

The Office of the FACULTY SENATE

MINUTES FACULTY SENATE MEETING APRIL 12, 2006 DODD HALL AUDITORIUM 3:35 P.M.

I. Regular Session

The regular session of the 2006-07 Faculty Senate was held on Wednesday, April 12, 2006. Faculty Senate President James Cobbe presided.

The following members attended the Senate meeting:

T. Adams, J. Ahlquist, E. Aldrovandi, M. Allen, P. Aluffi, A. Arnold, V. R-Auzenne, T. Baker, A. Bathke, S. Beckman, G. Blakely, F. Bunea, G. Burnett, J. Cao, D. Cartes, J. Clendinning, P. Coats, J. Cobbe, R. Coleman, C. Connerly, V. Costa, L. deHaven-Smith, I. Eberstein, L. Edwards, K. Erndl, J. Fiorito, M. Frank, J. Gathegi, K. Gelabert, J. Geringer, P. Gilmer, M. Hartline, L. Hawkes, P. Hensel, L. Hogan, C. Holmes, D. Houle, J. James, D. Kangas, L. Keller, A. Kercheval, W. Landing, T. Lee, W. Leparulo, S. Lewis, S. Losh, C. Madsen, N. Mazza, C. McCann, J. Milligan, D. Moore, R. Morris, A. Mullis, P. O'Sullivan, A. Payer, R. Pekurny, A. Plant, T. Ratliffe, R. Roberts, J. Sickinger, J. Sobanjo, J. Standley, J. Turner, G. Tyson, E. Walker, T. Welsh, J. Wulff.

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

D. Abood, G. Bates, B. Bower, J. Bowers (D. Von Glahn), M. Childs, D. Cornwell, V. Dobrosavljevic, J. Dodge, M. Fernandez, S. Fiorito (C. Readdick), L. Gravlee (M. Uzendoski), C. Greek, N. Greenbaum, K. Harris, H. Hawkins, R. Herrera, E. Hull, A. Koschnik, A. Lan (R. Romanchuk), T. Logan, T. Matherly, R. Miles, M. Mondello, R. Neuman, D. Pompper, D. Rice, J. Scholz (W. Carlson), N. Trafford, C. Upchurch, N. Warren (M. Cooper), J. Whyte, E. Wiedegreen, S. Wood (E. Jakubowski).

II. Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of the March 15, 2006 meeting were approved as distributed.

III. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as distributed.

IV. Election of the Faculty Senate President, J. Cobbe

Current Senate President James Cobbe was nominated for a 2nd term and unanimously elected Senate President.

V. Election of the Steering Committee, L. Edwards

There were no additional nominations from the floor of the Senate. Jack Fiorito asked that his name be withdrawn. There are four vacancies on the Steering Committee. The ballot for election consisted of: Dennis Moore, Cliff Madsen, Eric Walker, Jane Clendinning, Nick Mazza, Ann Mullis, Nancy Warren, Ted Baker, Hunt Hawkins, and Lance deHaven-Smith.

On the first ballot, voting was as follows: Dennis Moore-31, Cliff Madsen-38, Eric Walker-22, Jane Clendinning-25, Nick Mazza-15, Ann Mullis-14, Nancy Warren-19, Ted Baker-16, Hunt Hawkins-23, and Lance deHaven-Smith-24. One member was elected: Cliff Madsen.

On the second ballot, voting was as follows: Dennis Moore-38, Eric Walker-28, Jane Clendinning-34, Nancy Warren-28, Hunt Hawkins-20, and Lance deHaven-Smith-28. Jane Clendinning and Dennis Moore were elected.

On the third ballot Eric Walker won with 21 votes; Lance deHaven-Smith received 20 votes and Nancy Warren received 16 votes.

VI. Report of the Steering Committee, J. Standley

Since the last Faculty Senate meeting, the Steering Committee has met 3 times and has met with the President and Provost once.

The following issues were discussed with the President and the Provost. The Steering Committee recommended that when incremental recurring funds for the next academic year are known, that the administration refrain from making allocation of those funds beyond absolutely essential items such as utility increases until wage negotiations with all bargaining units have been concluded. We also informed the President and Provost that there is a serious faculty morale issue with regard to salaries at FSU.

The Steering Committee was informed that Althea Jenkins, the Director of the University Libraries, is retiring and will be on special assignment beginning May 9, 2006. Effective May 10, the transitional director will be Dr. William Summers. A national search will be conducted to identify an outstanding person for this job. Recommended names for the search committee have been submitted to the administration by the Steering Committee.

The Steering Committee recommended to the President and Provost that the organizational structure of the university administration might benefit from review prior to filling vacancies created by the loss of Dianne Harrison and others whose retirements are imminent. A great deal of turnover is expected in Westcott in the next year or two and this is a good time to review structure rather than simply refilling vacant slots. Having faculty provide input in this process was also recommended.

The President informed us that the Baxley Academic Freedom Bill is again in the Florida Legislature. There is a national foundation supporting this legislation and setting up offices in all 50 states. The President has asked the Florida legislators to quit citing anonymous complaints on this issue and be specific about what the problems are so that each campus can address the issue if it is a problem.

