



FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE

AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2023
3:05 P.M.

Regular Session

The regular session of the 2022-23 Faculty Senate was held on Wednesday, February 15, 2023. Faculty Senate President Eric Chicken presided.

The following members attended the Senate meeting:

T. Adams, P. Aluffi, E. Alvarez, J. Ang, C. Ann Baade, S. Ballas, E. Bangi, C. Barry, H. Bass, R. Baumbach, W. Berry, B. Birmingham, D. Bish, M. Blaber, M. Bourassa, A. Boutin, E. Brookshire Madden, D. Broxterman, M. Buchler, M. Bukoski, U. Bunz, J. Calhoun, J. Cano-Urbina, E. Chassignet, E. Chicken, I. Chiorescu, E. Coleman, R. Coleman, L. DeBrunner, A. Dewan, M. Duncan, V. Fleury, K. Gallivan, G. Gerard, F. M. Gloth, R. Goodman, T. Graban, A. Gunjan, M. Hanline, E. Hilinski, P. Hoefflich, C. Hofacker, M. B. Howren, R. Hughes, S. Johnson, K. Jones, M. Killian, E. Kim, J. Kimmes, E. Loic, G. Martorella, A. McKenna, Y. McLane, R. Morris, E. Murphy, J. Ohlin, T. Owen, C. Owens, E. Peters, M. Porter, J. Proffitt, , A. Rassweiler, R. Roberts, N. Rogers, E. Ryan, H. Schwadron, T. Somasundaram, D. Soper, J. Standley, R. Stilling, B. Stults, B. Stvilia, M. Swanbrow Becker, Y. Tang, G. Tyson, K. Ueno, A. Volya, D. Whalley.

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

D. Armstrong, A. Barbu, C. Barrilleaux, R. Brower, J. Chanton, E. Coggeshall (V. Joos), S. Daniels, F. Dupuigrenet, D. Eccles, S. Foo, J. Geringer, A. Gilzene, M. Gonzales-Backen, W. Guo, D. Gussak, W. Hanley (C. McClive), K. Ishangi, A. Khurshid, A. Lemmon, S. Lester, W. Li, P. Maurette, J. McNulty, C. Moore, G. Ostrander, J. Palmer, N. D. Fifer, Q. Rao, O. Steinbock, E. Stewart, A. Stiegman, Z. Yu.

I. Call to order

II. Approval of the agenda, February 15, 2023, meeting
The agenda was approved as distributed.

III. Approval of the minutes, January 18, 2023, meeting
The agenda was approved as distributed.

IV. Report of the Steering Committee – Bridgett Birmingham, Vice-Chair

- Bridgett Birmingham began her report by sharing that the committee has continued to monitor the developments in the state that affect teaching and learning.
- Bridgett Birmingham expressed continued meetings with the ACFS.
- The University has two searches underway: the College of Communication and Information Dean search and the College of Social Work Dean search.
- The ACFS passed a resolution regarding supporting accessibility and inclusivity of all persons.
- Bridgett Birmingham brought two upcoming meetings to attention. The FSU Board of Trustees General meeting, Friday, February 23. The Board of Governors conference call meeting on February 22, in which post tenure review will be discussed.
- Bridgett Birmingham concluded by noting there have been two modifications to the publicly posted document. She encouraged everyone to read and review the updated proposal. The document should be open for public comment for 14 days after the BOG conference call. If there are no objections in

the public comments after 14 days, the regulation will be forwarded for approval by the Board of Governors.

- **President Chicken** – opened the floor to questions. None were posed.

