



The Florida State University  
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-1480

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

**MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
SEPTEMBER 22, 2004  
DODD HALL AUDITORIUM  
3:35 P.M.**

**I. Regular Session**

The regular session of the 2004-05 Faculty Senate was held on Wednesday, September 22, 2004. Faculty Senate President Valliere Richard Auzenne presided.

**II. The following members attended the Senate meeting:**

**N. Abell, J. Ahlquist, M. Allen, A. Arnold, R. Atkinson, V. R-Auzenne, T. Baker, C. Barrilleaux, G. Bates, C. Beeler, S. Blumsack, B. Bower, S. Carroll, D. Clendinning, J. Clendinning, P. Coats, J. Cobbe, R. Coleman, C. Connerly, M. Cooper, D. Corbin, T. Crisp, J. Dodge, L. Edwards, L. Epstein, S. Fiorito, L. Flynn, J. Geringer, R. Glueckauf, J. Grant, C. Greek, N. Greenbaum, M. Guy, V. Hagopian, H. Hawkins, L. Hawkes, E. Hilinski, C. Hofacker, D. Houle, D. Jordan, W. Landing, S. Lewis, S. Losh, E. Madden, C. Madsen, N. Mazza, D. Moore, R. Navarro, P. Orr, S. Palanki, A. Payer, J. Peterson, S. Pfeiffer, D. Pompper, D. Rice, P. Rikvold, A. Sang, D. Seaton, M. Seidenfeld, S. Sirmans, S. Southerland, J. Standley, Jeanette Taylor, John Taylor, G. Tyson, E. Walker, C. Ward, J. Wulff, M. Young**

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

**J. Baker, M. Bonn, A. Boutin (A. Lower) J. Bowers, F. Bunea, M. Childs, C. Darling (B. Allison) F. Davis, L. Dehaven-Smith, J. Dexter, P. Doan, R. Fichter, P. Gielisse, D. Gussak, T. Hart (J. Gathegi), R. Herrera, A. Kalbian (M. Kavka), B. Kemker, D. Kuhn, W. Leparulo, V. MacDonald, T. Matherly, D. Odita, D. Peterson, D. Schlagenhauf (P. Steinberg), J. Tatum (K. Stoddard) N. Thagard, Q. Wang, B. Warf, J. Whyte, K. Yang**

**III. Approval of the Minutes**

The corrected minutes of the April 21 meeting were approved and will be distributed.

**IV. Approval of the Agenda**

The agenda was approved as distributed.

**V. Report of the Steering Committee, J. Cobbe**

Since the last Senate Meeting, the steering committee has met throughout the first six weeks of summer, and five times since August 18, including our regular monthly meeting on Monday, and earlier meetings in the summer, with President T.K. Wetherell and Provost Larry Abele.

As usual, much of our time during the summer was taken with making important faculty senate committee appointments. As usual, this process has been slower than one might like, but is very nearly complete. The list of members of standing committees will be presented for confirmation to the October meeting of the Senate; in the interim, all Senate committees do have much more than a quorum of members who have agreed to serve, and the Steering Committee urges all committee members to please attend their standing committee meetings to continue the essential work of the Senate.

In our meetings with the Provost and President, we discussed the expected size of the freshman class both this fall and next. This fall actual enrollment came in over expectations: the administration hoped for about 5,800 FTIC undergraduates, but we actually enrolled about 6,235. We have been assured that the University will make every effort to hold next fall's entering freshman class to 5,800, which is sufficient to keep total enrollment consistent with the Board of Governors' enrollment plan for us. Precise targeting is very difficult because our 'show rate'—the ratio of actual enrollees to admitted students—fluctuates in the 30%+ range, and a 1% change in the show rate is equivalent to about 200 students. A forecast error of 2.5% in the show rate—roughly this year's overage – is not outside a reasonable confidence interval.

We have been told that how to make up classes to replace one of the lost hurricane days that put our number of class days this semester below the minimum permitted by State policy is being discussed by the administration. We were also reminded that the University closing between Christmas and New Years is official Board of Trustees policy; this year the university will close at the end of business on Thursday 23 December and re-open on Monday 3 January. As last year, arrangements will be made to ensure faculty have access to their offices and laboratories throughout the official closure period.

We conveyed to the administration the difficulties academic units have experienced with the implementation of the OMNI system, and in particular that so far units are tending to find it a far more time-consuming way to conduct business than the methods it has replaced. We also discussed 'Academic Learning Compacts' and were informed of the initiatives the Provost is undertaking to try to mitigate the potential impact of this proposed requirement. The Steering Committee is deeply concerned that the current Board of Governors proposal on Academic Learning Compacts could be extremely burdensome without any commensurate educational gains.

The Provost has told us that the University is trying to join with other universities to jointly institute a mandatory health insurance program for graduate assistants, in order to obtain better rates because of the size of the group. Students will probably have to pay for this insurance if it is instituted. We were also told that the administration is looking into recycling of TIP and PEP awards, as initially intended, when they expire as a result of resignations, retirements, and deaths.

During the summer, members of the steering committee continued to observe bargaining sessions between UFF and the administration. We have received conflicting reports on the progress of these collective bargaining negotiations, at different times being told that an agreement might be reached in October or November and then that it might not be until the end of the academic year. There seems to be disagreement between the parties as to the reason for the relatively slow progress.

