



FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE

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

Regular Session

The regular session of the 2023-24 Faculty Senate was held on Wednesday, November 15, 2023. Faculty Senate President Bridgett Birmingham presided.

The following members attended the Senate meeting:

G. Adams, T. Adams, P. Aluffi, C. Baade, S. Ballas, A. Barbu, W. Berry, D. Bish, M. Bosworth, M. Bourassa, A. Boutin, J. Broome, D. Broxterman, M. Buchler, M. Bukoski, J. Calhoun, J. Chanton, E. Chicken, I. Chiorescu, A. Dewan, M. Duncan, D. Eccles, N. Ennis, N. Everhart, J. Fiorito, V. Fleury, K. Gallivan, G. Gerard, F. Gloth, M. Goldmark, R. Goodman, T. Graban, J. Guan, A. Gunjan, W. Hanley, E. Hilinski, P. Hoeflich, R. Hughes, S. Johnson, K. Jones, K. Killian, M. Killian, E. Kim, T. Ledermann, L. Lee, A. Lemmon, A. McKenna, Y. McLane, J. McNulty, S. Metcalfe, S. Miller, J. Ohlin, G. Ostrander, C. Parker-Flynn, E. Peters, N. Pifer, M. Porter, J. Proffitt, Q. Rao, P. Renfro, N. Rogers, E. Ryan, Q. Sang, S. Sansom, D. Smith, T. Somasundaram, J. Standley, M. Swanbrow Becker, A. Thomas, R. Tomko, G. Tyson, K. Ueno, A. Volya, G. Wang, S. Wasman.

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

J. Ang, D. Armstrong, M. Augustyn, E. Bangi, H. Bass, E. Brookshire Madden, E. Cecil, E. Coggeshall, E. Coleman, L. DeBrunner, M. Fuentes, A. Gilzene, A. Khurshid, P. Kumar, K. Lee, W. Li, T. Liu, P. Maurette, V. Mesev, C. Moore, K. Ogle, C. Owens, I. Quinn, T. Rhynard, R. Roberts, C. Schmettmann, G. Stanwood, O. Steinbock, Y. Tang, M. Therrien, S. Zane, M. Zhang, Y. Zhou.

I. Call to order

II. Approval of the agenda, November 15, 2023 meeting

The agenda was approved as distributed.

III. Approval of the minutes, October 18, 2023 meeting

The minutes were approved as distributed.

IV. Report of the Steering Committee – Roxanne Hughes

- Roxanne Hughes began by noting the Steering Committee discussed several topics, the first being Senate Bill 266. The Board of Governors posted the regulations, which include definitions for various terms used in Senate Bill 266, including definitions for diversity, equity, and inclusion, as well as general education core course options.
 - These regulations, known as 9.016 and 8.005 respectively, are open for public comment.
 - Hughes encouraged the Faculty Senate to post public comments with your respective units.
 - There is discussion that this will go into effect in January, and it will likely be challenged in the courts.
 - The Steering Committee will keep the Faculty Senate informed on the process as it unfolds.
- Roxanne continued with the discussion of post-tenure review. The Steering Committee wanted to thank all of the Senators and faculty who have volunteered to undergo post-tenure review in this first cohort.

- She noted that the process has brought up fears of what is to come and how this ongoing process could affect morale. Hughes asked that if anyone has any concerns, please let President Birmingham or any other members of the Steering Committee know your concerns so we can help work with the administration on this process.
- Hughes next spoke about the Advisory Council of the Faculty Senate, ACFS. Leaders from the Faculty Senate from each of the State universities meet regularly throughout the year to discuss issues affecting our faculty.
 - Each year the steering committee elects a member of this Council to serve as a representative on the Board of Governors. Currently, our representative is Amanda Fallon from the University of Florida.
 - During the Fall ACFS meeting, they invited Chancellor Ray Rodriguez to speak about the upcoming legislative session. During his presentation, he noted he does not believe the 2024 session will be a policy-heavy session for higher education. Reasons being, because of last year's crisis and last year's high spending on higher education.
- Hughes concluded that the Steering Committee has heard from some of our senators that colleagues in various units are unsure of the role and scope of the FSU Faculty Senate. The committee encourages you to invite your colleagues to our meetings so that they can see the process.
 - In addition, if there are suggestions you have for improvement, please contact Roxanne Hughes, President Birmingham, or any of the members of the Steering Committee.
 - The Senate is part of our FSU shared governance structure. We represent all our faculty and want everyone to understand the process and want to help make changes they would like to see.
- The floor was opened for questions. None were posed.

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

- No Announcements.

VI. **Reports of special committees**

- No Announcements.

