



MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
OCTOBER 19, 2005
DODD HALL AUDITORIUM
3:35 P.M.

I. Regular Session

The regular session of the 2005-06 Faculty Senate was held on Wednesday, October 19, 2005. Faculty Senate President James Cobbe presided.

The following members attended the Senate meeting:

N. Abell, J. Ahlquist, M. Allen, A. Arnold, L. Aspinwall, T. Baker, S. Beckman, B. Bower, J. Bowers, G. Burnett, M. Childs, D. Clendinning, J. Clendinning, P. Coats, J. Cobbe, R. Coleman, C. Connerly, M. Cooper, D. Corbin, L. deHaven-Smith, L. Epstein, K. Erndl, J. Fiorito, S. Fiorito, J. Gathegi, J. Geringer, P. Gilmer, R. Glueckauf, C. Greek, N. Greenbaum, M. Guy, M. Hartline, L. Hawkes, H. Hawkins, P. Hensel, C. Hofacker, D. Houle, E. Hull, J. James, A. Lan, S. Lewis, S. Losh, E. Madden, C. Madsen, N. Mazza, R. Miles, L. Milligan, D. Moore, R. Morris, A. Mullis, P. O'Sullivan, D. Rice, P. Rikvold, J. Roberts, D. Schlagenhauf, J. Sobanjo, D. Pompper, J. Standley, N. Trafford, G. Tyson, C. Upchurch, E. Walker, C. Ward, J. Whyte, J. Wulff.

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

D. Abood, E. Aldrovandi, A. Archbold, V. Richard Auzenne, J. Baker, G. Bates, A. Bathke (D. Paradise), F. Bunea, S. Carroll, V. Dobrosavljevic (N. Bonesteel), J. Dodge, L. Edwards, R. Fichter, P. Gielisse, J. Grant, V. Hagopian (B. Berg), K. Harris, A. Koschnik, W. Landing (D. Nowacek), W. Leparulo, T. Logan, T. Matherly, R. Navarro, D. Odita, P. Orr, S. Palanki, A. Payer, D. Peterson, J. Peterson, S. Pfeiffer, A. Plant, T. Ratliffe, M. Seidenfeld, K. Stoddard, J. Taylor, N. Thagard, Q. Wang.

II. Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of the September 21, 2005 meeting were approved as distributed.

III. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as distributed.

IV. Report of the Steering Committee, J. Standley

The Faculty Senate Steering Committee met 3 times since the last Senate meeting and met with the Provost once.

We finalized editorial revisions to the Policy and Guidelines for implementation of the BOG mandated Academic Learning Compacts that were distributed to you and will be voted on today. We also assisted with development of the FAQ sheet to answer questions about this process. We remind you that the policy and guidelines are separate issues, and it is only urgent that we finalize and pass the policy today. It would be good to agree on the guidelines as well, but they are less vital because they are not required by the State.

We have continued the discussion of OMNI problems. There will be an update to the software in January that will hopefully solve some of the worst problems. Other fine-tuning can occur after that update.

The university's initiative for branding (public relations/media icons and slogans) is being developed by three sub-committees: message management (getting news out); website design; and core message/tag line. We have recommended that faculty be given an opportunity to suggest and review media slogans that will be used to represent us.

With the Provost, we discussed the Pathways to Excellence Initiative and arranged for Ross Ellington to provide information to you today. We wanted faculty to be informed and involved from the beginning of this new initiative for campus development. We currently average 90+ new tenure-track faculty hires/year, but only 14% of these are net growth, the rest represent replacements. In the new initiative the University hopes to add 200 new tenure track faculty over the next five years, primarily in clusters like the research cluster announced 2 weeks ago.

We discussed the status of the "wireless campus" initiative. Approximately 90% of the outside of the main campus is completed and old buildings are being rewired as they are renovated. We advocated for Alumni Village to become wireless and were informed that students could request that from the Housing Office.

After 4 years of discussion and negotiation an agreement has been reached and FSU is joining the Workers Rights Consortium. The steering committee and student government are jointly proposing to President TK Wetherell that he should establish a University Licensing Oversight committee with faculty representation to evaluate and monitor compliance, as recommended in our original resolution on the subject in 2001.

The Steering Committee would like to remind senators that voting has begun on the UFF Contract and will continue through Oct. 20. All faculty in the bargaining unit are eligible to vote, including all tenure line faculty not in medicine or law, also assistants in _____, associates in _____, instructors, and lecturers. If you have any question about whether you are eligible, an Appendix in the back of the contract lists eligible positions.

There is discussion within the Orientation program of designating a text to be read by all incoming 1st year students which will then be the topic of small discussion groups in various settings during orientation week. A committee is being established to discuss the implementation of this concept and the selection of a specific text.

The Steering Committee endorses the name change request of the current School of Motion Picture, Television, and Recording Arts. It is recognized that this will serve a dual function. It will clearly differentiate the College from for-profit, vocational training courses in these fields. It will also underscore the higher purpose of the educational thrust at FSU to foster life long learning, citizenship, artistic endeavor, and preparation for significant contributions to the professional field of filmmaking. Therefore, it is moved that the Senate approve the request of the School of Motion Picture, Television, and Recording Arts to be renamed College of Motion Picture, Television, and Recording Arts.