We again spoke with the President about the safety concerns for the Anthropology faculty whose offices are located off campus. He informed us that the plan is for Anthropology to move into Conradi when it is vacated and renovated in approximately 18 months to 2 years.

In light of the legal ruling on the role of the BOG, we discussed with the President the role of the BOG and the Board of Trustees. He feels that the ruling will not substantially alter the relationship among the university and these two entities in the future.

We ask the Senate to recognize two members who have served diligently on the Steering Committee this year and who have opted not to run for re-election. Both Charles Connerly and Mark Cooper have devoted innumerable service hours each week to the Steering Committee and its related committees. Please stand and let us recognize you for outstanding service.

The Steering Committee wishes to propose a resolution to support the new smoking policy and the establishment of "breathe easy zones." The university smoking policy is official and on the university website. It specifies a Breathe Easy Zone as "a defined area designated as not smoking that is adjacent to a building. The delineation of this zone shall also include the designation of smoking area(s) that is (are) contiguous and appropriate. Postings shall be placed to ensure adequate

identification of both the Breathe Easy Zone and the designated smoking area(s)." I move that the Senate support the administration in designating "Breathe Easy Zones" and smoking areas across campus.

The motion passes unanimously.

The Steering Committee distributed proposed dates for Senate meetings for the next academic year. **I move that the Senate approve those dates as distributed.**

The motion passes unanimously.

VII. Reports of Standing Committees

a. University Budget Committee, C. Madsen

The University Budget Committee meets regularly. The people on that committee include, Jim Cobbe, Pam Coats, Joe Beckham, Eric Walker, Carol Darling and I. I have asked Ralph Alvarez to come and share with us. We are approaching a billion dollar budget.

Ralph Alvarez: The State University System budget is roughly a 3 billion dollar budget. The state is awash in recurring and non-recurring funds for this fiscal year. There is a lot of interest in that extra money. The House and the Senate budgets were passed last week somewhere in the 70 billion dollar range. This week they are going to conference.

Universities request their budgets for the coming year the June before. We submit that request, and it goes to the Board of Governors. The E&G budget for the SUS is somewhere around 3 billion dollars and the request from the BOG was around 400 million dollars. When FSU submitted our request, we did request money for faculty and staff salaries including the base salaries that come from the legislature.

The House and Senate did pass their budgets. There are some good things that I will go through. First is the cost to continue issues where they are providing funds for last year's salary increases, any changes in fringe benefits issues. Next is workload issues where you have naturally occurring issues such as enrollment. The provost has a plan to control enrollments and grow undergraduate enrollment by 1% and graduate by 2% over then next 2 years. Next is university specific issues such as salary increases above the base. We are not officially in administered funds but we hope to be there before the end of session. A couple of special budget requests such as utilities is in the House and Senate. There is a 20 million budget request for utilities, and our

share would be about 2.4 million. Another issues is the change of policy in the in and out of state mix. Another special issue is the change to recognize the price of construction costs to complete most buildings including the chemistry building. Enhancements issues are in there for us. Tuition increases are still in the works.

Today is the general revenue conference on estimating. There will probably be additional money available tomorrow.

This is the first year that we have allowed the units on campus to retain 100% of the unspent E&G money. We have some really healthy balances for some colleges on campus. The university is financially healthy and has some healthy carry forward balances and is anxious to hear about the 2% and anything else that may come our way.

b. Undergraduate Policy Committee, S. Lewis

The charge of the Undergraduate Policy Committee is to consider University-wide policies on undergraduate academic affairs. In that capacity, the UPC considers and makes recommendations for new courses to be added to the Liberal Studies Program, and approves courses to be designated as meeting the multicultural, oral communication, and computer skills competencies requirements. In its eight meetings each year, it also deals with matters related to the final exam policy, and other issues related to undergraduate academic affairs that may be brought before it.

The UPC is a hard working committee, and I'd like to recognize its members at this time: Michael Allen, John Bruno, Rinn Cloud, Patricia Dean, Cecil Greek, Lois Hawkes, Hunt Hawkins, Patrick Hollis, Aaron Lan, Gerard Leahy, Kim Maddox, Tim Matherly, Tom McCaleb, Donna Nudd, Gregory Riccardi, Gail Rubini, Stacey Sirmans, Philip Steinberg, Paul Strait, Frank Tomasulo, and James Tull. Also of critical importance to our work are the efforts on our behalf of Dean Karen Laughlin, of ex officio member, and Cheryl Oakley, who has the title of Secretary of the UPC, but who should be called Manager Extraordinaire.

During the past semester, the UPC has undertaken a review of all courses that previously have been identified as meeting the criteria for Liberal Studies Area IV, Humanities and Fine Arts. We asked program representatives offering these courses to collect and review each of the syllabi, major examinations, and assignments offered by Area IV course, and to pay particular interest to the following issues:

- adherence to the criteria established for Liberal Studies Area IV, including attention to the additional criteria for courses identified as meeting the Literature, Multicultural, or Gordon Rule designations,
- the preparation of the faculty to teach these courses, including the percentage of non-tenured personnel assigned to teach,
- the focus of assignments and tests, and
- the ways in which the concept and purpose of a liberal studies education is featured throughout the course.