VII. **Reports of standing committees**

a. **GPC 60 Day Deadline Proposal – Ulla Bunz (addendum 1)**

- Ulla Bunz proposed a change to the 60-day deadline. This proposed change would affect those who defend theses, dissertations, or treaties. The 60-day deadline applies to those who defend and do not meet the regular submission deadline by The Graduate School.
- The current policy is if the student has successfully defended, but does not submit by the semester deadline, they have to submit within 60 days or else they have to re-defend their manuscript, thesis, etc. This has caused issues for multiple parties involved in this process.
- The GPC has four requests: (1) to remove the 60-day deadline for thesis, treatise, and dissertation students, (2) request a new deadline for re-defends, (3) add “pass with major revisions” as an option to defense decision form in the manuscript clearance porter, (4) change the name of “re-examine” defense decision category to “re-defense”.
- These requests would allow those students who missed their semester deadline for their thesis, dissertation, treaty, or manuscript, to submit it at the next semester’s deadline without re-defending it. However, if they miss the next semester’s deadline, they will have to re-defend it.
- Ulla Bunz opened for questions and no questions were posed.
- Bridgett Birmingham moved to a vote.
- **The proposed change passed.**

VIII. **Unfinished business**

- No Announcements.

IX. **New Business**

115 Westcott Building, 222 S. Copeland Street, P.O. Box 3061480, Tallahassee, FL 32306-1480
 Telephone 850.644.7497 • Fax 850.644.3375 • <http://facsenate.fsu.edu>

a. BOG Proposed Regulation for DEI Expenditures (addendum 2)

- Bridgett Birmingham discussed the proposed Regulation 9.016 which is posted on the BOG website and is open for public comment until November 23rd.
- In addition, she announced that there is now an opportunity to get notifications on the chapters that you are interested in.
- Bridgett Birmingham discussed some important pieces of legislation. She discussed the definitions of DEI and political or social activism outlined in the regulation.
- Bridgett Birmingham opened the floor to discussion.
- **Robin Goodman, Arts and Sciences** – asked what can FSU’s administration do and what can the faculty do.
 - Bridgett Birmingham answered that she is opening this discussion to be able to make a statement that encapsulates the views of the Florida State’s Senate on this issue.
 - The Senate has been very forthright with the administration from the start that this is not a regulation that serves the interests of the university, that it is very chilling to academic freedom and speech, and that it is counter to our mission.
 - We are hopeful there will be a widespread outpour of public comment and cause the BOG to rethink this regulation.
- **Will Hanley, Arts and Sciences** – brought up his concerns about the regulation. He found it difficult to make logical sense of it. He explained that the definition of DEI that is written in the regulation is incomprehensible and therefore makes it difficult to sign off on. It targets core aspects of our colleagues’ disciplines, for example, sociology.
- **Jack Fiorito, Business** – seconds Senator Hanley’s remarks. He mentioned that the highlighted sections that were presented raise threats to academic freedom, professionalism, and free speech. He urged everyone to use the public comment portal to express their opposition to this regulation.
- **Kay Jones, Arts and Sciences** – asked if it would not be considered activism to request funding for the university. If we advocate for state spending on universities, are we engaging in political activity? She also discussed that she cannot fathom that we cannot speak about things that are social issues and she does not understand how they are supposed to teach anything.
 - Bridgett Birmingham said that under the regulation, lobbying activities of the university are not covered.
- **Erin Ryan, Law** – echoed Roxanne Hughes's comment to reach out to our colleagues to spread knowledge on what the Faculty Senate does. The Senate is a platform to communicate and engage in issues like this regulation and other faculty need to know that they can make public comments on this regulation.
 - A concern is that these regulations raise concerns about funding and socially divisive issues. It calls into question funding for faculty who engage in research on those topics.
 - Erin concluded that she made a comment on the law about her concerns. However, she knows there are many problems with the law and noted the importance of everyone commenting and pointing out all of the different problems they will experience as individual faculty members. As well as what they will be denying the students.
- **Ulla Bunz, Communication and Information** – asked about the national origin statement that was presented earlier with the supporting organizations. She was curious if the regulation would apply to the scholarships and fellowships. For example, students who benefit from the Latin American and Caribbean Scholarship based on their national origin. She also asked if national origin is defined as non-U.S. national origin. She brought up a concern for veterans and not being able to support them anymore.
 - Bridgett Birmingham – answered that there is a cutout for veteran support. She encouraged everyone to raise these issues in public comments.
- **Tarez Graban, Arts and Sciences** – said historically to similar issues, the Senate tends to make a statement. She asked if anything is stopping us from offering and supporting a resolution as a Faculty Senate?