V. **Announcements of the President of the University**

- President McCullough began his report by expressing his recent ability of approving tenure for 88 faculty members.
- Expressed importance of hiring and retaining faculty.
- President McCullough encouraged everyone to submit nominations for the Robert O. Lawton distinguished professorship, the deadline for the nomination is March 10.
- Expressed gratitude to everyone who helped present the Torch Awards, and congratulations to the winners.
- President McCullough provided an update on 2023 decision day. FSU received over 71,000 applications for a projected class of 6,200 freshman class students.
- He noted he had a great discussion with Union Faculty about post tenure review, academic, freedom, recent attacks on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion.
- President McCullough shared thoughts about being brought into the press for attacking certain values, misuse/misunderstanding of terms such as equity or Anti-Racism. Requested Provost Jim Clark for thoughts on the issue.
- **Provost Clark** – he agrees words are being manipulated on both sides and expressed concern. But agreed that what is being said is not University practice. He concluded that the University must continue to move forward in a way that helps preserve what we stand for.
- **President Chicken** – opened the floor for questions.
- **Peter Hoeflich, Arts & Sciences** – asked for a response on including questions asking candidates to share their thoughts on DEI on job advertisements.
 - **President McCullough** – responds that it makes sense for the university to use equal opportunity language in some cases, but given the restrictions, this kind of wording can be easily misunderstood. Expressed that the thought is to initially take out this language in advertisements and reevaluate the language.
 - **Peter Hoeflich, Arts & Sciences** – suggested using a more neutral statement. Because when picking faculty, it would be important to know where the candidates stand.
 - **President McCullough** – responded that there is no request for change operationally, however we noticed there was no standard language and HR and administration working to reword things on administrative websites.
- **Cathy McClive, Arts & Sciences** – raised concerns about colleagues at UF who work for DEI committees that had their emails searched, question if this is something that has happened at FSU.
 - **President McCullough** – answered that there have been records requests for emails from outside journalist.
 - **Janet Kistner, VP FDA** – confirmed that there was also a request from the state government to provide documents from DEI administrators and committee members.
 - **President McCullough** – clarifies that the documents and emails were supplied.
- **Cathy McClive, Arts & Sciences** – raised a second concern involving protecting graduate instructors, non-tenured instructors, and minority instructors when it comes to people harassing faculty for “breaking the law.”
 - **President McCullough** – thanked Cathy McClive for making them aware of this happening.
 - **Provost Clark** – requests that cases involving harassment of faculty are brought to his or Janet Kistner’s attention so that each case can be worked through with attention to detail to ensure the safety and integrity of the classroom.
- **Charles Hofacker, Business** – expressed the opinion that there may not be a way to use certain words to stay out of negative attention and hopes that eventually there could be a chance to speak out against anything that is wrong.
 - **President McCullough** – highlighted that the outside problem lies not with Diversity and Inclusion, but with the word Equity.

- He continued with highlighting the importance of faculty not politicizing their positions, so that we can continue focusing on keeping the things that make the university great.
- **Tarez Graban, Arts & Sciences** – seconded Senator Hofacker’s worries regarding using vague language to avoid problems with the state and highlights being far more specific with language rather than vague.
- **President McCullough** – clarified that there is no request on faculty to change anything that they are doing, but that from the administration there may need to be changes.
- **Christina Owens, Undergraduate Studies** – asked about a timeline for promotion announcements for specialized faculty.
- **Janet Kistner, VP FDA** – responded that there is not a specific time outlined but is shooting for the first half of March. She also noted there are 92 candidates this time.
- **Robin Goodman, Arts & Sciences** – raised concerns about post tenure review proposal, specifically concerning specific language and asks for clarification from President McCullough.
- **Provost Clark** – expressed that there have not been any discussions yet on these changes and is eager to meet with the leadership teams to address any troubling language.
- **President McCullough** – shared his final points, including upcoming BOT meeting, legislative session begins on March 7, there is a space planning group currently assessing campus. Trying to stay ahead on fundraising totals in comparison to last year. Lastly, FSU has a new Chief Marketing Officer, Susannah Wesley-Ahlschwede who will help build international prominence.
- **President Chicken** – thanked President McCullough for his time.

VI. Reports of Special Committees

- No reports from Special Committees.