After conducting this review, these program representatives were asked to prepare a short report of findings and present them to the Undergraduate Policy Committee. This past year, 12 individuals shared information about their program's classes, and I'd like to publicly acknowledge at this time our gratitude for the time and effort they took to assist us with this process. Most of the classes that were reviewed were re-approved; details can be found in the copies of the minutes that are posted on the Senate Website.

At its last meeting, the UPC approved the following courses:

- AMH 2583: History of the Seminoles and Southeastern Tribes for the Multicultural Y credit, effective Fall, 2006
- EGN 2212: Engineering Computation and Statistics for the Computer Skills Competency, effective Fall, 2005
- ARH 4928C: Advanced Workshop Art and COM 3110: Communication for Business and the Professions for the Oral Communication Competency, effective Summer, 2006 and
- ITT 3500: Italian Culture and Civilization: Origins to Age of Romanticism, ITT 3501: Italian Culture and Civilization: Unification to Present, and ITT 3520: Italian-American Experience in Literature and Film for the Gordon Rule credit, effective Summer, 2006.

With regard to the Gordon Rule, we have been informed that the state's requirements for the writing requirement have been revised. Though we have yet to learn the details of the change, we understand that the Gordon Rule standards are being reduced. This revision comes at a time when the UPC is trying to devise effective ways to increase the writing standards in these courses--and thereby the writing skills of students. Our discussions will continue over the summer and into next year. If you have strong feelings in favor or against the Gordon Rule, and especially if you have suggestions about ways we can improve students' writing skills, I urge you to be in contact with me at lewis@coe.fsu.edu or your UPC representative.

Thank you for the opportunity to serve the Senate in this capacity for another year.

c. Liberal Studies Coordinating Committee, D. Johnson (Report was given by committee member Dennis Moore)

It is a pleasure to present this brief annual report on behalf of the Senate's Liberal Studies Coordinating Committee, whose purpose is to promote liberal education and the university's liberal studies program. Each member of the committee brings a valuable perspective to our work: Charles Barrilleaux, Political Science; Sissi Carroll, Education, recipient of the most recent University Distinguished Teaching Award; Jane Clendinning, Music; Aline Kalbian, Religion; myself, from English and American Studies; Michael Ruse, Philosophy; and our chair, David Johnson, Interdisciplinary Program in the Humanities, who could not be with us this afternoon. He has relayed this message:

Essentially, we have taken it as our task this year to monitor and further the FIGs program [i.e., the clusters of courses we're calling Freshman Interest Groups]. Several of us attended the reception for outgoing and incoming FIG peer leaders last semester and were able to witness the enthusiasm, dedication and drive of these students. The evaluations of the FIGs themselves were overwhelmingly positive, and then there are the numbers [we have received from Alice Earp, Assistant to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies].

Working very closely with Dean of Undergraduate Studies Karen Laughlin, a former president of the Faculty Senate, we are basically scheduling "FIG Leader training courses" during the spring semester, and in the fall we're scheduling these clusters, these FIGS themselves.

The numbers to which Dr. Johnson refers show that 30 students satisfactorily completed the first-ever "FIG Leader" training course last spring, which Dean Laughlin offered to teach; all 30 of them agreed to serve as FIG Leaders during the first round of these clusters, Fall 2005. We scheduled 28 clusters last fall, and all but two of them made; three filled completely -- Pre-Law, Pre-Med, and Pre-Business. Among the 55 courses we offered last fall, 31 were from Arts and Sciences; 10 from the College of Social Sciences; 3 from Human Sciences; there was some duplication, for a total of 76 sections excluding HUM 1920. 629 seats were available and 337 students actually enrolled. At the end of Drop/Add, only eight courses had seats remaining.

This semester we're offering two sections of the FIG Leader training course, with Dean Laughlin teaching one and Dr. Greg Beaumont, Director of the Office of Undergraduate Studies, teaching the other section. A total of 115 students applied for the 40 seats in those two classes. For this fall, Undergraduate Studies has scheduled 39 FIG Clusters, serving approximately 975 First-Time-In-College students; topics include Pre-Med (three sections this time), Pre-Business and Pre-Law (four sections each), and 11 clusters we're identifying as General or Liberal Studies.

Preliminary reports indicate FIG participants earned a FSU cumulative 3.04 while the general population of First-Time-In-College students received a 2.96.

d. Library Committee, J. Clendinning

(See addendum 1.) Welcome new faculty senators, and greetings to continuing members of the Senate. This report from the Faculty Senate Library committee will serve two purposes: to inform new Senators of our committee's purview and procedures; and to provide an accounting to the Senate of what has transpired since the last report from this committee on March 15, the text of which is included in the minutes from that meeting. I apologize in advance for the length of this report—this committee has been quite active and has reviewed many elements of Library operations this year—and for reading from a text, which is to ensure that the events are recounted accurately for the Senate record.