- Bridgett Birmingham – answered no, that any senator can make a resolution and there is nothing stopping us from making one.
- **Daniel Broxterman, Business** – asked if they could draft whatever the correct resolution would be that could formally express our opinion on this proposed regulation. He asked what that procedure looked like.
 - Bridgett Birmingham – said that it wouldn't be possible to do that since the public comment periods are very short.
 - Daniel Broxterman – followed up with, does that mean we propose a resolution just because the public comment period is closing soon?
 - Bridgett Birmingham – answered that the BOG will take all those public comments and they have the option to use those comments and if there are substantive changes, then they must re-notice the regulation. But if they take those comments, and decide that there's nothing substantive to change, then they can put this regulation on the agenda of the next Board of Governors meeting. The likelihood that this regulation gets a widespread number of comments, the more public attention that this regulation receives, the more likely it is that they will make some changes.
- **Jayne Standley, Music** – suggested that a resolution is direly needed. She noted we could have a special session to draft a proposal, or anyone could take on the responsibility of drafting a resolution. She also asked if there has been a discussion about accrediting agencies responding to restrictions on academic freedom with any sort of censure of the university system. Has there been any appeal to any of the accrediting agencies, or professional organizations that relate to students within majors that are affected by this issue?
 - Bridgett Birmingham – answered that she is not against drafting a resolution and was looking to see the Senate's view on that. For the second question, Bridgett answered that to her knowledge, no, the accrediting bodies have not been involved.
- **Thayumanasamy Somasundaram, Arts & Sciences** – brought up a contradiction in the language used, specifically about the use of public restrooms.
- **Tarez Graban, Arts and Sciences** – **motioned to offer a resolution.**
- **Gary Tyson, Arts and Sciences** – **seconds the motion.**
 - Bridgett Birmingham – suggested that the Faculty Senate Steering Committee draft a resolution and send that along with an electronic vote. She asked Senator Graban if she accepted this as a friendly amendment.
 - **Tarez Graban accepts the friendly amendment.**
- Bridgett Birmingham opened the floor for discussion.
- **Erin Ryan, Law** – spoke on behalf of the Steering Committee, she thinks that before a resolution like this becomes something the Steering Committee alone has the final say and she thinks it's important to finish hearing some of the comments from the larger Senate.
- **Jeannine Murray-Roman, Arts and Sciences** – notes that a short statement saying the definitions of items such as DEI and social activism prevent the university from carrying out its core functions seems like the strongest option.
- **Matthew Bosworth, Office of Research** – moves to call to question.
- **Bridgett Birmingham** – calls for any objections to the motion on the floor.
- **No objections are posed, and the motion passes.**
- **Gary Tyson, Arts and Sciences** – wants to point out possible violations of state legislation as well as Title IX.
- **Robin Goodman, Arts and Sciences** – reiterates the need for a short response that expresses the FSU Faculty Senate's disagreement and wishes for it not to be implemented.
- **Todd Adams, Arts and Sciences** – does not object to a short statement yet believes that the statement must justify why the Faculty Senate is opposing it.
- **Erin Ryan, Law** – expresses the importance of a statement being issued by the faculty even with a low likelihood of it affecting what the Board of Governors decides to do. Whether or not it affects the regulation itself, the statement can become part of the litigation, reporting, and general political process which is incredibly important and warrants the faculty to make a statement.

- Bridgett Birmingham shared three different proposed languages for the statement provided by senators.
- **Kathryn Jones, Arts and Sciences** – voiced concern about putting the faculty in a position that seems to require them to be familiar with every aspect of state and federal law. She further expressed that the BOG's language provides no guidance.
- **Aimee Boutin, Arts and Sciences** – expressed that it is important to add to the resolution the ways it impacts the students.
- **Michael Buchler, Music** – does not think it is appropriate to mention the students because they have not been polled as well as because the Faculty Senate is the voice of the faculty, not the students.
- **Tarez Graban, Arts and Sciences** – voiced that she wishes to note all the feelings and ideas discussed in the meeting while also taking a step back and not finalizing a statement at this meeting.
- **Jayne Standley, Music** – wants to add that research is being restricted with this regulation. She also suggested adding that the regulation impacts the teaching of history, sociology, psychology, philosophy, etc., as it may add more impact.
- **Bridgett Birmingham** – wanted to clarify that the senate body is in favor of the steering committee crafting the resolution. No objections were made.
- **Bridgett Birmingham** – also wanted to bring to the Senate's attention Amendment 8.005 of the Board of Governors regulations. Regulation 8.005 would remove sociology as a general education class for the social sciences of the State of Florida.
- **Erin Ryan, Law** – expressed that the problem of removing sociology as it relates to the overarching as previously discussed. She proposed a sentence in the resolution that would express the disagreement in removing disciplines.
 - Bridgett Birmingham agreed.
- **Robin Goodman, Arts and Sciences** – wondered if there is another way to respond besides a resolution to these regulations. She feels like they are not being heard by the BOG.
 - Bridgett Birmingham responded that she would take it back to the Steering Committee to try to find a more productive way to handle these concerns.
- **Will Hanley, Arts and Sciences** – moved that he agreed we should include opposition to this regulation as part of the senate's other statement.
- **Tarez Graban, Arts and Sciences** – seconds the motion.
- **No objections are made. The motion Passed.**
- Bridgett Birmingham noted that someone asked if the statement would be reviewed at the next meeting, but she noted that the next meeting would be after public comment closes. However, the Steering Committee will circulate the statement through the senate body.
- **Tarez Graban, Arts and Sciences** – called the body's attention to Item 4 of Chapter 8. This section applies a level of curricular control annually.
- **Kathryn Jones, Arts and Sciences** – questions what the motivation for eliminating sociology is when there is a choice between sociology and psychology.
- Bridgett Birmingham closed the discussion on this topic.