VII. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Defense timelines – Ulla Bunz, Graduate Policy Committee (addendum 1)

- **Ulla Bunz, GPC** – presented the first proposal concerning the adjusting of the “academic courtesy” submission to committee timeframe for dissertations. This would change the timeline for students submitting a dissertation from four weeks prior to the oral examination to two weeks prior.
- This would change in two sections of the bulletin and as well as any other related documents concerning this.
- **Ulla Bunz, GPC** – continued, the second proposal by the GPC concerns establishing a deadline for defense course enrollment.
- **President Chicken** – opened the floor for discussion on the first proposal.
- **Gary Tyson, Arts & Sciences** – supports both proposals but wants to ensure that the clearance advisor does not have a problem from going from four weeks to two weeks.
- **Nancy Rogers, Music** – expressed disapproval of the first proposal for reasons of circumstances when two weeks is not enough for faculty and would prefer not putting faculty in a tough position where they disagree with the bulletin. Nancy suggested keeping the deadline to four weeks but adding to the bulletin that this can be amenable to change given all parties involved agree to it.
- **Tarez Graban, Arts & Sciences** – shared support for the second proposal on the basis that it may be difficult for the university representative (or external committee member) to accommodate a reduced timeline.
- **Nancy Rogers, Music** – moved to amend the proposal, keeping the deadline as four weeks unless it is shortened by the committee.
- **Ulla Bunz, GPC** – did not accept amendment as a friendly amendment, so it is moved to a vote.
- **President Chicken** – asked for a second for Nancy Rogers proposal, and it was seconded. Next discussion was opened, no discussion posed. A poll was open to vote on Nancy Roger’s amendment.
- **The amendment is approved.**
- **The amended GPC proposal is approved.**
- **President Chicken** – opened the floor to discussion on the second proposal.
 - **President Chicken** – a vote was opened on the second GPC proposal.

- **The second proposal passes.**

VIII. Unfinished Business

- No unfinished business currently.

IX. New Business

a. **Special Topics Course Approval Policy – Ulla Bunz, Communication & Information (addendum 2)**

- **Ulla Bunz, Communication & Information** – while working on the committee implementing new curriculum software, we are also hoping to change some policies and practices.
- Currently when teaching an online special topics course, courses must be reviewed by the UCC. This is an old senate policy that we hope to change.
- Proposal is that once special topics are approved through the normal curriculum process, other online topics only need to be approved by the department or school curriculum committee and not the UCC.
- Ulla Bunz concluded that they would like to have this added to the distance learning handbook.
- **Ulla Bunz, Communication & Information** – motions for approval of a new policy.
- **Gary Tyson, Arts & Sciences** – seconded Ulla Bunz motion.
- **President Chicken** – opened the floor for discussion and comments.
- **Gary Tyson, Arts & Sciences** – shared his support for treating online special topics courses the same way other courses are treated in the approval process.
- **Todd Adams, Arts & Sciences** – suggested striking a phrase from the proposal.
- **Ulla Bunz, Communication & Information** – accepted Todd Adam's suggestion as a friendly amendment.
- **President Chicken** – no more discussion posed, so policy is sent to a vote
- **The policy is approved by the Senate.**

b. **University Curriculum Committee bylaws change – Ulla Bunz, Communication & Information (addendum 3)**

- **Ulla Bunz, Communication & Information** – this proposal is a change to the UCC bylaws to have two elected leaders instead of one chairperson and who will create a working document regarding the division of labor.
- **President Chicken** – opened the floor for comments.
- **Bridget Birmingham, University Libraries** – questioned the reasoning behind two leaders instead of chair and vice chair.
 - **Ulla Bunz, Communication & Information** – responded that it was proposed as two leaders so the two leaders could define what their titles are and how to divide the responsibilities.
- **Michael Gloth, Medicine** – expressed concern about being able to identify every task each individual would need to cover. As well as the concern that when two are in charge sometimes it makes it more difficult to know who to go to for what.
- **Nancy Rogers, Music** – does not agree with adding it to the bylaws. She shared her concern that adding this and not specifying who the two leaders are could then be problematic with any reference to chairs in the rest of the bylaws. Nancy Rogers would rather it be one chair and then the committee is always free to add another leader.
- **Erin Ryan, Law** – asked if this proposal accounts for chairs being appropriately compensated.
 - **Ulla Bunz, Communication & Information** – no this was not discussed.
 - **Erin Ryan, Law** – responded that this raises a practical consideration to think about compensation for the two chairs. She also expressed concern about being able to fill positions on committees, as that has been a struggle in recent years.
 - **Ulla Bunz, Communication & Information** – clarified that the second leader would come from the existing committee members, not an additional member.
- **Ulla Bunz, Communication & Information** – thanked the senate for their comments.