The Faculty Senate Library Committee has met each month this academic year to consider issues related to the operation of the University Libraries and their mission to serve the research needs of Florida State University's Faculty, Students, and Staff. The agenda of this committee in a normal year includes informational reports from various units of the University Libraries—such as cataloging, acquisitions, technical services, interlibrary loan, public services, library technology, etc., all of whom we have heard from this year-and reports from Library Administration on the Library budget, operations, personnel, policy proposals, and other matters. These reports are intended to keep faculty informed, through their Library Committee representation, of the activities and concerns of the Library, to facilitate faculty support of initiatives by the University Libraries that are important to faculty, to transmit concerns from faculty to Library Administration that have not been addressed successfully through other channels, and to foster open communication between the FSU Faculty and the University Libraries. We also normally hear reports and updates from the autonomous branch libraries, including the College of Medicine's library, the Allen Music Library,

and the Goldstein Library of the College of Information, whose directors provided reports this year. We are primarily an advisory committee, responsible for representing the faculty's voice in library matters to the University Libraries administration and to the University administration. In addition, at least since the 1990s when I first served on this committee, the Faculty Senate Library committee has historically approved Library policies that relate to faculty and student users, including recommending and approving changes in such user issues as the operating hours of the Library, the length of time that materials can be borrowed, the imposition and amount of fines for non-returned or overdue materials, and other such policies.

Major reports reviewed by the University Library Committee in 2005-06 included: the University Libraries budget and financial statements from the last three years; the QER (Quality Enhancement Review), which included the visit of outside reviewers, their report, and the Library administration's various responses to their recommendations; a series of changes in the organizational structure of the library, including open positions and search procedures; and a Library Climate Survey to access library faculty and staff morale. This year we have also reviewed reports relating to the following areas of Library operations: collection development and acquisitions; circulation and interlibrary loans; print and electronic serials subscriptions; purchases of print materials including books and filling gaps in the collection; maintenance of the catalog; maintenance of the collection in the stacks and remote storage; and the need for additional and renovated library facilities. Some of these reports were in response to complaints from faculty regarding problems with the library that had not been resolved or to issues raised in other reports, including the QER; others were a part of our routine proceedings. All of these reports, the committee's discussion of them at our meetings, and the University Library's responses are detailed in the Faculty Senate Library Committee's minutes and in the report to the Faculty Senate from the Library Committee March 15, 2006, which is included in the Faculty Senate's minutes you approved earlier today.

In summary, the problems investigated by the Faculty Senate Library committee this year focused on issues of Library Administration that directly impact the ability of the University Libraries to provide services to the faculty, students, and staff of the university. These issues included financial, personnel, operations, collection development and maintenance, and facilities. At the April 5 meeting of the Library Committee, the committee was to hear the final Library responses to the QER and Climate Survey, and to make a final report and recommendations to the University Library Administration and University Administration regarding all we had reviewed over the course of the year. An ad-hoc subcommittee was to meet

on April 3 to prepare a draft of recommendations to be reviewed by the entire Faculty Senate Library Committee and voted on at the April 5 meeting. After receipt of the final responses from the Library Administration, which were distributed to the committee members on March 29, and detailed review of all the documentation received throughout the year, it was clear that the final report and recommendations of the Faculty Senate Library Committee would express a lack of confidence in the ability and willingness of the current Library Administration, including the Director and Assistant/Associate Directors, to make the changes needed to set the unit back on course.

On Wednesday, March 29, Director of University Libraries Althea Jenkins called meetings of the Library faculty and staff in the Technical Services building, Strozier Library, and Dirac Library, and announced to the Library Faculty and Staff that she would be retiring from her service as Director of University Libraries. After consultation with Vice President Dianne Harrison, who is assigned by the Provost with oversight of the University Libraries, with the Faculty Senate President Jim Cobbe and members of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, and with some of the leadership of the Library Committee, I emailed members of the Library Committee on Thursday, March 30, apprising them of the events that had transpired, and indicating that the recommendation to us was to proceed with a conclusory report and recommendations, even though the retirement had not been announced through official university channels. The thrust of the report and recommendations changed, though, from documenting concerns with the current Library Administration toward identifying what tasks lay ahead of the incoming transitional library administration.

The ad-hoc subcommittee, consisting of Professors Connerly, Moore, Schwartz, Paradice, Cooper, and Clendinning, met on Monday, April 3, and drafted recommendations, which were distributed to the committee members Tuesday, April 4, and approved with some changes at the Wednesday, April 5, 2006 meeting of the University Library Committee. Those final recommendations from the Faculty Senate Library Committee were sent out to you in advance of this meeting, and limited numbers of copies were available as you entered today. I will not take time to read them to you; they are to be entered from the committee as a part of this report, and some will be referred to shortly. Each of these recommendations is a response to specific problems documented in the series of reports reviewed by the Library Committee this year.