X. **University Welfare – Matthew Lata, United Faculty of Florida**

- Matthew Lata began by noting that the Union has been mostly focused on bargaining over the post-tenure review regulation.
- The next bargaining session is December 6, 2023.
- On the side of recruitment, they are nearing their goal of 60%.
- The Union has also been doing what it can to support academic freedom and oppose these regulations that are being suggested.
- **Kathryn Jones, Arts and Sciences** – asked for confirmation that those people who have not switched to E-Do's at this time have been dropped and must rejoin.
 - Matthew Lata confirms that this is the case.
- President Birmingham asked for any other University Welfare matters. None were posed.

- XI. **Special orders**
 - a. **No special orders.**

- XII. **Announcements of deans and other administrative officers**
 - a. **No announcements were made.**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:53pm.

.....

**NEXT FACULTY SENATE MEETING
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 29 2023, 3:05PM**

2/20/2024 | 11:23 AM EST

Bridgett Birmingham

Faculty Senate President

Graduate Policy Committee

- 1) **Request to remove the 60-day deadline for thesis, treatise, and dissertation students.**
- 2) **Request to set a new deadline for a student's re-defense.**
- 3) **Add "Pass with major revisions" option to the Defense Decision form in the Manuscript Clearance portal**
- 4) **Change the name of the "re-examine" Defense Decision category to "re-defense."**

Current Policy for 60 Day Deadline in Graduate Bulletin

Manuscript Clearance Deadlines (Graduate Bulletin Page 109)

[...]

Students will fall under either the Semester Deadlines or the 60-Day Deadline (typically whichever is earliest).

Sixty-Day (60) Deadline. The post-defense, final content-approved manuscript and the required online forms must be electronically submitted to the Manuscript Clearance Advisor within sixty days after a successful defense. If a student defends early in the semester of graduation, or in a semester prior to graduation, the manuscript clearance deadline that applies is the 60-Day Deadline. For example, a student that defends on August 20 would have to have their manuscript cleared by October 20, even though the Fall semester clearance deadline is later in the semester. Additional formatting revisions are often required by the Manuscript Clearance office after the 60-Day Deadline in order for manuscript clearance to be complete. The student must receive an email granting "Official Final Manuscript Clearance" from the Manuscript Clearance Portal no later than one week after the 60-Day Deadline. No exceptions will be made for this policy.

[...]

Examination in Defense of Thesis (Graduate Bulletin Page 101)

[...]

The defense of the thesis will be oral. Responsibility for suggesting the time, designating the place, and presiding at the examination rests with the major professor. It is recommended that students defend no later than the eighth week of classes in the semester of intended graduation. Students must meet all manuscript and online forms deadlines set by The Graduate School in the semester of graduation or within 60 days of a successful defense (whichever is earliest). Manuscript/forms submission deadlines can be found on The Graduate School's website under Thesis, Treatise, and Dissertation.

[...]

Defense Decision Definitions (Graduate Bulletin Page 101-102 and 106-107)

[...]

Pass. To receive a Pass, the thesis must be in its final form or require only minor revision (e.g., grammar, typographical, clarifications, minor changes not requiring review by full committee) at the time of the defense, AND the student passed their oral defense. A decision of Pass for the defense of thesis requires at least a majority approval of the committee. Individual departments may impose stricter requirements for what constitutes a Pass. Departments and other degree-granting programs must publicize their policy on this issue in their Graduate student Handbook and in the relevant section of the Graduate Bulletin.

