're doing an awful lot with digital scholarship and trying to work with scholarly communication issues to make a [-] scholarly communications system nationwide and worldwide. We are working with faculty more and more as funding agencies require data plans. We have a group of people who are much attuned to what we need to do there to formulate a successful data plan. We are doing a lot of that. Digital scholarship, digital humanities, using new forms of technology to do research in some of these fields that have been technology shy in the past – that's going to be a bigger and bigger thing, and we are really showing up our staff to be able to help with those things. As you know, we've been working with the President's Office on this celebration of tenure which is coming up soon. The FSU digital library built an infrastructure for it, and it will be a showcase for some 800,000 items that we have in the library that are rare or many of them are unique, not existing anywhere else in the world. And of course that includes our university archives which is a really wonderful source. We established a delivery service a few years ago to serve faculty. When I look at the statistics, I can say that it's saved tens of thousands if not hundreds of thousands of hours of faculty time because you don't have to walk to the library, get into your car, find a parking space, come into the library, and so forth and so on. We've been able to do it very efficiently. We are now able to extend it to certain groups of graduate students which just makes it all better. We've created a number of quick ways to get materials that we don't own. One of the big issues when I came here in 2007 was that the funding for books and other materials in humanities and the arts was just pitifully low, and we were able to raise the funding for those materials by 2 or 3 times in some cases. Spending three times the available amount we spent in years before I came here. I guess that's my segue here for talking about our issues with collections.

Matt mentioned that we asked for a million dollars. Three hundred thousand of that is for technology. We provide a lot of technology for students and faculty. And of course we have to have technology just to provide the online services and materials we do on a regular basis. We've been hit by a pretty dramatic reduction in what we get from student technology fees. We did receive for a long time a several hundred thousand dollar allocation that came straight from the BOG to all the libraries of the SUS. We lost a couple hundred thousand dollars a year that we were able to count on. And so now we are doing more and more technology all the time with less and less money. The cost of what we are doing through ITS here at FSU as well as outside vendors keeps going up. So we've really struggled to keep the technology afloat. So that's a piece of it. But what I want to talk about more than that is collections and why we need \$700,000 for collections. Let me start by saying that I manage a collections budget in my part of the library world here of about 7 million. And it's been flat for four or five years. Libraries in the colleges of law, medicine, music, and communication and information have their own budgets too which are administered down through the colleges. All together our library budgets for FSU are about 8.9 million. The problem, even though this budget has been relatively flat, is that inflation and the cost of library materials have been severe and it continues at a rate of about 4-5% per year. We've all taken out loans at that rate. You know what you wind up paying over time. The graph that's on the screen right now shows what's happened from 1993-2013. And you can see how the cost of journals and serials – that's the orange line – has gone up dramatically. The cost of books has sort of risen more or less along with the consumer price index. But the price of journals and serials are the things that are really doing us in. This gives you a picture of where the

money goes. This is by material type with the orange bar being journals and serials. You can see that the vast majority of our budget has gone to buying serials and journals. The gray thing is books. The yellow one is other; you know, audiovisual, whatever. When you have a situation where the cost of journals is going up dramatically and most of your budgets is in journals, it doesn't take much to figure out that we have a real problem. Now this graph is about expenditures by subject area with the longest bar, the blue bar, being STEM. The majority of the STEM literature is in journals. So there you have it. What it boils down to is – can you read the headers there? So what it boils down to is that the STEM journals are consuming an increasingly large share of the library's budget to the exclusion of books and databases in business and law and social sciences and particularly in the humanities and the arts. Now, when we talk about being top 25, I thought this would be illustrative to look at some of the institutions that the BOG has identified as our peer or aspirational peer institutions. The way we sliced and diced this was to look at the number of students on campus which indicates perhaps the size and breadth of the programs that are being taught at each campus and look at the amount of money that is going into the library, and you can see there that compared to some of our presumed peers, we don't spend a lot of money on the libraries. When you look at all of the top 25, the average collections expenditure for all of them is around \$14.1 million to our 8.9 million for all our 8 campus libraries.