The motion passed unanimously.

V. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Undergraduate Policy Committee, S. Lewis

The Undergraduate Policy Committee has met twice this semester and reviewed a number of syllabi that have been submitted from across the campus for inclusion in the liberal studies program. While many courses are still under consideration, I'd like to announce that the following classes have been approved for the Computer Skills Competency as of Fall, 2005:

ARE 4455: Computer Graphics in Art Education
 ART 4926C: Introduction to Digital Imaging Technology
 ECH 3854: Chemical Engineering Computations
 EEK 3750L: Digital Logic Laboratory
 MUS 2360: Introduction to Music Technology
 PHZ 4151 C: Computational Physics Laboratory

In addition, ANT 4175: Archaeology of the Islamic World has been approved for the Multicultural Understanding Competency as an x type course.

b. Library Committee, J. Clendinning

The Library Committee has met in September and October. We have heard reports from Sharon Schwerzel from the Science Library, Robert McDonald regarding the ALEPH system and its implementation. At that meeting we received copies of Faculty Guide to Resources and Services. These are available at the library and have a lot of information if you need publications so please look for them when you visit the library. At our last meeting we focused on issues regarding collection development and acquisitions. We heard from Rebecca Bichel, Associate Director and Marlene Harris and Roy Zeigler regarding that. We've begun a systematic process of hearing from different departments of the library regarding their activities and reviewing some of the different functions of the libraries. At the November 2 meeting we will be hearing regarding the proposed materials budget and circulation. At the next meeting on November 30 we will be looking closely at some financial information regarding the library.

A few items that have emerged include reactivating the liaisons program so you may be hearing more about that to foster more interaction between academic units and the library personnel that are working with purchasing more materials, acquisition and collection development issues. You should be receiving shortly information regarding departmental acquisition budgets.

I do have one motion for the Senate. In reviewing and discussing some of the issues for the libraries, one of the things that has emerged as being a problem that is significant is the lack of space. Dirac was built with an extra floor that was meant for expansion space and that expansion has never taken place and the space is now much needed. Strozier is considered inadequate for the collection it is intended to hold and also for its intended use as a research library. With that in mind the Faculty Senate Library Committee has brought forth a motion for the Faculty Senate. It is moved that the Faculty Senate urges the Florida State University administration to prioritize funding University Library facilities including an additional floor to Dirac Library and additional space for Strozier Library in its PECO budget requests. **The motion passed unanimously.**

VI. Old Business

- a. State Mandated Academic Learning Compacts Policy and Guidelines, J. Cobbe

It was moved that Faculty Senate adopt The State Mandated Academic Learning Compacts Policy. **The motion passed unanimously. (See addendum 1.)**

It was moved that Faculty Senate adopt The State Mandated Academic Learning Compacts Guidelines. **The motion passed unanimously. (See addendum 2.)**

- b. Grade Appeals System, J. Cobbe

It was moved that the Faculty Senate pass the revised Grade Appeals System. **The motion passed, 66 yea and 2 nay. (See addendum 3.)**

VII. New Business

- a. "Pathways to Excellence", R. Ellington, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

See addendum 4.

VIII. University Welfare

- a. **Updates on Bargaining and Related Matters, J. Fiorito**

Contract ratification voting is underway. The polls are open tomorrow at Dirac Library from 9am to 12noon, and at Strozier Library from 1pm-4pm. All faculty

members in the General Faculty bargaining unit are eligible to vote, and I hope all of you will urge our colleagues to review the contract and vote in the ratification ballot. Faculty votes, positive or negative, help convey that faculty are concerned about such things as shared governance, academic freedom, tenure, nondiscrimination, and various other matters in our contract as well as salaries. The UFF-FSU Chapter leadership urges a positive vote, but above all, we urge faculty to vote. We'll tally the votes at 4pm tomorrow at Strozier. All who care to observe are welcome.

Following ratification, we will be asking for faculty input as we resume negotiations to finalize 2005-06 salary terms, and on salaries and other matters for the 2006-07 academic year. Please encourage our colleagues to help UFF represent them by sharing their views.

Information on the tentative agreement and numerous other matters of interest to faculty are available at our UFF-FSU web site (www.uff-fsu.org).

Today's earlier discussion of SMALCs (state mandated academic learning compacts), our discussion a few minutes ago on the "Pathways to Excellence" initiative, and recent news of a lawsuit against the University of California – Berkeley over a web site supporting K-12 science education on evolution, all remind us that important decisions affecting faculty are made at the Board of Governors, in the Governor's office, and in the state legislature. As many Senators noted in discussion of the "Pathways" initiative, tremendous difficulties lie ahead if we can't improve state funding. All the evidence says FSU is already very efficient in terms of teaching and research output relative to resource inputs. The other side of that is that there aren't a lot of excess resources waiting to be redirected. Any serious effort at internal reallocation is going to be like starving dogs fighting over meat scraps.

We have politically well-connected trustees, a politically well-connected president, and friends in the legislature. We the faculty also have to get involved in improving funding for higher education and for FSU in particular.