Pass with Major revisions. This decision indicates that the thesis requires major revisions (e.g., additional chapters, major restructuring, significant changes needing approval by either the major professor/chair or the full committee), AND the student passed their oral defense. Revisions must be completed and approved within 60 days of a successful defense, or a re-examination will be required per The Graduate School's 60-Day Deadline.

Re-Examine. The committee may determine a re-examination is necessary if the thesis had significant flaws and major revisions are need (i.e., the current research will take a substantial amount of work/time to correct), AND/OR the student's oral defense was unsatisfactory. This decision can only be given once. If the student completes a re-examination and does not pass with only minor revision required to the thesis, they should be given a Fail.

Fail. In the case of a Fail, the thesis had significant flaws to the point at which the committee believes the student should discontinue the program, or that a new research direction is required; AND/OR the student's oral defense was unsatisfactory, and another defense of the existing project will not be allowed. This decision should only be given when a committee/academic unit does not believe the student should continue in the program, or if the student will be required to move in an entirely new direction for their research. It is the committee's goal to prevent students from defending if their work is substantially flawed when they are reviewing it prior to defense. This decision is required if a student completes a re-examination and does not earn a Pass.

After approval by the oral examining committee (which includes or may be the same as the supervisory committee) and completion of the Final Content Approval Form in the Manuscript Clearance Portal, the student should electronically submit the post-defense, final content-approved version of the thesis to the Manuscript Clearance Advisor. This submission must occur by the semester deadline or within 60 days of successful defense (whichever is earliest). The degree cannot be awarded until the required forms have been completed on The Graduate School's Manuscript Clearance Portal and the final version of the manuscript has been submitted to and approved by the Manuscript Clearance Advisor. If the appropriate deadline is missed, the student's semester of graduation may be delayed and/or they must be re-examined. Electronic manuscript/forms submission instructions and deadlines can be found on The Graduate School's website under Thesis, Treatise, and Dissertation.

[...]

Examination in Defense of Dissertation (Graduate Bulletin Page 106)

[...]

The defense of the dissertation will be oral. Responsibility for suggesting the time, designating the place, and presiding at the examination rests with the major professor. It is recommended that students defend no later than the eighth week of classes in the semester of intended graduation. Students must meet all manuscript and online forms deadlines set by The Graduate School in the semester of graduation or within 60 days of a successful defense (whichever is earliest). Manuscript/forms submission deadlines can be found on The Graduate School's website under Thesis, Treatise, and Dissertation. [...]

Reasons for the Request to Remove the 60-Day Deadline

The 60-day deadline was created during a time with typewriters and paper-based forms, and it has created significant confusion and problems for graduate students, as well as administrators on campus.

Thesis, treatise, and dissertation students defend at different times throughout the semester and if they miss one of the semester deadlines for manuscript clearance (initial or post), they then fall under their “own” individual 60-day deadline, which starts from the time they defended. This requires the manuscript clearance advisors to constantly keep track of an ever-changing list of individual deadlines, some of which fall on or between holiday breaks, university closures, etc. This puts undue stress on the manuscript clearance advisors in The Graduate School and the graduate coordinators in the different academic units on campus.

Additionally, if a student defends their thesis, treatise, or dissertation and it is identified by their major professor or supervisory committee that they have major content or formatting edits to be made to their manuscript that cannot be completed within the semester deadlines, they then will also fall under a 60-day deadline. If the 60-day deadline were to be removed, all students would have the same set amount of time to complete the substantive edits to their manuscript. The students would be permitted to continue making edits to their manuscript up to the semester deadlines of the next term, instead of 60-days from the time they passed their defense, which would provide them with even more time to complete the necessary changes to their manuscript.

Explanation for Requested Changes

1) Remove the 60-day deadline entirely.

- If a student misses a semester deadline for manuscript clearance (initial or post) and there is an extenuating reason to justify why the deadline was missed, then an Exception Request can be submitted to The Graduate School for review to remain on the current graduation list, as done in present practice.

If the Exception Request is approved, then the student can remain on the current graduation list, continue working with the manuscript clearance advisors to finalize the formatting of their manuscript to graduate, and would not be required to enroll in 2 hrs of thesis, treatise, or

dissertation in the next term. If the Exception Request is not approved, then they would simply become a next-semester student and be required to meet those semester deadlines for manuscript clearance.

- Additionally, as noted above, if a student successfully defends, but there are substantive/major edits to be made to the content or formatting of their manuscript (as requested by their major professor or supervisory committee) and the student needs more time to finalize everything, then they will simply become a next-semester student instead of a 60-day deadline student and must meet the appropriate semester deadlines for manuscript clearance in the next term. In this scenario, all students would have the same minimum amount of additional time to finalize their manuscript (from the beginning of the new semester to that semester's deadline). There would no longer be separate individual deadlines which the 60-day deadline created. The same next-semester rule would apply to students who do not have substantive/major edits but miss the defense semester submission deadline due to ineffective time management or circumstances that do not warrant an exception request.