We met with Dean of Undergraduate Studies Karen Laughlin and discussed progress on implementation of FIGS and the 'mapping' of undergraduate degree programs. Karen is very anxious to recruit outstanding lower division undergraduates to be 'student leaders' for FIGS next year, and asks senators to refer potential candidates to her office. An Office of National Fellowships is being established to coordinate student applications for prestigious national awards, and a search is currently underway for the office's first Director. The steering committee is represented on the search committee by Chuck Connerly, who will report on this initiative in more detail later in this meeting.

We met with Dean of the Faculties Anne Rowe and were told of progress on the revision of the Faculty Handbook, on which a committee is working. The intent is to have it online with live links to relevant materials; the target is to have the draft complete in November. She also informed us of other changes in her office; the Dean of the Faculties is now responsible for the whole of new faculty orientation, and the intent is for the office to have a greater commitment to faculty career development. There may also be a greater formalization on a University-wide basis of the third year review for assistant professors.

A new committee called the 'performance and reputation committee' is looking at issues of retention and graduation of students, and the University's public reputation, at the request of the Provost. Dennis Moore is representing the steering committee on it. He and Senate President Vall Richard Auzenne have also joined the committee that is planning the President's Distinguished Faculty Lecture series.

We clarified the voting and alternate membership of the FSU Faculty Senate in the state-wide ACFS, Advisory Council of Faculty Senates, and FSU was represented at their meeting in late spring. We also clarified steering committee designees to attend Board of Trustee committee meetings.

President Richard Auzenne herself attended many other meetings on your behalf. The steering committee confirmed nominees for Torch awards, which will be announced at the fall general faculty meeting. We also made a number of recommendations to the Provost's office of names of faculty to serve on various University committees.

As you can tell, we had quite a busy summer and beginning to the academic year, as I'm sure you have too. The last issue I want to report on is the proposed new Academic Honor Policy (Addendum 1). This was circulated in advance of this meeting, and I hope you have all had a chance to read it. This proposed new policy was produced by a joint committee of students, faculty, and staff, who have been working under the chairmanship of Vice President for Student Affairs Mary Coburn since early in 2003. There has not been unanimity on all points, but there has been remarkable consensus on the bulk of this document, which greatly clarifies and simplifies, is far more explicit about both offences and procedures, and institutes systems so that miscreant students can no longer get away with claiming multiple 'first offences'. To go into effect, the policy has to be adopted by both the Faculty Senate and the Student Senate, who are also discussing it this week. If the two senates differ, it may be necessary to negotiate a compromise, which the Steering Committee would do before bringing it back to you for approval. Before the agreed text can go into effect, it has to undergo the normal administrative procedure rule-making process after the Student and Faculty Senates have agreed.

The Steering Committee was represented on the committee that drafted this text, and the Steering Committee has discussed the proposal in detail with Assistant Dean of the Faculties Jennifer Buchanan and strongly endorses it. At this time, on behalf of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, I move adoption of this revised Academic Honor Policy.

**After much discussion, the Faculty Senate voted unanimously to adopt the revised Academic Honor Policy.**

#### **VIII. Special Order: Remarks by the Senate President, V. Richard Auzenne**

I would like to welcome you to the 2004-2005 Senate year and take a moment to thank those of you who have agreed to serve on Senate committees. As we all know, this is where the work of the Senate takes place and without your participation in this very important phase of our process, our faculty governance would be compromised.

In January I spoke about the need to continue our long tradition of dedication to faculty governance by working side by side with the administration. I noted that this would undoubtedly mean serving on more committees and writing more policies...I had no idea how fast this would come upon us...for today we are asked to respond to a request from SACS and the Board of Governors, to provide documentation on what our students have learned. We face learning

outcomes, academic learning compacts and all the work that brings for the faculty. However, despite how much effort we expend on devising these instruments, it is far better for us to be part of the process rather than have the process be dictated to us.

We face difficult times in academe. Not just here in our state but throughout the country. For the word 'accountability' has become a new mantra of many, including legislators. This is our profession. We should be the designers of accountability measures for education. As educators, we do not object to accountability. For here at Florida State University, we have many mechanisms that have been in place for decades to address accountability issues. One of the charges of several of our Senate committees focuses on the quality of education and accountability issues. The Graduate Policy Committee, the Undergraduate Policy Committee, the Curriculum Committee, the Liberal Studies Coordinating Committee and Honors Policy Committee...these are just a few of the Senate committees who address accountability issues.

We continue to have a strong stake in these issues, for it questions the very core of our existence and the definition of an educator and of education. We cannot step back and allow others to define the goals of our classes and the standards to which we hold our students to and more importantly, ourselves. Therefore, I strongly urge you when called upon to contribute your special expertise, step up to the challenge, make time to be part of the process which will define the future of education and the future as educators. Thank you.

## **VII. Reports of Standing Committees**

### **a. Liberal Studies Coordinating Committee, K. Laughlin for D. Johnson**

I appreciate this opportunity to speak to all of you. I am sorry that David Johnson was not able to be here because he deserves a lot of credit for the FIGS program and pushing it forward and keeping with the mandate of the Faculty Senate and the Liberal Studies Coordinating Committee.