That's why UFF is conducting a "Legislative Action Campaign," and I urge Senators and other faculty members to sign on and support the campaign. If a volunteer has not yet contacted you, one probably soon will. I also will be happy to try to point one in your direction if you contact me (jfiorito@fsu.edu).

And one last thing today. Regardless of the faculty vote on our tentative agreement, I hope everyone will appreciate the tremendous effort a few faculty members have devoted to negotiating this contract, under circumstances that were often very difficult. We have had major time and effort contributions from faculty not directly represented in the Senate, and from our statewide organization, but Faculty Senate members have always constituted a solid majority of our faculty bargaining team.

I don't think that should surprise anyone. People who care about FSU and faculty governance also tend to see the value of contractual protection for faculty rights. To

borrow from Senate President Cobbe's remarks last month, these are the people who don't accept the exit mechanism as the answer to all things, feel loyalty to FSU, and believe in the value of voice.

In particular, I'd like to recognize the efforts of Senator Ted Baker, our chief negotiator. I think of him as our "workhorse," although he prefers the analogy of an ox since that is the animal associated with his birth year on the Chinese calendar. Regardless of your animal analogy preferences, no one can deny Senator Baker's contribution to faculty voice. I hope you will join me in expressing appreciation to Senator Baker.

b. Omicron Delta Kappa, D. Moore

Senator Dennis Moore tapped Senator Jayne Standley into Omicron Delta Kappa.

IX. Announcements by Deans and Other Administrative Officers

There were no announcements.

X. Announcements by Provost Abele

Provost Abele was not in attendance.

XI. Announcements by President Wetherell

President Wetherell was not in attendance.

XII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:52 p.m.



Melissa Crawford,
Secretary to the Faculty

University Board of Trustees Policy:

State Mandated Academic Learning Compacts

I. PURPOSE

This policy governs the development, implementation, and review of State Mandated Academic Learning Compacts. The policy shall be consistent with and further the requirements of the Board of Governors in Policy Guideline, #02.05.15.

II. ACCOUNTABILITY/ RESPONSIBILITY

Primary responsibility for implementation of these guidelines resides with the Office of Academic Affairs.

III. PROCEDURES FOR IMPLEMENTATION

(1) State University System Academic Learning Compact (SMALC)

A State mandated Academic Learning Compact shall be comprised of the identification, for each academic Bachelor's program, of what it is that students will have learned by the end of the program, and how that learning will be measured and validated above and beyond course grades. The published compact for each degree program will identify core student learning outcomes in three areas: content/discipline knowledge and skills, communication skills, and critical thinking skills.

(2) Development of the Compacts

The faculty of each baccalaureate program listed on the State University System Academic Degree Inventory will develop an Academic Learning Compact.

(3) Submission of State Mandated Academic Learning Compacts

The Department Chair or Program Director will be responsible for submitting the core student learning outcomes associated with a degree program for each academic year into the existing university institutional effectiveness repository. The Chair of the Undergraduate Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate will be responsible for submitting core student learning outcomes associated with the liberal studies curriculum. Each outcome must be written in clear, concise, jargon-free language.

The core student learning outcomes and their related assessments, results, improvements and review will be recorded in and conform to the template in the university institutional effectiveness repository.

Student Learning outcomes and assessment statements along with results and improvements statements for the previous academic year shall be entered into the institutional effectiveness portal annually between August 15th and October 15th.

(4) Assessment of State Mandated Academic Learning Compacts

Each student learning outcome within a State Mandated Academic Learning Compact must identify a specific learning result that can be measured and be assessed in accordance with the university guidelines for State Mandated Academic Learning Compacts.

The assessment or method used to measure performance on a student learning outcome must constitute a valid measurement. The validity of an individual measure must be established by both internal and external methods as specified in the university guidelines for State Mandated Academic Learning Compacts.

(5) Reporting and Analyzing the Results of Assessment

The results of assessing student performance on a student learning outcome must be reported thoroughly and clearly, and include an analysis of the findings along with any concerns that the analysis identifies.

(6) Improvement and Action Plans

Each student learning outcome must be considered in an improvements and action plan statement that is supported by the results of the assessment and their analysis. The recommended improvement and action plan should note how student performance can be improved or sustained, and whether the assessment mechanism is performing as expected.

(7) Review of the Learning Outcomes and Associated Information

Each of the student learning outcomes and associated information shall be subject to annual review in accordance with university guidelines. The Chair, Program Director or designee shall be responsible for the initial review of the student learning outcomes and associated information concerning a degree program. The Office of Academic Affairs is responsible for overall assessment of the policy annually and, at three-year intervals, shall develop, implement and report on evaluation efforts (including external validations) necessary to corroborate that the assessments actually measure student achievement against the expected core learning outcomes.

(8) Programmatic Uses

State Mandated Academic Learning Compacts shall be an integral part of the university quality enhancement process and be included in the State University System program review process.

The Documentation required for and certified for graduation by each major, program or department to the Office of the University Registrar shall constitute satisfaction that individual students have met the requirements of the State Mandated Academic Learning Compact.