- **President Chicken** – asked if there was any more discussion, seeing none, discussion was closed.
- c. **Resolution on DEI – Roxanne Hughes, Faculty Senate Steering Committee (addendum 4)**
- **Roxanne Hughes, FSSC** – began by reading the current drafted statement in support of DEI initiatives in higher education.
 - **President Chicken** – this is a proposal for a resolution coming from the steering committee and so it does not need a second. The floor was opened for discussion.
 - **Besiki Stvilia, Communication & Information** – would like to add “staff” as a friendly amendment, in the last paragraph.
 - **Roxanne Hughes, FSSC** – accepted the friendly amendment.
 - The proposal was modified.
 - **Michael Blaber, Medicine** – expressed concern that there is no definition of the term's diversity, equity, and inclusion in the statement, which opens it up to interpretation. Suggests attempting to define what these terms mean.
 - **President Chicken** – answered that the Board of Governors do not attempt to define these terms because they have well-accepted, common meaning.
 - **Erin Ryan, Law** – added that the statement does explain what the University means by equity, without walking into a political debate trying to define equity.
 - **Robert Coleman, Fine Arts** – suggested changing “colleagues” to “faculty,” he also had concerns with the word “disallowing” as being passive.
 - **Roxanne Hughes, FSSC** – prefers colleagues, and is willing to put this up to a vote.
 - **Robert Coleman, Fine Arts** – did not wish to propose an amendment.
 - **Roxanne Hughes, FSSC** – prefers “precluding” and would take that as a friendly amendment.
 - **Robert Coleman, Fine Arts** – agreed with using the word “precluding.”
 - **Linda DeBrunner, Engineering** – expressed concerns with suggesting that learning cannot occur without DEI programs.
 - **Roxanne Hughes, FSSC** – responded with that this is not necessary about the DEI committees, it is about the ability to be able to speak, share ideas, and perspectives in the classroom.
 - **Linda DeBrunner, Engineering** – did not wish to propose an amendment.
 - **Michael Gloth, Medicine** – suggested that this resolution needed some reworking, so we avoid misinterpretation. He would prefer that, then voting at this time on it.
 - **Erin Ryan, Law** – wanted to speak to Linda DeBrunner’s concern and express that the point of this statement is that we want to be able to deliberate together as a society in the classroom, even if not directly teaching about those topics. The statement is not saying students can’t learn without DEI, but it may weaken their ability to cope with the challenges in modern America.
 - **Michael Buchler, Music** – suggested that the small edits in verbiage are not going to make a large difference to the document and urges the proposal resolution to go to a vote.
 - **Aimee Boutin, Arts & Sciences** – agreed with Michael Buchler’s comments, but also provided a small wordsmithing change.
 - **Jayne Standley, Music** – also expressed the urgency in passing this resolution.
 - **President Chicken** – opened the floor for more questions or discussion. None were posed. The resolution was opened for voting.
 - **The resolution passes.**
- d. **Torch Awards committee bylaws - Jayne Standley, Torch Awards Committee Co-Chair (addendum 5)**
- **Jayne Standley, Torch Awards** – introduced the bylaws change which would add the duty of recommending recipients for the Fred. D Standley Distinguished Service Professor Award, to the Faculty Senate Torch Awards Committee.
 - **Nancy Rogers, Music** – suggested some wordsmithing, so that the bylaws would not have to be amended in the future.

- **President Chicken** – asked that Jayne Standley take note of Nancy Roger’s comment and to also remind Nancy to bring it up at the next senate when we discuss this bylaw change.
- **President Chicken** opens the floor to any new business. There was none.

X. **Special Orders**

- No special orders currently.

XI. **University Welfare – Matthew Lata, United Faculty of Florida (addendum 6)**

- **Matthew Lata, UFF** – quickly updated faculty about lawsuits, upcoming bills, and urges everyone to participate in discussion and protests including a union busting bill.
- Matthew Lata was having technical difficulties, so President Chicken asked him to email his topics to the Faculty Senate Coordinator who passed them along to all the senators after the meeting.
- **President Chicken** – asked if there are any more items of University Welfare, none were posed.

XII. **Announcements of Deans and Other Administrative Officers**

- No announcements.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 pm.