2) Set a new deadline for a student's re-defense.

- Currently, if a student misses their 60-day deadline, they are **required** to entirely re-defend their manuscript with their committee. The GPC and representatives from several Dean's Offices that were consulted strongly believe that there still needs to be a university deadline for a re-defense to prevent students from entering a state of stasis that could lead to never submitting the final manuscript. The timing of such a required re-defense is determined by amount of changes the students were asked to undertake by their committee after the original defense.

Updates to Graduate Bulletin

Manuscript Clearance Deadlines (Graduate Bulletin Page 109)

*Changes shown with red strikethrough and highlights.

[...]

Students must meet the ~~will fall under either the~~ semester deadlines ~~for Manuscript Clearance~~ in order to graduate. In addition, students must meet criteria described in the Examination in Defense of Thesis and Examination in Defense of Dissertation sections by or before Manuscript Clearance deadlines in order to graduate. ~~or the 60-Day Deadline (typically whichever is earliest).~~

~~Sixty-Day (60) Deadline. The post-defense, final content-approved manuscript and the required online forms must be electronically submitted to the Manuscript Clearance Advisor within sixty days after a successful defense. If a student defends early in the semester of graduation, or in a semester prior to graduation, the manuscript clearance deadline that applies is the 60-Day Deadline. For example, a student that defends on August 20 would have to have their manuscript cleared by October 20, even though the Fall semester clearance deadline is later in the semester. Additional formatting revisions are often required by the Manuscript Clearance office after the 60-Day Deadline in order for manuscript clearance to be complete. The student~~

~~must receive an email granting "Official Final Manuscript Clearance" from the Manuscript Clearance Portal no later than one week after the 60-Day Deadline. No exceptions will be made for this policy.~~

[...]

Examination in Defense of Thesis (Graduate Bulletin Page 101)

[...]

The defense of the thesis will be oral. Responsibility for suggesting the time, designating the place, and presiding at the examination rests with the major professor. It is recommended that students defend no later than the eighth week of classes in the semester of intended graduation. Students must meet all manuscript and online forms deadlines set by The Graduate School in the semester of graduation. ~~or within 60 days of a successful defense (whichever is earliest).~~ Manuscript/forms submission deadlines can be found on The Graduate School's website under Thesis, Treatise, and Dissertation. Additional rules apply to thesis, treatise, or dissertation students who miss a Manuscript Clearance Deadline during their defense semester. See Defense Decision Definitions for details.

[...]

Defense Decision Definitions (for Thesis, Treatise and Dissertation) (Graduate Bulletin Page 101-102 and 106-107)

[...]

Pass. To receive a Pass, the thesis, treatise, or dissertation must be in its final form or require only minor revision (e.g., grammar, typographical, clarifications, minor changes not requiring review by full committee) at the time of the defense, and the student passed their oral defense. A decision of Pass for the defense of thesis, treatise, or dissertation requires at least a majority approval of the committee. Students who defend successfully with a "Pass" but miss the defense semester's Manuscript Clearance submission deadlines will need to register for an additional semester and meet the Manuscript Clearance deadlines of the semester following the original defense semester. Students who fail to graduate in their original defense semester and the semester after their original defense semester are required to re-defend their thesis, treatise, or dissertation and meet Manuscript Clearance deadlines during the second semester since their original defense semester (e.g., original defense F24, required re-defense Su25). Students who re-defend and do not earn a "Pass," should be given a "Fail." The transcript will reflect a "Pass" once the student submits their successfully defended document. Exception requests for extenuating circumstances can be submitted by the unit's academic dean to the Dean of The Graduate School (or designee) for consideration. Individual departments/units may impose stricter requirements for what constitutes a Pass or the timing of a re-defense. Departments and other degree-granting programs must publicize their policy on these issues in their Graduate student Handbook and in the relevant section of the Graduate Bulletin.

Pass with Major revisions. This defense decision category is a sub-category of the "Pass" category. This decision indicates that the thesis, treatise, or dissertation requires major revisions (e.g., additional chapters, major restructuring, significant changes needing approval by either the major professor/chair or the full committee), and the student passed their oral defense.