(9) Dissemination of the Compacts

State Mandated Academic Learning Compacts for each Bachelor's degree program will be made readily available to students electronically at a site initially listed on the university's home page. The Academic Learning Compacts must be made available to students beginning no later than the end of the fall semester of 2005. The web site will provide current and prospective students access to the outcome statements of Academic Learning Compacts, edited and rendered in clear, concise, colloquial descriptions of what knowledge, skills and abilities active and successful participants have attained and be able to do after completion of the requirements for each baccalaureate degree. The web site will list the types of assessments used in each program and will be updated as needed.

IV. SCHEDULE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Full implementation is contingent upon approval of these guidelines by the Faculty Senate and the University Board of Trustees.

Guidelines

State Mandated Academic Learning Compacts

1. PURPOSE

These guidelines are designed to provide clearly defined procedures for developing, implementing, and reviewing Academic Learning Compacts and their associated activities. They complement and further university policy. See Policy on State Mandated Academic Learning Compacts and Appendix 1, Board of Governors, “Academic Learning Compacts”, Policy Guideline, #02.05.15.

2. ACCOUNTABILITY/ RESPONSIBILITY

Primary responsibility for implementation of these guidelines resides with the Office of Academic Affairs and the Associate Vice President of Budgeting, Institutional Effectiveness and Planning. The Associate Vice President is charged with oversight of the processes detailed in these guidelines and reporting the results of the processes to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs and the Vice-President for Academic Quality and External Programs. Reports prepared for the State Board of Governors regarding state mandated academic learning compacts will be submitted through the university data administrator.

3. PROCEDURES FOR IMPLEMENTATION

a. Definitions

For purposes of these guidelines, the following definitions shall apply:

1. A **State University System Academic Learning Compact** is comprised of the identification, for each academic Bachelor’s program, of what it is that students will have learned by the end of the program, and how that learning will be measured and validated above and beyond course grades. The compact for each degree program identifies clearly articulated core student learning outcomes in three areas: content/discipline knowledge and skills, communication skills, and critical thinking skills.
2. **Student Learning Outcomes** indicate what a student will be able to do at the end of a course of study that she or he couldn’t do at the beginning of that course of study. They are the knowledge, skills, and abilities that a student has attained at the end (or as a result) of his or her engagement in a particular set of higher education experiences. A Student Learning Outcome should not describe a process. Student learning outcomes must be framed as specific, measurable results whose attainment can be assessed after the student has undertaken a set of education experiences.
3. **Core Student Learning Outcomes** are those selected student learning outcomes that are central to a degree program and are indicative of what active and successful participants in the joint process of teaching and learning will know and be able to do as recipients of the baccalaureate degree in a particular program of study. Core learning outcomes will

generally be associated with courses required for the degree, with capstone courses, with a variety of designated student experiences, or with evaluative exercises undertaken by all students in a program or course of study.

4. **Assessment** is the systematic collection, review and use of information about student performance in an educational program. It is undertaken for the purpose of improving student learning and educational programs.
5. A **Rubric** is a “set of rules printed in some special way and telling one what to do.” Within assessment circles, a rubric is a prescribed “guide used to score performance assessments in a reliable, fair, and valid manner and is generally composed of dimensions for judging student performance, a scale for rating performances on each dimension, and standards of excellence for specified performance levels.” (cited at: <http://pals.sri.com/pals/guide/glossary.html>)
6. A **Capstone Course** is typically thought of as a course for undergraduates who are nearing the completion of their studies that builds on skills and knowledge acquired in previous courses and provides an opportunity for students to demonstrate the competencies and communication skills they have acquired in the course of study. Capstone courses are often required of all students in a program for graduation.
7. An **Embedded Examination** is an evaluation that occurs within a single course designed to assess specific student learning outcomes.
8. **Validity** shall mean how well a measurement, including any systematic scoring procedure, captures what it purports to measure. A measurement is said to be valid when the scores derived from a given indicator can be interpreted in terms of the concept that it aims to operationalize. Validation is often said to be part of a process that integrates multiple sources of evidence and combines logical argument and empirical justification in a way needed to establish intersubjective validity.
9. **External Validation** entails the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data conducted by an individual, group of individuals, or organization outside the entity being evaluated that results in agreement that internal scoring procedures fairly capture what they purport to measure.
10. A **Program** is a set of activities guided by clearly stated goals designed to achieve approved purposes through an integrated course of academic study. (e.g. a degree program)
11. **Goal** is the broad statement that describes the desired impact or outcome of a program.

12. **Outputs** are the products and services delivered by the program. They include the quantity of units produced, services provided, and people served such as the number of graduates of a program.
13. A **Process** is a series of operations or activities that result in a program output. They include operations such as the number of courses taken or the prerequisite courses satisfied.
14. **Bachelor's program** shall mean Baccalaureate Degree programs found in the Degree Inventory maintained by the university in compliance with s. 1007.25, Florida Statutes. The University Departmental Degree Program Inventory is a listing of FSU Degree Programs, approved by the Division of Colleges and Universities (DCU) of the Florida Board of Education. Included are programs approved and offered by departments within the Schools and Colleges of the university. This departmental list includes official degree program names and the Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) code of the degree program approved by the DCU for which State Mandates Academic Learning Compacts will be prepared. The university's degree inventory is located at <http://www.ir.fsu.edu/Factbooks/2004-05/CIP.pdf>.
15. **Communication Skills** generally involve the ability to conduct written and oral communication in different modes with different audiences. These skills include the abilities to organize information clearly and coherently; respond to written sources ; present information orally in a clear and convincing fashion appropriate to the topic and purpose; adapt style for different audiences; and use images as a communication tool. They also involve demonstrating the ability to discuss ideas clearly with others, to hear and respond to questions, and to assess critical responses appropriately.
16. **Critical thinking skills** generally describe reasoning that involves framing a situation or problem and supporting the solution. They involve such processes as interpretation, analysis, evaluation, inference, reflection, argumentation and disposition.
17. **Content/discipline knowledge and skills** generally describe the concepts, ideas, principles, relationships and information a student emerging from a program of study is expected to know and be able to use. They include common forms of representation, analogies, illustrations, examples, explanations, demonstrations and performance. They include the theoretical, conceptual, methodological, creative and aesthetic elements of a discipline.