This morning, the following announcement was sent out by Vice President Dianne Harrison's office:

Dr. Althea Jenkins will be stepping down from her position as Director of the University Libraries effective May 9, 2006, and will be retiring from FSU service at the end of December. Following her departure as Director, Dr. Jenkins will be working on special projects related to her area of expertise.

Effective May 10, Dr. William Summers will assume the position as Director of University Libraries while a national search is conducted for a new Director.

To my knowledge, the search details, including the search committee members and timetable, have yet been announced officially by University Administration. The Faculty Senate Steering Committee and I have been updated regarding these matters throughout the last two weeks. We have been informed that the transition will take place May 10, 2006, with the transitional director coming on board as Director of Libraries. understand from administrative sources that the transitional director will have full power of the office, and serve until a national search for a new library director can be completed. In the Recommendations from the Library Committee, the term "transitional director" is used where immediate action is urged; "new library administration" refers to the team of the Library Director and Assistant/Associate Directors that will be in place after national searches for those positions have been conducted. Since this morning's announcement, we can now announce that the term "transitional director" in the Recommendations from the Library Committee and in this report refers to Dr. William Summers.

Recommendation point 2)b) speaks to the need for a full-scale, national searches for the "brightest and best" to lead the University Libraries as Director and Assistant/Associate Directors and to fill any open Library positions, and lays out a proposed timetable to take advantage of the exposure available at the ALA (American Library Association) conference this summer. The University Administration has indicated to the Steering Committee their commitment to employ a search firm to conduct a full national search for the Library Director. We look forward to hearing more from University Administration regarding details of these searches, and faculty roles in the search process.

The Recommendations from the University Library Committee, points 1)a) and b) and 2)a) speak to matters of personnel and budget in regard to the Transitional Director, giving directives to review and revise the organizational chart so that the library will have proper staffing in each area of function and so that faculty will know whom to contact in case of

problems, to review the credentials and performance of current employees to place personnel where they can best serve the university, and to review and expend the remaining budget in a fiscally responsible manner.

Unfortunately, there has been increasing evidence in the last week since the April 5 Library Committee meeting that the current Library Administration, Director Althea Jenkins, along with Associate Directors Robert McDonald and Rebecca Bichel, both of whom were appointed to these leadership positions or given additional duties within the last year, and Roy Ziegler, elevated to an Associate Director position last week, all of whom have been documented in the reports mentioned earlier as complicit in creating the problems and concerns detailed in those reports, have been accelerating activities regarding purchases to expend the Library's budget and have been implementing personnel actions including demotions, transfers, and an intensified pace of interviews for open positions. All of this is being done with haste at a time when it would be appropriate to slow or cease such activities awaiting the arrival of the transitional administration. University Administration, to my knowledge, has not taken action to curtail these activities, after they were brought to the administration's attention by various constituencies, though it would be standard administrative procedure to do so in a transition of this type.

Recommendations points 3)a) and 4)a) also are addressed to the transitional director, regarding collections and communications; with points 3)b) and 4)b) following up on those issues with the new library administration. Recommendations 1)c), 2)b) and 5)a) are also addressed to University Administration. For the University Libraries to be successful under new leadership, it is absolutely necessary that the Libraries have the attention and support of University upper Administration.

What will it take to have an outstanding University Library—the type of Library that will shine forth as a part of an AAU-qualified university? The obvious answer is that it will take action by all of us. University Administration must step up in hiring and fully supporting the "brightest and best" in Library Administration and Library employees. The University Libraries will need funding appropriate for a 21st century library—not the level appropriate for the 1950s. There is an urgent need for new and expanded library facilities. Both new funding and appropriate facilities will be challenging to achieve with current university funding levels, and will require University Administration and Library Administration setting this as a priority with full Faculty support, and the development and implementation of a plan to achieve these goals. The transitional and new library administrations will have to set the direction for a revitalized library

organization and recruit, hire, train, and support the work of outstanding employees. Faculty will need to be supportive of the University Libraries, taking the initiative to work with Librarians to solve problems in the areas of collection development and acquisitions of print materials and serials, and to facilitate open and collegial communication between the library and its constituents. For any of this to happen, we must start by <u>believing that it is possible</u> to have a first-class Library for the use of all its constituents—and not give up on making that dream a reality.

This report concludes the work of the Faculty Senate Library Committee for 2005-06. The elected incoming chair of the Faculty Senate Library Committee is Professor David Paradice from the College of Business. Please feel free to contact him with concerns you have regarding the University Libraries. He and I will be meeting with the transitional director soon after he starts to discuss the documentation from this year and the recommendations, and, along with members of the Library Committee and Faculty Senate Steering Committee, will be available to the transition administrative team to provide faculty input as needed.

Another area where faculty can support the library is through Friends of the Library, which offers membership and activities in support of University Libraries. Fred Stanley will be incoming as chair of that organization; contact him or Don Latham, outgoing chair, for more information.