So where we are right now is that we are trying to finish up the fiscal year in the black and that's proved impossible. I've talked to Sally McRorie about giving us some one-time funding to get us through this year. We are also planning to cut back somewhat on a number of books and databases and other one-time expenditures that normally we would be buying a lot of at this time of year. We can defer payments to the next fiscal year. We have some carryforward and so forth that we can use to help address the problem. But this is obviously not a sustainable situation. Next year we will have considerably more than the deficient we have this year and the year after that and so on and so forth. I just want to say that I understand that everyone has needs and the faculty salary issue, we are all very much aware of that. I know that every department is kind of working on a shoestring. The other thing that I struggle against is that boosting the library budget is not going to do anything for metrics. It's not going to give us performance funding or preeminence funding or boost us into the top 25 in a measurable way. Nevertheless, if we don't get this money, one of two things is going to have to happen. One is we will cut one of the big STEM journal packages. We have a couple of them that are, you know, six to seven hundred thousand dollars a year. And we can just cancel it, and then we'll be good in the rest of budget. The other thing we can do is we can simply stop buying books and database and other one-time expenditures which of course would be dreadful for people in those fields who use a lot of non-periodical materials, particularly the arts and humanities, education, social sciences, business, etc., etc. But we can't continue to buy the same level of stuff that we've been buying and get by. We simply cannot do it. So on that unhappy note, I want to say that I appreciate you listening to me. I really am anxious to hear your comments and advice for how we cope with this situation. Because we do really need to do something if we are going to be able to move forward as the institution that we deserve to be.

Kercheval: Alec Kercheval, mathematics. Thanks for your presentation. Some of us have been involved in starting a new journal in mathematics and we've been talking to the various publishers and they all tell us that there is a revolution in publishing in the journals going on and everything is moving towards open source, which is a mixed bag

but it would mean that potentially a lot of these big STEM journal expenditures are going to start dropping as all the journals become electronic open source and won't require a subscription. On the flip side, faculty will have to pay to publish in those open source journals, so there will still need to be financial support somehow. I noticed you have an item on the library there. To what extent have you incorporated that shift in publishing models in your projections?

Zimmerman: Well, we are doing an awful lot to try to encourage open access because it really is the way that this problem is going to be solved long term. And we do have an open-access fund, so that we have some money for faculty who run into expenses publishing in those journals. We are happy to do that. But we're years away from being able to say to Elsevier for example, "We're not going to buy your journals."

Kercheval: Elsevier? That's the one that's killing you, right?

Zimmerman: Oh yes. It absolutely is. Our Elsevier subscriptions is, I believe, 1.7 million every year, and going up once again at a 4-5% rate. It's not a problem unique to FSU. Every university in the country is grappling with it. I think our issue right now is that we have a somewhat smaller budget than peer institutions, and our payment to Elsevier may be somewhat greater than it needs to be. Which is a problem that we are working on [inaudible]. It's going to take a few years before we get there. But thank you for your question.

Buchler: Michael Buchler from the College of Music. Being a musician, it's safe to say I don't get any C&G funds contrary to contracts and grants. But I wonder if for STEM disciplines which are very heavy in C&G funds, if it's possible to use some library funds for grants that would be essential to STEM schools?

Zimmerman: Well, Vice President Ostrander is not interested in talking to us about that at this time. Actually it's not an uncommon thing. The library at the University of Florida gets about a million and a half a year from sponsored research. I could point to many other examples throughout the country where funding from sponsored research goes into the library. After all, it supports research. I haven't given up on that one yet, but we haven't made much progress at all.

XI. Announcements by Interim Provost McRorie

Interim Provost McRorie was not in attendance.

XII. Announcements by President Thrasher

President Thrasher was not in attendance.

XIII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.



Melissa Crawford
Faculty Senate Coordinator

courses to be retained as 3000/4000 Level

New #	Old #	Course Title
AML2600	AML4600	African-American Literary Tradition
ARH2050	ARH3050	History & Criticism of Art I
ARH2051	ARH3051	History & Criticism of Art II
ART2330C	ART3330C	Life Drawing
CHM2210	CHM3210	Organic Chemistry I
CHM2211	CHM3211	Organic Chemistry II
CHM2211L	CHM3211L	Organic Chemistry Lab
MAC2312	MAC3312	Calculus with Analytic Geometry II
MAC2313	MAC3313	Calculus with Analytic Geometry III
MAD2104	MAD3104	Discrete Mathematics I
MAP2302	MAP3302	Ordinary Differential Equations
BSC2086	BSC3086	Anatomy & Physiology II
BSC2086L	BSC3086L	Anatomy & Physiology II Lab
GEA2210	GEA3210	United States and Canada
GEA2270	GEA3270	Geography of Florida
PHY2048	PHY3048	General Physics A w/o Lab
PHY2048C	PHY3048C	General Physics
PHY2048L	PHY3048L	General Physics Lab
PHY2049	PHY3049	General Physics B w/o Lab
PHY2049C	PHY3049C	General Physics B
PHY2049L	PHY3049L	General Physics B Lab
PHY2053C	PHY3053C	College Physics A
PHY2053L	PHY3053L	College Physics A Lab
PHY2054C	PHY3054C	College Physics B
PHY2054L	PHY3054L	College Physics Lab
STA2122	STA4122	Intro to Applied Statistics
STA2171	n/a	Statistics for Biology