Graduate Policy Committee

- 1) **Proposal to adjust the “academic courtesy” submission to committee timeframe for dissertations**
- 2) **Proposal to establish a deadline for defense course enrollment**

Requirements at the Master’s Level

[other subheadings]

Thesis (Graduate Bulletin Page 101)

[...]

Before writing the thesis, the student should become familiar with the University's manuscript formatting and clearance requirements. Academic courtesy requires that the thesis be submitted to each member of the supervisory committee at least two weeks before the date of the oral examination. At the same time, the thesis should be submitted electronically to the Manuscript Clearance Advisor in The Graduate School so that the clearance advisor can provide the student with a critique of the manuscript with respect to The Graduate School's formatting requirements. Electronic submission instructions and manuscript/forms submission deadlines can be found on The Graduate School's website under Thesis, Treatise and Dissertation.

[...]

Examination in Defense of Thesis (Graduate Bulletin Page 101)

[...]

Academic courtesy requires that the thesis be submitted to each member of the supervisory committee at least two weeks before the date of the oral examination. At the same time, the thesis should be submitted electronically to the Manuscript Clearance Advisor in The Graduate School so that the clearance advisor can provide the student with a critique of the manuscript with respect to The Graduate School's formatting requirements. Electronic manuscript submission instructions can be found on The Graduate School's website under Thesis, Treatise, and Dissertation.

The supervisory committee will conduct the examination. All members of the graduate faculty are invited to attend. At least two weeks prior to the date of the examination, the student will submit an announcement of the thesis title, date, and place of the examination to The Graduate School. The announcement must be submitted electronically on The Graduate School's Manuscript Clearance Portal and will be posted on the Defense Calendar on The Graduate School's website. Electronic forms submission instructions can be found on The Graduate School's website under Thesis, Treatise, and Dissertation. **By this time, the students must be enrolled in their defense course.**

[...]

Requirements of the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) Degree

[other sub-headings]

Dissertation (Graduate Bulletin Page 105)

[...]

Before writing the dissertation, the student should become familiar with the University's manuscript formatting and clearance requirements. Academic courtesy requires that the dissertation be submitted to each member of the supervisory committee at least four weeks before the oral examination unless all members of the examination committee agree to a shorter reading period. At the same time, the dissertation should be submitted electronically to the Manuscript Clearance Advisor in The Graduate School so that the clearance advisor can provide the student with a critique of the manuscript with respect to the Graduate School's formatting requirements. Electronic submission instructions can be found on The Graduate School's website under Thesis, Treatise and Dissertation.

[...]

Examination in Defense of Dissertation (Graduate Bulletin Page 106)

[...]

Academic courtesy requires that the dissertation be submitted to each member of the supervisory committee at least four weeks before the oral examination unless all members of the examination committee agree to a shorter reading period. At the same time, the dissertation should be submitted electronically to the Manuscript Clearance Advisor in The Graduate School so that the clearance advisor can provide the student with a critique of the manuscript with respect to The Graduate School's formatting requirements. Electronic manuscript submission instructions can be found on The Graduate School's website under Thesis, Treatise, and Dissertation.

The supervisory committee will conduct the examination. All members of the graduate faculty are invited to attend. At least two weeks prior to the date of the examination, the student will submit an announcement of the dissertation title, date, and place of the examination to The Graduate School. The announcement must be submitted electronically on The Graduate School's Manuscript Clearance Portal and will be posted on the Defense Calendar on The Graduate School's website. Electronic forms submission instructions can be found on The Graduate School's website under Thesis, Treatise, and Dissertation. **By this time, the students must be enrolled in their defense course.**

[...]

[other sub-headings]

Recommendations by the Policy/Procedures Sub-Committee

(Chair: Ulla Bunz; The overall Course Approval Review Committee was formed by Janet Kistner and led by Jennifer Buchanan)

Presented by: Ulla Bunz (Senator, School of Communication, CCI)

Recommendations to the Faculty Senate

Recommendation 1:

Changing the way online Special Topics syllabi are reviewed and approved by adding the suggested language below to the Distance Learning Committee handbook, Section “Governance and Curriculum,” (suggested: as new paragraph 2). The new language would replace the 2001 policy voted into practice by the Faculty Senate (see attached the minutes of the March 2001 Senate meeting, p. 3), which was never added into the DL handbook or any other formal document, as far as we were able to determine, but has been enforced since 2001.