I would be remiss if I didn't mention some of the important contributions that outdoing Library Director Althea Jenkins made during her time at FSU; contributions that have become so much a part of our everyday experience of the University Libraries that it is easy to forget that it ever was not this way. She focused soon after her arrival at FSU on making the Library more friendly for undergraduates, working with the existing building to make it more attractive and comfortable. She also led in updating the University Libraries in the area of technology, which was much needed, bringing in electronic books, new online research sources, and additional online bibliographic tools. We wish her well in this new phase of her life.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the Faculty Senate Library Committee, Jane Piper Clendinning, Chair.

I will be glad to address questions, and also there are members of the Library Committee and the University Libraries faculty present.

e. Teaching Evaluation Committee, E. Walker

(See Addendum 2.) We are recommending a change to the SPOT system. Members of the committee are John Geringer, Music, Cecil Greek, Criminology, Nancy Greenbaum, Arts and Sciences, Liz Jakubowski, Education, Woody Carlson, Social Sciences, Rebecca Miles, Social Sciences, Pat O'Sullivan, Social Sciences, John Sobanjo, Engineering. Most are here today and can help me answer any questions you may have.

The change is very simple. We are proposing an alternative to the current form. The basic goal of the alternative is to enable local units to make better use of the optional items, at the individual course and individual instructor level. A mockup was prepared by Assessment Services. If you vote no to this recommendation, nothing will change. The current SPOT form will stay in place. If you vote yes for the recommendation, nothing will change necessarily. If your unit does not wish to use the new alternate form you will still use the same old form. Individual units will have the option by using the alternative form. There are 3 conditions attached to using the alternative form. First, that decision may be made at the unit or department level. It would be too chaotic at the instructor level. Second, if departments or units elect to use the alternative, those units must use those optional items. Third, Assessments services will have to know by June 1 who will want to use the alternative forms in fall 2006, spring 2007 and/or summer 2007.

A set of friendly amendments were suggested. In the student information section, add "no FSU GPA yet" as a choice. Under grades, "S/U" needs to be added as a choice. The fourth question, "Is this a required course for you." will be revisited in order to determine what are we trying to get with that question and if there is a better phrasing for that question.

The proposal passed.

VIII. Old Business

There were no items of old business.

IX. New Business

There were no items of new business.

X. University Welfare

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

Good afternoon, and welcome new Senators! Continuing Senators already know that one of the "perks of office" is regular updates on collective bargaining as a university welfare matter, and not just the information (some say "spam") we try to send to all UFF-represented faculty.

As reported last month, there is bargaining-related activity on two fronts. First, on merit raises for 2005-06, we're still at impasse. The UFF-FSU faculty team proposed merit-based increases averaging 1.5%. The Trustees' team proposed zero. There has been no change in positions. Attorneys are finalizing briefs for the Special Magistrate, who will make a recommendation.

Second, on re-openers for 2006-07 on salary and other matters. We have a tentative agreement on some modest changes to Article 9 on Assignments. We're continuing Interest-Based Bargaining (IBB) on Article 17, Leaves. Still ahead are negotiations on appointment, non-reappointment, and benefits, as well as salaries for 2006-07. Our next bargaining session is Friday at 1pm at the FSU Training Center. Senators are especially welcome to attend.

We have also held a consultation meeting with the Administration. In it we discussed implementation of contract terms on evaluations and assignments, faculty contacts with legislators, access to salary data, and mutual interests in academic freedom among other topics.

UFF has contacted legislators about extending the proposed state employee raise to state university and DRS faculty and to graduate assistants, and about funding enrollment growth. We are cautiously optimistic at this point.

On other matters: The April 2006 UFF-FSU Faculty Poll and Administrator Evaluation is about to be shut down. We've received hundreds of responses, and we will shortly start announcing results. Thanks to everyone who responded, and especially to those who encouraged their colleagues to respond. We want a response that accurately reflects faculty views. If you haven't responded, please do so *very soon*. I hope you will encourage others to respond as well, but again, *very soon*. Contact me at <u>ifiorito@fsu.edu</u> for details needed to take the poll.

Volunteers have distributed contracts to most faculty members, although I'm sure we've missed some. I brought a few copies today, and will follow up if

those run out and you don't get one. Please let me know if you are aware of any faculty we've missed.

I'll be glad to take questions if time permits. Thank you.

XI. Announcements by Deans and Other Administrative Officers

There were no announcements.

XII. Announcements by Provost Abele

We met with Academic Search Consultants yesterday and asked them to fast track the Foundation search and asked them to start the Library search for June or July. We will have our interview and introduction to the search by the search firm this summer.

XIII. Announcements by President Wetherell

President Wetherell was not in attendance.

XIV. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Melissa Crawford

Melissa Crawford

Faculty Senate Coordinator

TO: Faculty Senators

FROM: Faculty Senate Teaching Evaluation Committee

DATE: April 7, 2006

RE: Recommendation to present alternative to SPOT form

The Senate Teaching Evaluation Committee has been meeting during the past year to review the data from the five semesters since the new SPOT system went into effect in Fall 2003. Our primary goal has been to study the numbers to determine if any revisions to the form might be warranted. At our most recent meeting on March 22 and in subsequent conversation with the Steering Committee, the committee unanimously endorsed the following proposed revision.