~~Revisions must be completed and approved within 60 days of a successful defense, or a re-examination will be required per The Graduate School's 60-Day Deadline.~~ Students who defend successfully with a "Pass with Major revisions" but miss the defense semester's Manuscript Clearance submission deadlines will need to register for an additional semester and meet the Manuscript Clearance deadlines of the semester following the original defense semester. Students who fail to graduate in their original defense semester and the semester after their original defense semester are required to re-defend their thesis, treatise, or dissertation and meet Manuscript Clearance deadlines during the second semester since their original defense semester (e.g., original defense F24, required re-defense Su25). Students who re-defend and do not earn a "Pass," should be given a "Fail." The transcript will reflect a "Pass" once the student submits their successfully defended document. Exception requests for extenuating circumstances can be submitted by the unit's academic dean to the Dean of The Graduate School (or designee) for consideration.

Re-Defense. The committee may determine that a re-examination in defense of thesis, treatise, or dissertation is necessary if the thesis, treatise, or dissertation has significant flaws and major revisions that are needed and/or the student's oral defense is unsatisfactory. This decision can only be given once. If the student re-defends and the manuscript requires more than only minor revisions to pass, they should be given a Fail. It is the committee's goal to prevent students from defending if their work is substantially flawed when they are reviewing it prior to defense.

Fail. In the case of a Fail, the thesis, treatise, or dissertation had significant flaws to the point at which the committee believes the student should discontinue the program, or that a new research direction is required; and/or the student's oral defense was unsatisfactory, and another defense of the existing project will not be allowed. This decision should only be given when a committee/academic unit does not believe the student should continue in the program, or if the student will be required to move in an entirely new direction for their research. It is the committee's goal to prevent students from defending if their work is substantially flawed when they are reviewing it prior to defense. This decision is required if a student a re-defends and does not earn a Pass.

After approval by the oral examining committee (which includes or may be the same as the supervisory committee) and completion of the Final Content Approval Form in the Manuscript Clearance Portal, the student should electronically submit the post-defense, final content-approved version of the thesis, treatise, or dissertation to the Manuscript Clearance Advisor. This submission must occur by the semester deadlines for manuscript clearance. ~~or within 60 days of successful defense (whichever is earliest).~~ The degree cannot be awarded until the required forms have been completed on The Graduate School's Manuscript Clearance Portal and the final version of the manuscript has been submitted to and approved by the Manuscript Clearance Advisor. If the appropriate a semester deadline is missed, the student's semester of graduation may be delayed and a re-defense may be required. ~~and/or they must be re-examined.~~ Electronic manuscript/forms submission instructions and deadlines can be found on The Graduate School's website under Thesis, Treatise, and Dissertation.

[...]

Examination in Defense of Dissertation (Graduate Bulletin Page 106)

[...]

The defense of the dissertation will be oral. Responsibility for suggesting the time, designating the place, and presiding at the examination rests with the major professor. It is recommended that students defend no later than the eighth week of classes in the semester of intended graduation. Students must meet all ~~manuscript and online forms~~ semester deadlines for manuscript clearance set by The Graduate School in the semester of graduation. ~~or within 60 days of a successful defense (whichever is earliest)~~. Manuscript/forms submission deadlines can be found on The Graduate School's website under Thesis, Treatise, and Dissertation. Additional rules apply to thesis, treatise, or dissertation students who miss a Manuscript Clearance Deadline during their defense semester. See Defense Decision Definitions for details.

[...]

Implementation

This change would go into effect starting in **Fall 2024** for the 2024-2025 academic year.

If approved, the Manuscript Clearance Portal will need to be reworked. The Graduate Bulletin sections will need to be updated with the 60-day deadline language removed, as well as all other promotional materials, including but not limited to: the Graduate Student Handbook, Academic Calendar, websites, forms, etc.

**FLORIDA BOARD OF GOVERNORS
NOTICE OF PROPOSED AMENDED REGULATION**

DATE: November 9, 2023

REGULATION NUMBER AND TITLE: 9.016 Prohibited Expenditures

SUMMARY:

Senate Bill 266, signed by the Governor on May 9, 2023, prohibits a university or university direct-sport organization from expending any state or federal funds, regardless of source, to promote, support, or maintain any programs or campus activities that:

- (a) Violate section 1000.05 Florida Statute; or
- (b) Advocate for diversity, equity, and inclusion, or promote or engage in political or social activism, as defined by rules of the State Board of Education and regulations of the Board of Governors.

FULL TEXT OF THE REGULATION IS INCLUDED WITH THIS NOTICE.

AUTHORITY TO PROPOSE REGULATION(S): Section 7(d), Art. IX, Fla. Const.; BOG Regulation Development Procedure dated March 23, 2006.

THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS' OFFICIAL INITIATING THE PROPOSED REGULATION: Rachel Kamoutsas, General Counsel & Corporate Secretary

COMMENTS REGARDING THE PROPOSED REGULATION SHOULD BE SUBMITTED WITHIN 14 DAYS OF THE DATE OF THIS NOTICE TO THE CONTACT PERSON IDENTIFIED BELOW. The comments must identify the regulation on which you are commenting:

General Counsel, Board of Governors, State University System, 325 W. Gaines St., Suite 1614, Tallahassee, Florida 32399, (850) 245-0466 (phone), (850) 245-9685 (fax), or generalcounsel@flbog.edu.