Implementation date: Fall 2023

2001 policy voted into practice by Faculty Senate that would be replaced by the new language:

“Special Topics courses may be approved through the normal Form 2 process to be offered by alternative formats (including distance learning), but approval is for one semester only. The same special topics course may be offered more than once, but each time a unit wishes to offer a Special Topics course by alternative format, a Form 2 must be submitted for approval. Normal rules covering Special Topics (e.g. that the same course may only be offered three times by Special Topics, and that a syllabus must be filed with the Dean of Faculties each time a Special Topics course is offered.) continue to apply whatever the format of delivery.”

Suggested language:

Alternative modes may be added to Special Topics course numbers through the normal curriculum request approval process, ~~as for all other course numbers~~. Once approved for online offering, other online topics offered under that Special Topics course number are reviewed by the department or school curriculum committee only and do not need to be reviewed by the University Curriculum Committee. For colleges without departments or schools, this review is conducted by the college curriculum committee. Records of these approvals should be kept. Normal rules covering Special Topics (e.g. that the same course content may only be offered three times by Special Topics course number) continue to apply whatever the format of delivery.

Style Definition: Heading 2

Explanation/Justification:

In 2001, the Faculty Senate approved the policy that special topics courses that would be offered online could be approved for only one semester. If the same topic would be taught online again (a special topics course can be taught up to three times with the same topic before it is supposed to apply for its own number), it would have to apply for permission at the university level again. The Policy/Procedures sub-committee does not believe that this policy should continue. We are much more experienced with online courses now. We recommend that Special Topics course numbers can apply for online modes one time, just like any other course, and get permanent approval. Then, different topics that will be offered under that number online will only have to be reviewed at the department/school (or college if there are no departments/schools) level. Review of these syllabi is still necessary as each new offering essentially constitutes a new online course, even if it runs under the same special topics course number. However, the suggested language leaves content approval with the content experts (unit offering the course). The suggested language streamlines approval at the university level (one time approval for the course number only instead of repeated submissions for each offering). The suggested policy reduces workload overall and speeds up the approval process for specific syllabi.

Recommendation 2:

Appointing two people to leadership positions for the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) by changing the Faculty Senate by-laws language as indicated below

Pertinent section from the Faculty Senate by-laws:

University Curriculum Committee

The Curriculum Committee shall consider curricular policies and procedures at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The Committee shall consist of twelve faculty members appointed by the Steering Committee, with the advice and consent of the Senate, for staggered three-year terms. The Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement, or their designee, shall be a non-voting ex-officio member.

The Committee shall annually elect its chairperson from the faculty representatives.

Suggested changes:

University Curriculum Committee

The Curriculum Committee shall consider curricular policies and procedures at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The Committee shall consist of twelve faculty members appointed by the Steering Committee, with the advice and consent of the Senate, for staggered three-year terms. The Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement, or their designee, shall be a non-voting ex-officio member.

The Committee shall annually elect two leaders from the faculty representatives who will create a working document regarding their division of labor.

Explanation/Justification:

While the current by-laws don't prevent appointing a second leadership position, the Policy/Procedures sub-committee doesn't want such an appointment to be optional for two main reasons. First, FSU's growth has resulted in a workload that is unreasonable for a single UCC chair; and second, the university needs continuity in leadership that cannot occur when a single chair is sick, has a personal crisis, or resigns. The other leadership position can temporarily assume at least some of the duties of the vacant position until a replacement is found so that the absence of a single person doesn't bring academic affairs all across the university to a grinding halt. There are multiple ways of dividing up the UCC chair's responsibility that are logical and feasible and they can be decided on by the two people themselves. An additional advantage of shared leadership may be easier recruiting. It is possible that people are more willing to assume a leadership role when they know responsibilities are shared.