<u>Recommendation</u>: The committee recommends that academic units and departments use either the new revised form prepared by Assessment Services (see attached PDF file) or the current SPOT form. The purpose is to begin to develop a system that will help local units and instructors use the evaluation forms to assist with improving instruction in locally defined and locally useful ways.

Rationale and background: The current SPOT form was passed by the Senate in the spring of 2003 and went into effect in Fall 2003. Section D of the current form, the "SUSSAI" set of eight questions, is used system-wide in the state and cannot be altered. Because of a specific statute in state law, these SUSSAI results are public-domain information (unlike the other parts of the form) and are available to our students (and to the public generally) on the Assessment Services website, which we hope is better information than what is being aggressively marketed to students by commercial "rating" enterprises. As you know, the administration also uses the responses to SUSSAI question 8 to identify problems in teaching and recognize superior performance.

Because the SUSSAI questions have for these several reasons become a permanent fixture in the system, we focused our study on whether the questions in sections B and C were providing significantly different information. Our conclusion: they are not. There is a very high correlation between the responses to the Section D questions and the questions in sections B and C. In other words, compared to the information gathered from the questions in Section D, the information gathered by the questions in B and C is, on the whole, redundant.

We then posed several questions: Could the SPOT form be put to better use? Can the SPOT form, or some alternative, be used to actually improve instruction? One key goal in our suggestion to allow alternatives to sections B and C is to suggest survey items that will effectively inform instructors regarding specific aspects of teaching in order to improve instruction. A second key goal is to move the SPOT system in the direction of locally adapted use. Instead of university-wide "one-size-fits-all" questions that necessarily ignore the extraordinary variety of pedagogical settings and purposes in a comprehensive research university, we would like to see the SPOT system develop the means to help individual instructors and local units ask, optionally, specific questions of specific local use. On the proposed alternative form, you will see expanded sections for "optional items" generated by the instructor and/or generated by the department or unit. We're not just trying to fill up blank space on the form. Over the next year, in the next phase of this process, we propose to turn the work of the committee toward defining banks of questions designed for dozens of different pedagogical settings and purposes; these questions would be available for instructors and units to draw upon. For models of such systems, here are links to two best-practice operations currently in place at the University of Michigan and at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill:

Michigan: http://www.umich.edu/~eande/tq/designtq.htm

UNC: http://ctl.unc.edu/unc-cesopt.html

Our current proposal to provide alternatives to Sections B and C on the SPOT form is the first step in moving the FSU system in the direction of such systems. It would be helpful for you to know that Assessment Services bids its printing order for the scantron forms for SPOT once a year, in June. The mock-up form attached would be an alternative form available for use in Fall 2006, Spring 2007, and Summer 2007 courses. Decisions to use this alternative form would have to be made at the unit or department level; selection of the alternative form requires use of the optional sections, that is, the SUSSAI section cannot be used alone. In the expanded optional sections, it would give us room to begin to try to develop systems of optional items that would be useful locally.

In addition to providing better information to instructors and more specific local use, we hope these revisions might also help improve the seriousness of this enterprise. Students who see the same long page of questions course after course, term after term, understandably might be tempted to fall into patterns of rote response. But if they encounter, course by course, a short set of standard questions followed (optionally) by very different questions, course by course, questions that have clearly been designed with the specific course in mind, it might help send the signal that these forms are not just rote exercises. The forms themselves are not going to go away. We're hoping to improve their use.

<u>In summary</u>: The committee recommends that academic units and departments use either the revised form prepared by Assessment Services or the current SPOT form. We propose to use the expanded "optional items" sections to begin to develop a system that will help instructors to improve teaching effectiveness and for units and instructors to use the form in course-specific and locally useful ways. We think that such a revision will offer a better use of university resources and the large amounts of time expended on these forms by both instructors and students.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these matters.

The 2005-06 Faculty Senate Teaching Evaluation Committee:

Woody Carlson, Sociology
John Geringer, Music
Cecil Greek, Criminology
Nancy Greenbaum, Chemistry
Elizabeth Jakubowski, Education
Rebecca Miles, Urban and Regional Planning
Patrick O'Sullivan, Geography
John Sobanjo, Engineering
Eric Walker, English (chair)
Bonnie Armstrong, Assessment Services, ex officio
Jean-Marc Wise, Assessment Services, ex officio

Attachment: Proposed alternative SPOT form (PDF file)

Florida State University

Student Perception of Teaching	TOTAL AND
Instructor Name	
Course Number & Section	
Course Title	
Date	
Student Information	Form design by Assessment Services, 3/23/2006/jmw