Development of State Mandated Academic Learning Compacts

1. The Faculty of each baccalaureate program listed on the State University System Academic Degree Inventory will develop an Academic Learning Compact that identifies,

at a minimum, seven expected core student learning outcomes for its program graduates in the areas of:

- a. content/discipline knowledge and skills;
- b. communication skills; and
- c. critical thinking skills.

The instrument or mechanism used to assess each outcome may deal with more than one outcome, but each outcome must be assessed separately.

The Faculty serving on and working with the Undergraduate Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate shall develop core student learning communications skills outcomes associated with the general requirements of the liberal studies curriculum.

2. The student learning outcomes of each Baccalaureate program will be clearly related to the mission and goals of that degree program and clearly tied to course or other requirements necessary for graduation. The student learning outcome statement should not describe either educational processes or outputs.
3. The student learning outcomes associated with the requirements of the liberal studies curriculum will be clearly related to the approved communication liberal studies goals and competencies approved by the Undergraduate Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate.
4. Each student learning outcome will state in which courses or at what time in their academic career students will evidence that the results cited will be attained. The course of study of every graduate of a program must include core student learning outcomes in content/discipline knowledge and skills, communication skills, and critical thinking skills that are assessed with mechanisms that ensure that graduates have met the criteria of the Compact.
5. The Chair of the Department or Program Director in which the degree program resides is responsible for reporting the State Mandated Academic Learning Compact for that program.

Submission of State Mandated Academic Learning Compacts

1. The Department Chair or Program Director will be responsible for submitting the core student learning outcomes associated with a degree program into the university institutional effectiveness portal in accordance with its operating procedures and guidelines. The Chair of the Undergraduate Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate will be responsible for submitting the core student learning outcomes associated with the liberal studies curriculum.
2. The core student learning outcomes will be configured to conform to the template in the institutional effectiveness portal for recording outcomes, assessment, results and improvements.

3. The State Mandated Academic Compact for each bachelor's degree program will be recorded in the responsible academic department's (or program's) file within the institutional effectiveness portal. The Student Learning Outcomes associated with the liberal studies curriculum will be recorded in the appropriate folder within the institutional effectiveness portal listed under the Dean of Undergraduate Studies.
4. The detail of assessment mechanisms along with results and associated analyzes should be stored in the portal file bank.
5. Under state and federal law, the information that can be legally included in the portal is rigorously restricted. Federal and state privacy laws protect student educational records. [The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (20 U.S.C. § 1232g; 34 CFR Part 99) is a Federal law that protects the privacy of student education records. The law applies to all schools and universities that receive funds under an applicable program of the U.S. Department of Education. Section 1002.22, Florida Statutes, is a similar state law that also gives students privacy rights in their records.] A university found in violation is subject to severe penalties, including the loss of federal funding. You should be exceptionally careful about the information you submit for entry into the Institutional Effectiveness Portal. Please do not upload information into the Portal that contains specific information about a student unless it complies with university policy. Also, do not upload information that lists a student's social security number, grade point average or standardized test scores. When in doubt, do not enter or upload information that provides information on specific students. Before uploading or releasing student information, you should check with the University Registrar to see if the student has indicated he or she does not want his or her name included. For university policy, see http://registrar.fsu.edu/dir_class/spring/registration_information.htm
http://registrar.fsu.edu/bulletin/undergrad/info/acad_regs.htm#ReleaseStudentInfo
<http://registrar.fsu.edu/bulletin/undergrad/info/registrar.htm#AccessToRecords>
<http://registrar.fsu.edu/bulletin/grad/info/registrar.htm#AccessRecords>
<http://www.vpfa.fsu.edu/policies/bmanual/safeguard.html>
6. Unless expressly noted, student learning outcomes will be assessed for the period of the Fall semester plus the Spring and Summer Semesters of the following calendar year.
7. Student Learning outcomes and assessment statements for the current extended academic year should be entered into the institutional effectiveness portal annually between August 15th and September 15th. Results statements along with improvement and action plans related to the previous academic year should be entered between August 15th and October 15th.

Assessment of State Mandated Academic Learning Compacts

1. Each student learning outcome must state a specific learning result that can be measured for a well defined period that will be reported in an assessment statement.
2. Each student learning outcome assessment statement must specify the standard or criterion that establishes successful performance on the measure or rubric.