Florida State University Faculty Senate

Statement in Support of DEI Initiatives in Higher Education

The Florida State University Faculty Senate resolves that diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives (DEI) are critical to the success of our university and to all institutions of higher learning. The Florida Board of Governors recognized the importance of DEI education in its 2020 memo on “Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion: Strategic Priorities,” which states that “a university’s strategic plan, as well as its mission statement, should prioritize diversity, equity, and inclusion and provide clear direction for the total integration of D.E.I. initiatives throughout the institution.” Florida State’s commitment to DEI has been celebrated nationwide, as demonstrated by our receipt of a Higher Education Excellence in Diversity award from *INSIGHT Into Diversity* nine years in a row.

Casting efforts to improve DEI as “indoctrination” misunderstands the purpose and impact of these initiatives. Education is designed to foster critical thinking skills, which requires the discussion and deliberation of diverse ideas. Inclusion ensures that these ideas are discussed in a space that is supportive of multiple viewpoints, teaching us to critically examine evidence and make thoughtful decisions about its accuracy. Equity enables all students, including those who might not be able to afford college without help, to participate in these deliberations. The announcement that the state of Florida would eliminate DEI programs threatens these foundational educational objectives. It also threatens to create a culture of fear that we must resist.

Public education enables students to be citizens in our pluralist society, a project that requires each of these elements. To deny students the opportunity to learn to critically evaluate viewpoints different from their own would leave them unable to cope with the challenges of the modern American workplace, where we are all confronted with complex, ethical issues that affect people of all walks of life. DEI initiatives in the academic setting prepare our graduates to excel as entrepreneurs, professionals, leaders, and within the marketplace of ideas. If the state denies us the opportunity to engage the voices of all students and fellow citizens, we as a university will struggle to produce the successful graduates and future members of the Florida workforce that we do now. Precluding us from engaging in these efforts would be a uniquely disempowering form of indoctrination by omission.

We stand proudly behind the efforts by our colleagues, students, and staff to make our campuses a vibrantly diverse and inclusive learning environment for everyone. We urge the Governor, the legislature, and the Board of Governors to join us in this ongoing celebration of what makes Florida the engine of creativity, innovation, and democracy that we are. Understanding the value of our DEI initiatives will enable us to align our shared goals of preparing students to be productive and contributing members of society throughout the state and the nation as a whole.

Amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws to add the Fred L. Standley Distinguished Service Professor Award to the charge for the Faculty Senate Torch Awards Committee

In Faculty Senate Bylaws, Section G. Standing Committees, Number 13. Torch Awards Committee,

Add after the fourth (4th) paragraph in the Torch Awards Committee Charge the following language:

The Torch Awards Committee shall also be responsible for recommending recipients for the Fred L. Standley Distinguished Service Professor Award. This award is given from time to time for extraordinary service by a faculty member and has traditionally been conferred upon the retirement of the faculty member being honored. It is intended to be given rarely to someone who has gone far above and beyond the normal measure of service to FSU. The recipients so far have been long-serving members of the Faculty Senate, but this is not necessarily a requirement. The Committee may wish at its annual meeting to consider whether there is a viable candidate for the Standley Award; it may also accept nominations for the award, keeping in mind that this is not intended to be an annual award. Recommendations for recipients of the Standley Award will be transmitted to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee for confirmation.

Matthew Lata - UFF

- Lawsuits against HB7 and HB233 are still in process
- In bargaining, we have made proposals to expedite the procedure and focus on salaries with a view to giving priority to the threats FSU and UFF face in the next few months
- By the next Senate meeting, we will be well into the Legislative Session. We know, at the very least, that guns on campus will be back, as well as a union busting bill that will eliminate dues deductions as well as mandating a 60% enrollment from the bargaining unit at the risk of decertification. For the last several years, that proposed figure was 50%. Now that many chapters are approaching that figure, union opponents in the Legislature are cynically moving the goalposts.

Whether you are a Union member or not, this affects you, as we represent all faculty. If we are decertified, our Collective Bargaining Agreement is null and void. We will lose a faculty voice on a host of issues, including academic freedom, tenure and evaluation procedures, intellectual property rights, and salaries.

We can fight back. We ask all faculty to stay informed. Please talk to your colleagues. Write letters to the local paper, or an Op Ed. Reporters at the Democrat, WCTV, and other media outlets are asking for this, and don't want to hear from the same people all of the time. No one will speak for us if we don't do it ourselves.