Freshman Interest Groups (FIGS) has been on server other university for years. The Liberal Studies Committee has embraced this idea. WE anticipate FIGS providing a focus for freshman as they start their liberal studies education. A FIG will be composed of 3 or 4 lower division generally liberal studies courses and a 1 hour seminar. For each FIG the same group of 25 students will be taking the same 3 or 4 courses but they may not be the only students in the class. This tends to produce some bonding among those 25 students. It helps them develop a sense of collegiality and community within this large institution.

You have a handout (Addendum 2) that explains some of the advantages of taking FIGS. This is will be used in admissions material so it is geared towards students. The plan in to have a pilot program of 20-25 FIGS

starting next fall. We will hit roughly 500 students. The Division of Undergraduate Studies has been asked to implement the program.

The FIG seminar will be taught by undergraduate students who will be peer instructors. We want these seminars to be taught by good, strong undergraduate students. We want to make sure we carefully train these students so there is a 1 hour training course they will take starting in spring 2005. I am hoping to work closely with Paul Cottle, Director of the Honors Program, for this first time around, but if you have a good undergraduate who would be a good candidate to recommend that student to us. We are hoping to get tuition waivers for those students so they do not have to pay to take the class.

We will be working in the spring also constructing the FIGS. We have has a wonderful time playing with these. We have one called Great Discoveries. They would take World Greatest Shipwrecks, Great Discoveries of Archaeology and Physical Anthropology. Or a FIG called Children and Families. We will tie some of them to majors and some will be more topical.

Once we determine a section for inclusion in a FIG we will let you know. Seats will be blocked out and students will register as a block. If you do not want to participate please let us know. This will make no additional demands on faculty. There is no reason a faculty member has to change what they are doing. But you can get in touch with other faculty within the FIG.

Dean Laughlin answered questions to end her presentation.

## **IX. Unfinished Business**

There was no unfinished business.

## **X. New Business**

### **a. Office of National Fellowships Initiative, C. Connerly**

Last year a committee was established by the Provost, called The Provost Task-force on National Fellowships and Scholarships. The concern is with the number of national scholarships that undergraduates are able to compete for. In the history of FSU there has only been Rhode Scholar. Few students have won other scholarships.

This committee became aware that to be competitive that there is a need for a fulltime director of National Fellowships at FSU. The Provost agreed to fund that office and a fulltime director. We realized that out of our 12

peer universities, 8 of them already have fulltime offices looking at ways they can encourage students to apply.

A National search for a director has begun. We began interviews today. The director will report to Karen Laughlin. We hope to have the person by the end of this semester.

## **XI. University Welfare**

### **a. Moving of Evaluation Services, L. Flynn**

Leisa Flynn discussed the pending movement of Evaluation Services from the William Johnston Building to the University Center, Building C. In the College of Business there are many faculty who teach multiple sections of 150 students and who give 5-7 exams a semester. It can take up to 45 minutes to get across campus on the bus. By moving it to the UCC it puts this very important faculty service in a nearly unreachable spot. Faculty can not very often wait for the results so faculty would have to make multiple trips across campus.

The Provost announced that the William Johnston Building is being gutted. There will be a drop at the Student Union.

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

President Richard-Auzenne has kindly granted me time to provide an update on an important part of Faculty Welfare, namely progress in bargaining our first-ever local FSU faculty contract.

First, a brief reminder of recent developments for new faculty and new Senators: For about 25 years, the United Faculty of Florida (UFF) bargained a statewide agreement covering the State University System (SUS), a one-size-fits-all contract covering FIU, UWF, UF, FAMU, FSU, and other institutions across the state. With replacement of the statewide Board of Regents (BOR) by the new Board of Governors (BOG), and the devolution of most of the old Board of Regents powers to newly-appointed, separate Boards of Trustees (BOTs), we have a new employer. Our new employer, the FSU-BOT, contended that it was not bound in any sense by our previous statewide contract. The Florida Public Employees Relations Commission (PERC) ruled in favor of the FSU-BOT on this earlier this year—in a split decision. The UFF has appealed that decision, which runs counter to well-established precedents.

While our case worked its way through PERC, the UFF launched a statewide drive to guarantee faculty bargaining rights anew at each of the universities. Statewide, 6500 faculty signed authorization cards requesting UFF representation. At FSU, over 1100 faculty signed cards.

Statewide, eight of the 11 SUS universities granted voluntary recognition based on this massive faculty support for collective bargaining. The UWF, UF, and FSU BOTs insisted on an election. The election has still not occurred at UF, where the BOT has tried to change the electorate radically in hopes of defeating UFF. At UWF and FSU, over 90% of the voters favored UFF representation. We secured collective bargaining rights here last October by a faculty vote of 736 to 33.

Negotiations commenced in December, 2003. Since then, 25 bargaining sessions of about four hours each have been held. Of course, bargaining a local contract is a bit like new course prep for our UFF-FSU faculty team. It's new to all of us. Our team has spent far more hours preparing for negotiations than at the table.

Our previous statewide contract included 32 major divisions, or "articles." We expect the new contract to be about the same length, with close parallels between most articles, but with significant differences that reflect the unique needs of FSU and our faculty.