3. Each student learning outcome assessment statement must identify the corresponding assessments and methods used to determine how well student learning matches those articulated expectations. The outcome statement should identify the timeframe, in which the assessment or method is conducted along with any special conditions, if necessary, that might affect the evaluation.
4. The assessment or method associated with each student learning outcome should provide evidence as to the percentage of students of the program that have met the standard or criterion of each of student learning outcome.
5. The assessment or method used to measure performance on a student learning outcome should constitute a valid measurement. The validity of an individual measure can be established in a number of ways, but should involve evaluation of the measure by faculty or individuals external to the particular course or circumstance in which the assessment is conducted. Validity can be established by review and approval of an assessment or method by a group of designated faculty such as a department curriculum committee or through use of an externally validated assessment tool. The technique used to establish validity along with the evaluation resulting from application of the technique should be documented in writing and filed with the appropriate department Chair or Program Director. Such documentation may also be maintained in the associated file bank within the institutional effectiveness portal.
6. The outcome statement should identify the group or individual responsible for conducting the assessment.
7. More than one single assessment measure or method can be used to assess a student learning outcome.

Reporting and Analyzing the Results of Assessment

1. The results of assessing student performance on a student learning outcome must be reported in the institutional effectiveness portal using the same measure or method identified in the Assessment Statement. The Program Director or Department Chair is responsible for reporting results in the institutional effectiveness portal.
2. The results should be reported thoroughly and clearly. Summary statements should be representative of the full range and distribution of results.
3. The results statement must indicate how the results compare to the standards set in the assessment statement and note the size and direction of any deviation from the standard.
4. The results statement should include an analysis of the results and consider any concerns raised by the assessment.
5. The results should identify the number or percentage of students whose initial performance on an assessment meets the standard or criterion.
6. Details of the results shall be maintained by the department responsible for the assessment in accordance with student privacy requirements.

Improvement and Action Plans

1. The results and analysis statement for each student learning outcome must be considered in an improvements and action plan statement.
2. Recommended improvements and action plans must be clearly supported by the results and analysis statement.
3. Recommended improvements and action plans should be feasible, include an associated timetable for implementation, and help insure continuous improvement or sustained performance at a high level in student learning or the degree program.
4. The budgetary implication of any recommended improvements or action plans should be noted appropriately within the reporting system.
5. Recommended improvement and action plans should designate the individual or organization responsible for implementation and oversight.
6. The recommended improvement and action plan should note whether the assessment mechanism is performing as expected. The department, dean's office or responsible administrative unit, on a schedule determined by the appropriate review authority, should develop, implement and report on evaluation efforts (including external validations) necessary to corroborate that the assessments actually measure student achievement against the expected core learning outcomes. Such evaluations will serve to validate the confidence levels associated with assessment mechanisms used in the program, and results will be used to improve student achievement and program effectiveness.

Review of the Student Learning Outcomes and Associated Information

1. Submission and review of the student learning outcomes and associated information shall involve two steps: the first step consists of initial submission and the associated review of outcomes and assessment, and the second involves the submission and review of results, analysis and improvement plans.

In September annually, The Student Learning Outcomes for each degree program and for the student learning outcomes associated with the liberal studies curriculum shall be submitted, reviewed and approved by officials at three levels beyond the initial submission. The Program Director or designee shall be responsible for the initial submission and review of the student learning outcomes and associated information concerning a degree program. This shall constitute the level 1 review.

2. Following development and submission of the Student Learning Outcomes, they shall be reviewed and approved by the Department Chair, Program Director or Chair of Undergraduate Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate. This is a level two review as depicted in Figure 1. The review shall apply criteria drawn from these guidelines. Approval shall be contingent upon conformance with these guidelines and validation of the associated assessment mechanisms.

3. A level three review shall be conducted by the appropriate Dean of the appropriate college or the Dean of Undergraduate Studies in the case of liberal studies outcomes. The review shall apply criteria drawn from these guidelines. Suggested rubrics for evaluating the submissions will be distributed on a timely basis by the Associate Vice-President for Budgeting, Institutional Effectiveness and Planning. Approval shall be contingent upon conformity with these guidelines.
4. A level four review shall be conducted by the Provost or Associate Vice President of Budgeting, Institutional Effectiveness and Planning. The review shall apply criteria drawn from these guidelines. Approval shall be contingent upon conformance with these guidelines.
5. The Associate Vice President for Budgeting, Institutional Effectiveness and Planning, at three-year intervals, shall develop, implement and report on evaluation efforts (including external validations) necessary to corroborate that the assessments actually measure student achievement against the expected core learning outcomes. Such evaluations will serve to validate the assessment mechanisms used in the program, and results will be used to improve student achievement and program effectiveness. They should integrate multiple sources of evidence that combines logical argument and empirical justification needed in order to establish intersubjective validity. These sources can include: student test scores on licensure examinations, CLAST, GREs, GMAC, LSAT, MCAT, and various field examinations; direct inquiry of employers on performance, and direct inquiry of officials at the graduate school admitting students.