9.016 Prohibited Expenditures.

(1) Definitions

(a) For purposes of this regulation:

1. "Diversity, Equity or Inclusion" or "DEI" is any program, campus activity, or policy that classifies individuals on the basis of race, color, sex, national origin, gender identity, or sexual orientation and promotes differential or preferential treatment of individuals on the basis of such classification.
2. "Political or Social Activism" is any activity organized with a purpose of effecting or preventing change to a government policy, action, or function, or any activity intended to achieve a desired result related to social issues, where the university endorses or promotes a position in communications, advertisements, programs, or campus activities. Political or social activism does not include:
 - a. Authorized government relations and lobbying activities of the university concerning matters that directly affect the operations of the university or direct-support organizations of the university.
 - b. Endorsement or promotion of a position that encourages compliance with state or federal law, or Board of Governors guidance or regulation.
3. "Social Issues" are topics that polarize or divide society among political, ideological, moral, or religious beliefs.
4. "Any programs or campus activities" are activities authorized or administered by the university or a university's direct-support organization(s) that involve:
 - a. Academic programs subject to review as outlined in sections 1001.706(5)(a) and 1007.25, Florida Statutes, other than classroom instruction;
 - b. Student participation, other than classroom instruction;
 - c. Hiring, recruiting, evaluating, promoting, disciplining, or terminating university employees or contractors.
5. "Student-led organization" is a student organization recognized by the university as an active and registered student organization that is comprised of student members with a faculty or staff advisor, including but not limited to organizations that receive activity and service fees pursuant to section 1009.24, Florida Statutes.
6. "Non-traditional Student" is an undergraduate student not pursuing higher education immediately or up to 2 years after graduating high school.
7. "State funds" are those funds provided to a university or direct-support organization for a university directly or indirectly by an

appropriation by the Florida Legislature. This includes financial aid provided to the university by or on behalf of a student attending the university if that financial aid is provided to the student via a state government aid or grant program.

8. "Federal funds" are those funds provided to the university or direct-support organization for a university directly or indirectly by an appropriation by Congress. This includes financial aid provided to the university by or on behalf of a student attending the university if that financial aid is provided to the student via a governmental aid or grant program.
 - a. State and federal funds do not include student fees to support student-led organizations notwithstanding any speech or expressive activity by such organizations which would otherwise violate this section, provided that the student fees must be allocated to student-led organizations pursuant to written policies or regulations of each state university, as applicable.

(2) A state university or state university direct-support organization may not expend any state or federal funds to promote, support, or maintain any programs or campus activities that:

- (a) Violate section 1000.05, Florida Statutes;
- (b) Advocate for diversity, equity, and inclusion as defined in this regulation; or
- (c) Promote or engage in political or social activism as defined in this regulation.

(3) A state university or state university direct-support organization advocates for DEI when it engages in a program, policy or activity that:

- (a) Advantages or disadvantages, or attempts to advantage or disadvantage an individual or group on the basis of race, color, sex, national origin, gender identity, or sexual orientation, to equalize or increase outcomes, participation or representation as compared to other individuals or groups; or
- (b) Promotes the position that a group or an individual's action is inherently, unconsciously, or implicitly biased on the basis of race, color, sex, national origin, gender identity, or sexual orientation.

(4) Student-led organizations may use university facilities notwithstanding any speech or expressive activity by such organizations which would otherwise violate section (2), provided that such use must be granted to student-led organizations pursuant to written policies or regulations of each state university, as applicable.

(5) Section (2) does not prohibit programs, campus activities, or functions required for compliance with general, state, or federal laws or regulations; for obtaining or retaining institutional or discipline-specific accreditation with the approval of the

Board of Governors; or for access programs for military veterans, Pell Grant recipients, first generation college students, nontraditional students, “2+2” transfer students from the Florida College System, students from low-income families, or students with unique abilities.

- (6) Section (2) does not prohibit expenditure of state or federal funds, so long as the expenditure is for ministerial or administrative activities of a program or campus activity that is not unique to that program or campus activity and that specific program or campus activity is otherwise supported by private funds.

- (7) A university shall designate a university official or officials who are responsible for compliance, oversight and adherence with the prohibited expenditure provisions of this regulation.

Authority: Section 7(d), Art. IX Fla. Const. §§ 1000.05, 1001.706, 1004.06, 1007.25, 1009.24, Fla. Stat. (2023); History – New XX- XX-XX.