With that as the context, I can report that tentative agreement has been reached on 12 articles, and we are down to a few words' difference on two others (Addendum 3). So, in terms of a superficial count, we are close to halfway done. Much of the hardest work lies ahead, however. Many of the articles we've agreed are fairly straightforward or "technical" in nature, and they correspond to only about 16 of the 95 pages in the old contract. Although some potentially "tough" issues have been resolved, there are a lot of potentially tough issues still ahead, including salary.

We still have 18 articles neither agreed nor close to agreement. What about those? Our UFF-FSU faculty team has submitted proposed contract terms on 15 of those 18. The Administration team representing the BOT has proposed contract terms on four of those 18 articles.

So why is the process taking so long? Despite the fact that our faculty team has far outpaced the Administration in getting proposals or responses on the table, we have the impression that the Administration bargaining team is indeed working hard and trying to find solutions, some of which take a lot of talking. The Administration team does appear to be subject to severe constraints in terms of other assigned duties and in terms of a limited authorization from the BOT or top FSU administrators. We often have to wait for our proposals to work their way up an invisible hierarchy before negotiations can proceed. The outside attorney hired on an hourly basis to lead the Administration team is an able, experienced, and conscientious professional, but the incentive structure and authority structure seem to provide limited motivation to move negotiations promptly toward a conclusion.



I should point out that our team has compromised for the sake of expediency when we felt it would be in the faculty's interest. For example, we agreed to a Memorandum of Understanding that permitted the Administration to begin paying promotion raises for those who went through promotion successfully last year, and to begin paying a very limited number of other raises, such as for verified counteroffers. The UFF-FSU faculty team proposed increasing those promotion raises to 12% instead of the traditional 9%. That proposal was rejected by the Administration team, however, and we instead agreed *on an interim basis* to continue the 9% rate. The UFF-FSU faculty team still intends to negotiate an increased rate for promotion raises.

Our proposal to increase promotion raises was part of a comprehensive salary proposal that has been on the table since June 16<sup>th</sup>—more than three months. Many hours went into this proposal. We conducted a thorough analysis of data on salaries at FSU and at other Research I universities and a thorough analysis of FSU faculty concerns as revealed in our survey last spring, earlier surveys, and direct faculty input at meetings held all over campus and at Panama City. We also looked at FSU's budget from the Legislature and its tuition revenues. Although it is not a panacea, we feel confident that our plan will systematically address the most pressing FSU faculty concerns about salary.

The details have long been posted at our web site and are available for all to see ([www.uff-fsu.org](http://www.uff-fsu.org)). Briefly, the major components of our proposal include a market equity adjustment to bring FSU salaries up to those of other Research I universities, merit components to recognize good performance, cost-of-living increases to prevent real salary cuts from inflation, and traditional promotion increases—but at a 12% rate. Think about how much FSU would have to pay a private consulting firm to assemble a team of professors of computer science, higher education policy, public administration, and a supporting extended team of faculty from math, management, educational psychology, the library, English, and various other disciplines to put together a study of FSU faculty salary issues! We did it for free, *more than three months ago*.

Although the proposal is multifaceted, it is hardly beyond the comprehension of our able bargaining partners across the table. I have no doubt that if top FSU administrators said "Make a serious counter proposal," that it would be done. When the faculty voted overwhelmingly for UFF representation nearly a year ago, they clearly said it *should* be done. It seems to me that as faculty leaders, Senators should feel empowered, individually and informally, if not collectively and formally, to let the University's top administrators know that faculty expect it to be done *in fact and on a timely basis*. I ask for your help in setting a constructive tone: Let FSU's top administrators and BOT know that faculty expect bargaining to yield a fair agreement in the near future.

Details on bargaining progress and the UFF-FSU salary proposal are at [www.uff-fsu.org](http://www.uff-fsu.org).

**VIII. Announcements by Deans and other administrative officers**

Anne Rowe, Dean of the Faculties, solicited input about how to handle the missed hurricane days. We are only required to make up one day. The options are:

1. Every faculty member would work out something individually and report to chair or dean.
2. Saturday classes. October 30 or Nov 13
3. Classes on Veteran's Day

Dean Rowe will take the input back to the Provost and a decision will be announced soon.

**IX. Announcements by the Provost**

The Provost had to leave to attend a 5:00pm meeting.

**X. Announcements by the President**

President Wetherell was unable to attend today's meeting.

**XI. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.



Melissa Crawford  
Secretary to the Faculty

## ACADEMIC HONOR POLICY PROPOSAL HIGHLIGHTS

1. Comprehensiveness
  - a. Violations much more explicitly defined
  - b. Grey areas (e.g., collaboration, multiple submission) addressed
  - c. Student rights elaborated
  - d. Additional sanctions available (match Conduct Code)
  - e. Appeal procedures included
  
2. Clarity and Readability
  - a. Procedures explained – faculty should know what to do without additional verbal explanation
  - b. “Real language” used whenever possible, while complying with legal requirements
  
3. Policy and Procedure
  - a. Web-based forms will be available when approved
  - b. Procedure ended up being written in
  
4. Efficiency
  - a. Elimination of panels in cases involving students who agree that they violated policy but don't agree with the sanction
  - b. Elimination of separate process for determining non-academic sanctions (suspension, dismissal, etc.)
  