Figure 1. SMALC Submission and Review

	Level 1	level 2	level 3	level 4
2004-2005 Student Learning Outcomes □ Academic Units: Degree Offering	Program Director	Chair or Program Director*	Dean	Provost [AVPAA]
2005-2006 Student Learning Outcomes □ Academic Units: Offering Courses Leading to the Bachelor's Degree	Program Director	Chair, Chair UPC or Program Director*	Dean or Dean of Undergraduate Studies	Provost [AVPAA]

Note: A Reviewer can be assigned by the appropriate higher level Administrative unit upon contacting The Institutional Effectiveness Portal Administrator for inclusion in the IE Portal.

** The Chair or Director will certify the status and validity of the SMALCs as determined and reported by third parties (e.g. committee, etc.)*

6. The second step of steps consists of submission of the results, analysis, improvement statements and action plans associated with each outcome and assessment along with the four levels of review. The levels of review shall proceed in the same manner as in the first step.

Programmatic Uses of State Mandated Academic Learning Compacts

1. State Mandated Academic Learning Compacts are an integral part of the university quality enhancement process. See http://www.fsu.edu/~acaffair/qe/qe_process.html. The

Vice President for Academic Quality and External Programs will submit to the Board of Governors an electronic copy or hyperlink to a copy of the Academic Learning Compact for each Baccalaureate degree program reviewed as part of the mandated review and continuous improvement process for State University System degree programs (refer to the Policy Guideline on Academic Program Review #PG 04.08.11).

2. The Quality Enhancement Review prepared for review of each program will demonstrate how information from the periodic review of student learning outcomes, as well as from the evaluation of corresponding assessment mechanisms, has been used to improve student achievement and program effectiveness.
3. The Documentation required for and certified for graduation by each department to the Office of the University Registrar shall constitute satisfaction that individual students have met the requirements of the State Mandated Academic Learning Compact.
4. In addition to satisfying the requirements of the Academic Learning Compact, the general requirements of the Florida State University remain applicable to all students for all baccalaureate degrees.
5. Undergraduate students will notified of the State Mandated Academic Learning Compact requirement in the General Bulletin.

Dissemination of State Mandated Academic Learning Compacts

1. State Mandated Academic Learning Compacts for each Bachelor's degree program will be made readily available to students electronically at a site initially listed on the university's home page. The Academic Learning Compacts must be made available to students beginning no later than the end of the fall semester of 2005.
2. The web site will provide current and prospective students access to the outcome statements of Academic Learning Compacts, edited and rendered in concise colloquial statements of what active and successful participants will know and be able to do after completion of the requirements for each baccalaureate degree.
3. The web site will list the types of assessments used in each program and will be updated as needed.
4. The web and its contents are subject to periodic change. Neither the State Mandated Academic Learning Compact nor its associated activities constitute a contract with students, either expressed or implied, between the University and the Student, but represent a flexible program of the current curriculum. Educational plans, offerings and requirements may be altered from time to time to carry out the administrative, academic and procedural purposes and objectives of the University. The University specifically reserves the right to change, delete or add to any provision, offering, academic curriculum, program or requirement at any time within the student's period of study at the University.

4. SCHEDULE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

1. Preliminary submission and review of the State Mandated Academic Learning Compacts will begin in the summer of 2005. Full implementation is contingent upon approval of these guidelines by the Faculty Senate and the University Board of Trustees.
2. Students will complete the State Mandated Academic Learning Compact for their program of graduation, effective in the semester following approval of this policy by the University Board of Trustees and these guidelines.
3. Undergraduate students with an AA degree or General Education Statement from a Florida public senior or community college with which The Florida State University maintains an official articulation agreement are exempted from completion of those elements of a State Mandated Academic Learning Compact that are included in the courses approved for transfer of credit after a student has met other university requirements and been declared eligible for transfer.

5. SCHEDULE FOR REVIEW

1. Following the first two years of implementation, these guidelines shall be reviewed every two years or more frequently as necessary. During the first two years of implementation, the review will occur every six (6) months.
2. The exemption for undergraduate students with an AA degree or General Education Statement from a Florida public senior or community college with which The Florida State University maintains an official articulation agreement shall be reviewed following the initial eighteen months of implementation of these guidelines by the Associate Vice-President for Academic Affairs for Budgeting, Institutional Effectiveness and Planning. The Associate Vice-President shall make recommendations for change, as necessary, to the Faculty Senate for their consideration and review. The review should also consider whether the university should develop comprehensive core student learning outcomes associated with the general requirements of the liberal studies curriculum that conform to the requirements of the State Mandated Academic Learning Compact. Additionally, it will examine the advantages and disadvantages of including an evaluation and approval of such liberal studies core student learning outcomes as part of the award of transfer credit. The review shall determine if the university will award and recognize the associate in arts (AA) certificate to students who have successfully completed the State Mandate Academic Learning Compact associated with the Liberal Studies program and satisfied all other requirements established by the University.
3. The Associate Vice President for Budgeting, Institutional Effectiveness and Planning, on two year intervals, shall develop, implement and report on evaluation efforts (including external validations) necessary to corroborate that the assessments actually measure student achievement against the expected core learning outcomes.