5. Decentralization vs. Centralization
  - a. Prior-record check required to screen for repeat offenders
  - b. Decentralized first-level process retained
  - c. Faculty discretion with first-time offenders
  
6. Strength of Message Sent to Students and Faculty
  - a. Integration with *Values and Moral Standards at FSU*
  - b. “XF” sanction

## FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC HONOR POLICY

### FINAL PROPOSAL TO FACULTY SENATE AND STUDENT SENATE

(Submitted August 19, 2004)

#### Introduction

The statement on *Values and Moral Standards at FSU* says: "The moral norm which guides conduct and informs policy at Florida State University is responsible freedom. Freedom is an important experience which the University, one of the freest of institutions, provides for all of its citizens – faculty, students, administrators, and staff. Freedom is responsibly exercised when it is directed by ethical standards." (*Values and moral standards at FSU* retrieved from <http://registrar.fsu.edu/9899general/universi.htm>)

The statement also addresses academic integrity: "The University aspires to excellence in its core activities of teaching, research, creative expression, and public service and is committed to the integrity of the academic process. The [Academic Honor Policy] is a specific manifestation of this commitment. Truthfulness in one's claims and representations and honesty in one's activities are essential in life and vocation, and the realization of truthfulness and honesty is an intrinsic part of the educational process." (*Values and moral standards at FSU* retrieved from <http://registrar.fsu.edu/9899general/universi.htm>)

Guided by these principles, this Academic Honor Policy outlines the University's expectations for students' academic work, the procedures for resolving alleged violations of those expectations, and the rights and responsibilities of students and faculty throughout the process.

#### FSU Academic Honor Pledge

I affirm my commitment to the concept of responsible freedom. I will be honest and truthful and will strive for personal and institutional integrity at Florida State University. I will abide by the Academic Honor Policy at all times.

#### Academic Honor Violations

Note: Examples have been provided for the purpose of illustration and are not intended to be all-inclusive. Instructors are responsible for reinforcing the importance of the Academic Honor Policy in their courses and for clarifying their expectations regarding collaboration and multiple submission of academic work.

**PLAGIARISM. Intentionally presenting the work of another as one's own (i.e., without proper acknowledgement of the source).**

**Typical Examples Include:** Using another's work from print, web, or other sources without acknowledging the source; quoting from a source without citation; using facts, figures, graphs, charts or information without acknowledgement of the source.

**CHEATING. Improper application of any information or material that is used in evaluating academic work.**

**Typical Examples Include:** Copying from another student's paper or receiving unauthorized assistance during a quiz, test or examination; using books, notes or other devices (e.g., calculators, cell phones, or computers) when these are not authorized; procuring without authorization a copy of or information about an examination before the scheduled exercise; unauthorized collaboration on exams.

**UNAUTHORIZED GROUP WORK. Unauthorized collaborating with others.**

**Typical Examples Include:** Working with another person or persons on any activity that is intended to be individual work, where such collaboration has not been specifically authorized by the instructor.

**FABRICATION, FALSIFICATION, AND MISREPRESENTATION. Intentional and unauthorized altering or inventing of any information or citation that is used in assessing academic work.**

**Typical Examples Include:** Inventing or counterfeiting data or information; falsely citing the source of information; altering the record of or reporting false information about practicum or clinical experiences; altering grade reports or other academic records; submitting a false excuse for absence or tardiness in a scheduled academic exercise; lying to an instructor to increase a grade.

**MULTIPLE SUBMISSION. Submitting substantial portions of the same academic work (including oral reports) for credit more than once without authorization.**

**Typical Examples Include:** Submitting the same paper for credit in two courses without instructor permission; making minor revisions in a credited paper or report (including oral presentations) and submitting it again as if it were new work.

**ABUSE OF ACADEMIC MATERIALS. Intentionally damaging, destroying, stealing, or making inaccessible library or other academic resource material.**

**Typical Examples Include:** Stealing or destroying library or reference materials needed for common academic purposes; hiding resource materials so others may not use them; destroying computer programs or files needed in academic work; stealing, altering, or intentionally damaging another student's notes or laboratory experiments. (*This refers only to abuse as related to an academic issue.*)

**COMPLICITY IN ACADEMIC DISHONESTY. Intentionally helping another to commit an act of academic dishonesty.**

**Typical Examples Include:** Knowingly allowing another to copy from one's paper during an examination or test; distributing test questions or substantive information about the material to be tested before a scheduled exercise; deliberately furnishing false information.

**ATTEMPTING to commit any offense as outlined above.**

## Student Rights

Students have the following important due process rights, which may have an impact on the appellate process:

- a) to be informed of all alleged violation(s), receive the complaint in writing (except in a Step 1 agreement, described in the Procedures Section, where the signed agreement serves as notice) and be given access to all relevant materials pertaining to the case.
- b) to receive an impartial hearing in a timely manner where they will be given a full opportunity to present information pertaining to the case.

Students are also accorded the following prerogatives:

- a) when possible, to discuss the allegations with the instructor.
- b) privacy, confidentiality, and personal security.
- c) to be assisted by an advisor who may accompany the student throughout the process but may not speak on the student's behalf.
- d) to choose not to answer any question that might be incriminating.
- e) to contest the sanctions of a first-level agreement and to appeal both the decision and sanctions of an Academic Honor Hearing.

The student has the right to continue in the course in question during the entire process. Once a student has received notice that he/she is being charged with an alleged violation of the Academic Honor Policy, the student is not permitted to withdraw or drop the course unless the final outcome of the process dictates that no academic penalty will be imposed. Should no final determination be made before the end of the term, the grade of "Incomplete" will be assigned until a decision is made.

Students should contact the Dean of Students Department for further information regarding their rights.

## Procedures for Resolving Cases

Step 1. Throughout the Step 1 process, the instructor has the responsibility to address academic honor allegations in a timely manner, and the student has the responsibility of responding to those allegations in a timely manner. For assistance with the Academic Honor Policy, students should consult the Dean of Students Department and instructors should consult the Office of the Dean of the Faculties.

If a student observes a violation of the Academic Honor Policy, he or she should report the incident to the instructor of the course. When an instructor believes that a student has violated the Academic Honor Policy in one of the instructor's classes, the instructor

must contact the Office of the Dean of the Faculties to report the alleged violation to determine whether to proceed with a Step 1 agreement. The instructor must also inform the department chair or dean. (Teaching assistants must seek guidance from their supervising faculty member.) However, faculty members or others who do not have administrative authority for enforcing the Academic Integrity Policy should not be informed of the allegation, unless they have established a legitimate need to know. If pursuing a Step 1 agreement is determined to be possible, the instructor shall discuss the evidence of academic dishonesty with the student and explore the possibility of a Step 1 agreement. Four possible outcomes of this discussion may occur:

- a. If the charge appears unsubstantiated, the instructor will drop the charge, and all documents created in investigating the allegation will be destroyed. The instructor should make this decision using the “preponderance of the evidence” standard and should inform the Office of the Dean of the Faculties.
- b. The student may accept responsibility for the violation and accept the academic sanction proposed by the instructor. In this case, any agreement involving an academic penalty must be put in writing and signed by both parties on the “Academic Honor Policy Step 1 Agreement” form, which must then be sent to the Dean of Students Department. This agreement becomes a confidential student record of academic dishonesty and will be removed from the student’s file five years from the date of the final decision in the case.
- c. The student may accept the responsibility for the violation, but contest the proposed academic sanction. In this circumstance, the student must submit the “Academic Honor Policy Referral to Contest Sanction” form along with supporting documentation to the Office of the Dean of the Faculties. The Dean of the Faculties (or designee) will review the submitted documentation to determine whether the instructor has imposed a sanction that is disproportionate to the offense. The Dean of the Faculties may affirm or modify the sanction as appropriate. The decision that results from this review is final.
- d. The student may deny responsibility. In this circumstance, the instructor submits the “Academic Honor Policy Hearing Referral” form along with supporting documentation to the Dean of the Faculties Office for an Academic Honor Policy Hearing. The student is issued a letter detailing the charges within ten class days of the receipt of the referral, and the schedule for the hearing will be set as soon as possible and within 90 days from the date of the letter. These timelines may be modified in unusual circumstances. Unless all parties agree, the hearing will not be held any sooner than 7 class days from the student’s receipt of the charge letter. The process then proceeds to Step 2.

If the student is found to have a prior record of academic dishonesty or the serious nature of the allegations merits a formal hearing, the instructor must refer the matter to Step 2 for an Academic Honor Policy Hearing by submitting the “Academic Honor Policy Hearing Referral” form to the Office of the Dean of the Faculties.

**Step 2. Academic Honor Policy Hearing.** A panel consisting of five members shall hear the case. The panel shall include: one faculty member appointed by the dean from the unit in which the course is taught; one faculty member appointed by the Dean of the Faculties who is not from that unit; and two students appointed through procedures established by the Dean of Students Department. The panel shall be chaired by the Dean of the Faculties (or designee), who is a non-voting member of the committee.

The hearing will be conducted in a non-adversarial manner with a clear focus on finding the facts within the academic context of the course. The student is presumed innocent going into the proceeding. After hearing all available and relevant information, the panel determines whether or not to find the student responsible for the alleged violation using the “preponderance of the evidence” standard. If the student is found responsible for the violation, the panel is informed about any prior record of academic honor policy violations and determines an academic sanction (and disciplinary sanction, if appropriate). In some cases, a Step 1 sanction may have been appropriately proposed prior to the convening of an Academic Honor Hearing. If the student is found responsible in these cases, the panel typically will impose a sanction no more severe than that which was proposed by the faculty member. The panel is required to provide a clear written justification for imposing a sanction more severe than the sanction proposed in Step 1.

The chair of the Academic Honor Policy hearing panel will report the decision to the student, the instructor, and the Dean of Students Department. The Dean of Students Department will report the decision to the University Registrar, if appropriate. If the student is found “responsible,” this outcome will be recorded with the Dean of Students Department and becomes a confidential student record of an Academic Honor Policy violation. Records in which suspension or a less severe sanction (including all academic sanctions) is imposed will be removed five years from the date of the final decision in the case. Records involving dismissal and expulsion will be retained permanently, except in cases where a dismissed student is readmitted. Those records will be removed five years from the date of the student’s readmission.

## Sanctions

### Step 1

This Step 1 procedure is implemented with first-offense allegations that do not involve egregious violations. The decision regarding whether an allegation is egregious is made by the Dean of the Faculties (or designee) and the instructor. The criteria used by the instructor to determine the proposed academic penalty should include the seriousness and the frequency of the alleged violation. The following sanctions are available in the Step 1 procedure.