PROPOSED REVISION TO THE GRADE APPEALS SYSTEM

The purpose of the grade appeals system is to afford an opportunity for an undergraduate or graduate student to appeal a final course grade under certain circumstances. Faculty judgment of students' academic performance is inherent in the grading process and hence should not be overturned except when the student can show that the grade awarded represents a gross violation of the instructor's own specified evaluation (grading) statement and therefore was awarded in an arbitrary, capricious, or discriminatory manner. The evaluation (grading) statement utilized during the grade appeals process is the one contained in the instructor's syllabus at the beginning of the semester. This system does not apply to preliminary or comprehensive exams or to thesis or dissertation defenses; these issues are reviewed by the Student Academic Relations Committee via the Dean of the Faculties.

Step 1.

Within 30 calendar days following the date that final grades are made available to students, the student must contact the instructor in question to discuss the grade and attempt to resolve any differences. The student should document any attempts to contact the instructor in order to establish that the appeal was begun within this 30-day period. In the event that the instructor is not available, the student should provide that documentation to the instructor's program or department chair. It is expected that the student will first attempt to resolve the grade dispute with the instructor; however, either the student or the instructor may consult with the appropriate program or department chair during this process.

Step 2.

If no resolution is reached within this 30-day period, after the student's documented attempt, the student has an additional 15 calendar days to submit a written statement to the program or department chair. This statement must include an account of attempts to resolve the issue, as well as the evidence that forms the basis for the appeal.

Within 20 calendar days thereafter, the department or program chair will arrange for a meeting of a grade appeals screening committee composed of three students enrolled in the academic unit offering the course to review the appeal. Appropriate students who have no conflict of interest will be chosen to serve on this screening committee by a student organization associated with the program or department, if such an organization exists. If none exists or if members of such an organization are not available, the department or program chair will select appropriate students who have no conflict of interest. Both the student and the instructor may attend the meeting.

The role of the screening committee is solely to determine whether the student has presented sufficient evidence to warrant further review. Within five calendar days after this meeting, the screening committee will render its decision in writing (recommend/do not recommend further review) to the program or department chair, the student, and the instructor. A negative decision will end the appeal. A positive decision will trigger the next step in the process.

Step 3.

Within 20 calendar days of a positive decision from the grade appeals screening committee, the program or department chair will appoint and arrange for a meeting of a grade appeals board. This board is composed of three faculty members and two students other than those who served on the screening committee.

The purpose of this board is to determine whether or not to uphold the final grade assigned by the instructor. The board will consider only the evidence provided by the student and the instructor in making the determination. Both the student and the instructor may attend the meeting.

The grade will be upheld unless the evidence shows that the grade was awarded in an arbitrary, capricious, or discriminatory manner, as a result of a gross violation of the instructor's own evaluation (grading) statement. If the original grade is not upheld, the board will recommend that an alternative grade be assigned by the program or department chair.

If the student has evidence that this grade appeals process has deviated substantially from these established procedures, resulting in a biased decision, the student may consult with the Dean of the Faculties regarding referral to the Student Academic Relations Committee.

Pathways to Excellence

It is the long-term goal of the Florida State University to become one of the top public research and graduate education universities in the United States. Membership in the Association of American Universities (AAU) would be a tangible indicator that the University has attained this goal.

Why should FSU pursue AAU membership?

1. The effort will challenge programs at FSU at all levels and can be used as a vehicle to engage the faculty in a shared endeavor that will move the University forward.
2. It will allow us to attract even stronger faculty, postdoctoral fellows and students at all levels.
3. Some nationally recognized programs at FSU are being held back by the overall reputation of the university (the “inverse halo effect”). AAU membership will help to mitigate this. If FSU’s overall academic reputation is enhanced, all programs stand to benefit.

FSU lags behind AAU publics and most AAU “candidates” in 7 of the 9 AAU membership indicators. Five deficits are severe-

- Federal C&G expenditures (esp. NIH)
- National academy memberships
- NRC doctoral program rankings
- Quality and quantity of journal publications
- Number of Ph.D. graduates/yr (FSU has an acute deficit in the Science Technology Engineering Mathematics [STEM] disciplines)

To best position FSU for selection into the AAU, we propose to do the following:

Grow the faculty (net increase of 200 in 5 years)

- Cluster hiring initiatives – primarily of an interdisciplinary nature.
- Bolster individual areas of inherent and recognized strength but limited in faculty size (lack of critical mass).
- There will likely be a modest STEM bias as these disciplines offer the maximum potential yield in terms of the AAU indicator parameters for which we are most deficient.

- The fiscal implications of hiring, setting up and housing 200 additional faculty are staggering. Enhancement resources are being requested. We will have to look very carefully at how we use existing funds.

We will also assess infrastructural deficits at FSU (space, support staff, stipends etc) that impede progress in attaining “Pathway” goals and recommend remediation.

And encourage each college/school to prepare a plan that addresses how it will contribute to the “Pathways” initiative **consistent its unique mission and disciplinary capabilities.**

“Pathways” Executive Committee-

Ross Ellington (Biology, Academic Affairs), Greg Boebinger (Mag Lab), Emmanuel Collins (Engineering), Brooks Keel (Research), Nancy Marcus (Oceanography, Grad Sch), Mike Overton (Medicine), Jim Rossi (Law), Jayne Standley (Music; Senate Steering Committee), Gary Taylor (English), Jay Turner (Sociology), Lori Walters (Modern Languages).