- a. additional academic work
- b. a reduced grade (including “0” or “F”) for the assignment
- c. a reduced grade (including “F”) for the course



## Step 2

An Academic Honor Policy Hearing is held for all second offenses, for all first offenses that involve egregious violations of the Academic Honor Policy, for all offenses that involve simultaneous violations of the Student Conduct Code, and in all cases where the student denies responsibility for the alleged violation. The decision regarding whether an allegation is egregious is made by the Dean of the Faculties (or designee) and the instructor. In some cases, a Step 1 sanction may have been appropriately proposed prior to the convening of an Academic Honor Policy Hearing. If the student is found responsible in these cases, the panel typically will impose a sanction no more severe than that which was proposed by the faculty member. The panel is required to provide a clear written justification for imposing a sanction more severe than the sanction proposed in Step 1. Students will not be penalized solely for exercising their right to request a Step 2 hearing. The following sanctions are available in Step 2 (see the Procedures section) and may be imposed singly or in combination:

- a. additional academic work
- b. a reduced grade (including “0” or “F”) for the assignment
- c. a reduced grade (including “F”) for the course
- d. Reprimand (written or verbal)
- e. Educational Activities – attendance at educational programs, interviews with appropriate officials, planning and implementing educational programs, or other educational activities. Fees may be charged to cover the cost of educational activities.
- f. Restitution
- g. Conduct Probation – a period of time during which any further violation of the Academic Honor Policy may result in more serious sanctions being imposed. Some of the restrictions that may be placed on the student during the probationary period include, but are not limited to: participation in student activities or representation of the University on athletic teams or in other leadership positions.
- h. Disciplinary Probation – a period of time during which any further violation of the Academic Honor Policy puts the student’s status with the University in jeopardy. If the student is found “responsible” for another violation during the period of Disciplinary Probation, serious consideration will be given to imposing a sanction of Suspension, Dismissal, or Expulsion. The restrictions that may be placed on the student during this time period are the same as those under Conduct Probation.
- i. The grade of “F” (or “U” in S/U courses) with the designation “X” on the transcript, indicating that the grade was assigned as a result of an Academic Honor Policy violation. If the hearing panel imposes the “XF” penalty, it will stipulate the exact conditions for removal of the “X” notation. Following the panel decision, the “X” notation will be removed at any time, when the student completes one of the following, as determined by the hearing panel: a relevant course; an analysis paper that meets specific criteria set by the panel; or an alternative educational

activity assigned by the panel. The “F” will remain on the student’s permanent academic record.

- j. Suspension – Separation from the University for a specified period, not to exceed two years.
- k. Dismissal – Separation from the University for an indefinite period of time. Readmission is possible but not guaranteed and will only be considered after two years from the effective date of the dismissal, based on meeting all admission criteria and obtaining clearance from the Dean of Students or designee.
- l. Expulsion – Separation from the University without the possibility of readmission.
- m. Withholding of diplomas, transcripts, or other records for a specified period of time.
- n. Revocation of degree, in cases where an egregious offense is discovered after graduation.

### Appeals

Decisions of the Academic Honor Policy Hearing Panel may be appealed to the Academic Honor Policy Appeal Committee, a standing four-member committee composed of two faculty appointed by the President and two students appointed by the Vice President for Student Affairs. The chair will be appointed annually by the President, and members will serve two-year renewable terms. In case of a tie vote regarding a case, the committee will submit a written report to the Provost, who will then make the final determination.

On appeal, the burden of proof shifts to the student to prove that an error has occurred. The only recognized grounds for appeal are:

1. Due process errors involving violations of a student’s rights that substantially affected the outcome of the initial hearing.
2. Demonstrated prejudice against the charged student by any panel member. Such prejudice must be evidenced by a conflict of interest, bias, pressure, or influence that precluded a fair and impartial hearing.
3. New information that was not available at the time of the original hearing.
4. A sanction that is extraordinarily disproportionate to the offense committed.
5. The preponderance of the evidence presented at the hearing does not support a finding of responsible. Appeals based on this consideration will be limited to a review of the record of the initial hearing.

The procedures followed during the appeals process are:

1. The student should file a written letter of appeal to the Office of the Dean of the Faculties within 10 class days after being notified of the Academic Honor Policy Hearing Panel decision. This letter should outline the grounds for the appeal (see 1-5 above) and should provide supporting facts and relevant documentation.
2. The Academic Honor Policy Appeal Committee will review this letter of appeal and will hear the student and any witnesses called by the student, except in appeals based on consideration #5 above. The committee may also gather any additional information it deems necessary to make a determination in the case.

3. The Appeals Committee may affirm, modify, or reverse the initial panel decision, or it may order a new hearing to be held. This decision becomes final agency action when it is approved by the Provost. In cases where the student is found responsible, the decision becomes a confidential student record of academic dishonesty.
4. Appellate decisions are communicated in writing to the student, the instructor, the Office of the Dean of the Faculties, and the Dean of Students Department within 30 class days of the appellate hearing.

### Academic Honor Policy Committee

An Academic Honor Policy Committee shall be appointed by the University President. The Committee will include: three faculty members, selected from a list of six names provided by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee and three students, selected from a list of six names provided by the Student Senate. The Dean of the Faculties or designee and the Dean of Students or designee shall serve *ex officio*. Faculty members will serve three-year staggered terms, and students will serve one-year terms. The committee will meet at least once a semester. It will monitor the operation and effectiveness of the Academic Honor Policy, work with the Faculty Senate and the Student Senate to educate all members of the community regarding academic integrity, and make recommendations for changes to the policy.

### Amendment Procedures

Amendments to the Academic Honor Policy may be initiated by the Academic Honor Policy Committee, the Faculty Senate, the Student Senate, and/or the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Amendments to the policy must be approved by both the Faculty Senate and the Student Senate.



The Florida State University  
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2460

*Division of Undergraduate Studies  
Office of the Dean*

### **Freshman Interest Groups (FIGs)**

A FIG is a pre-packaged cluster of high-demand freshman courses that have been linked by a theme or academic program. There are several advantages to registering for a FIG:

- It makes the registration process very easy; you can register for most of your classes at once.
- Take classes with the same 20-25 students, so even a lecture class will seem small
- Take courses that fulfill general education requirements.
- Meet students with similar interests
- Form your own FSU community.

One of the most significant advantages to registering for a FIG is enrolling in the FIG Colloquium HUM3930. This course is designed to provide you a set of experiences that will introduce you to the academic culture at the Florida State University. The objectives for this course are as follows:

- To reflect on the FIG topic and develop an understanding for pursuing it within the FSU scholarly community.
- To learn how to identify and reflect on your in-class and out-of-class learning experiences and how to utilize your reflections for learning about yourself and planning for the future.
- To reflect on your class experiences during your first semester and to learn about the different ways in which the FSU calls upon you to demonstrate your learning.
- To reflect on your out-of-class experiences during your first semester and to learn how you can connect your identities and interests with the people and places of the FSU community.
- To learn how to interact with your instructors and fellow students in ways which support your own goals and the values of the FSU community.

## UFF-FSU Collective Bargaining Update, 22-Sept-04

Article #	Topic	pp	Latest BOT Proposal	Latest UFF Proposal	Tentative Agreement	Status for UFF Team
Preamble	Preamble	1	04-Mar-04			back burner
1.	Recognition	1	16-Aug-04	23-Aug-04	near?	waiting on BOT
2.	Consultation	1	3-May-04	2-Jun-04	2-Jun-04	Done!
3.	UFF Rights	3	23-Aug-04	30-Aug-04	near?	waiting on BOT
4.	Board Rights	1	26-Apr-04	15-Mar-04	26-Apr-04	Done!
5.	Academic Freedom & Resp.	1	02-Jun-04	21-Jun-04	21-Jun-04	Done!
6.	Nondiscrimination	1	23-Aug-04	23-Aug-04	23-Aug-04	Done!
7.	Minutes, Rules, etc.	1	19-May-04	2-Jun-04	2-Jun-04	Done!
8.	Appointment	6		2-Jun-04		waiting on BOT
9.	Assignment of Resp.	3	16-Apr-04	2-Jun-04		waiting on BOT
10.	Performance Evaluations	4		21-Jun-04		waiting on BOT
11.	Evaluation File	1	16-Apr-04	2-Jun-04	8-Jul-04	Done!
12.	Nonreappointment	2	23-Aug-04	8-Jul-04		needs discussion
13.	Layoff & Recall	2		8-Jul-04		waiting on BOT
14.	Promotion	2		4-Aug-04		waiting on BOT
15.	Tenure & Permanent Status	4		4-Aug-04		waiting on BOT
16.	Disciplinary Action, etc.	1				working
17.	Leaves	11	04-Mar-04	16-Aug-04		waiting on BOT
18.	Inventions & Works	3				working
19.	Conflict of Interest etc.	3		26-Jul-04		waiting on BOT
20.	Grievance	6	16-Jun-04	30-Aug-04		waiting on BOT
21.	Other Employee Rights	1		30-Aug-04		waiting on BOT
22.	Professional Dev. & Sabbat.	5		26-Jul-04		waiting on BOT
23.	Salaries	4		16-Jun-04		waiting on BOT
24.	Benefits	4				next or soon
25.	UFF Deductions	1	26-Apr-04	3-May-04	3-May-04	Done!
26.	Shared Governance	1	21-Jun-04	21-Jun-04	21-Jun-04	Done!
27.	Maintenance of Benefits	1	31-Mar-04	15-Mar-04	31-Mar-04	Done!
28.	Miscellaneous Provisions	1	31-Mar-04	15-Mar-04	31-Mar-04	Done!
29.	Severability	1	22-Feb-04	14-May-04	14-May-04	Done!
30.	Amendment & Duration	1		15-Mar-04		waiting on BOT
31.	Totality of Agreement	1	22-Feb-04	19-May-04	2-Jun-04	Done!
32.	Definitions	3		15-Mar-04		back burner
App. A	Position Codes in Unit	2		19-May-04		waiting on BOT
App. B	UFF Dues Check-Off Form	4	3-May-04	3-May-04	3-May-04	Done!
App. C	Grievance Form	2				next or soon
App. D	Request for Review Form	2				next or soon
App. E	Notice of Arbitration Form	1				next or soon
App. F	Reserved	1				
App. G	Salary Increase Notification	1				
App. H	Assign. Dispute Procedure	1				next or soon
App. X & Y	P&T Criteria & Procs.			4-Aug-04		waiting on BOT