Course Number & S	Section						
Course Title							
Date							
Student Informa	tion		F	orm design by A	Assessment Ser	rvices, 3/23/200)6/jmw
1. What is your year	is your year in school? 1st year Sophomore Junior Senior Grad/Other			re GPA?	2 1.99 or less 2.0 - 2.49 2.5 - 2.99 3.0 - 3.49 3.5 - 4.0		
3. What grade do yo	ou expect to receive in	this course?	ОВ	_ c	_ D	○ F	:
4. Is this a required	course for you?	○ yes	s ono				
State University (SUSSAI)	System Student A	ssessment of Instru	ıction	ENT VERY	GOOD	FAIR	POOR
	ourse objectives and a	ssianments		GOOD			
-	of ideas and information						
	pectations and perform						
_	sist students in or out						
5. Respect and con	cern for students						
6. Stimulation of int	terest in the course						
7. Facilitation of lea							
8. Overall assessme	ent of instructor						
Department or U	Init Questions						
1. ABCDEF	7. ABCDEF	13. ABCDEF	19. ABC		25. 🛽		
2. ABCDEF	8. ABCDEF	14. ABCDEF	20. ABC				
3. ABCDEF	9. ABCDEF	15. ABCDEF	21. (A) (B) (C)				
4. ABCDEF	10. ABCDEF	16. ABCDEF	22. ABC				
5. ABCDEF	11. A B C D E F	17. A B C D E F	23. A B C				
6. ABCDEF	12. ABCDEF	18. A B C D E F	24. A B C		30. (A		
Instructor Quest	tions						
1. ABCDEF	7. ABCDEF	13. ABCDEF	19. ABC		25. 🛽		
2. ABCDEF	8. ABCDEF	14. ABCDEF	20. ABC				
3. ABCDEF	9. ABCDEF	15. ABCDEF	21. ABC				
4. ABCDEF	10. A B C D E F	16. A B C D E F	22. A B C				
5. ABCDEF	11. A B C D E F	17. ABCDEF	23. A B C				
6. ABCDEF	12. A B C D E F	18. A B C D E F	24. (A) B) C		30. 🕒		

Free Response Questions

The following items are designed to allow you to express your opinions about this course and communicate **directly to the instructor** your particular feelings and suggestions concerning the course.

NOTE: The instructor will receive this form, as is, after the semester is over and final grades have been recorded. If you are concerned that the instructor might recognize your handwriting, you may wish to communicate your comments in a typed format separately at a later time rather than completing this section.

1. What did you most like about this course? What could be improved? Give examples.
2. What did you most like about this instructor? What could be improved? Give examples.
3. Additional question your instructor may add.
4. Additional comments and suggestions you may wish to add.

Recommendations from the Faculty Senate Library Committee for presentation to the Faculty Senate on April 12, 2006

We call upon the University Administration and the incoming Library Administration to address the following recommendations from the Faculty Senate Library Committee. These recommendations are in response to concerns identified in the 2005-06 QER, Budget and Financial report, Climate Survey, and other reports to the Faculty Senate Library Committee this year, and reflected in the Faculty Senate Library Committee report to the Senate on March 15, 2006. Some of these recommendations are short term; others involve longstanding issues that will take time to address.

Recommendations

1) Budget

- a) The incoming transitional Library Director should review the Library's financial reports and budget, prior to the end of the current fiscal year (2005-06), to expend remaining resources from this year's budget in a fiscally responsible manner.
- b) The new Library Administration needs to examine the budget allocations carefully in planning for next year's budget, to ensure that we are maximizing our current resources. Open library and staff positions need to be filled during the 2006-07 budget year if possible so that the library is fully staffed. Attention needs to be devoted both to electronic or online materials, including the backlog of requested serials, and also to print materials, which continue to be necessary for research in the Humanities, Fine Arts, and other fields. Additional short-term funding will likely be necessary to continue to correct deficits in the collections; requests for additional funds are appropriate after the Library Administration can demonstrate that all current monies are being used to their fullest potential. The budget priorities should be detailed in a report by the Library Administration to the Faculty Senate Library Committee at its September meeting.
- We are attempting to fund a 21st-century library with resources that were inadequate for a 20th-century library. The University Library administration and the Faculty Senate Library Committee should identify what an appropriate funding level would be for a library of this type, and develop a plan to achieve the proper level of funding. The plan should include aggressively seeking private donors. To this end, the University Libraries should be an integral part of the next Capital Campaign, and have a development officer assigned to them as soon as possible. If we wish to have a Research I, AAU quality library, it is likely that the new Library Administration and the Faculty Senate Library Committee will need to call upon the University Administration for additional funding to meet these goals.

2) Personnel

a) The incoming transitional Library Director should review the Library's organization chart, revising it as needed to ensure that all necessary library functions are assigned the number and types of positions to be properly staffed. The Library Director should

consider the credentials and performance of current library employees to place employees in positions for which they are well qualified and where they can make their best contribution to University Library operations, and begin the process of hiring University Librarians and staff to fill urgently needed positions. The Library should designate person(s) whom faculty and other users of the University Libraries can contact for specific concerns or problems.

b) The University Administration must make a commitment to hiring the "brightest and best" personnel for the University Libraries, as they have for other academic units on campus. This new hiring priority should be highlighted by a national search resulting in the recruitment of an exceptional leader and administrator as the new Director of University Libraries, and should include recruitment of outstanding Assistant or Associate Directors to complete the University Libraries Administrative team. Faculty Senate, through the Faculty Senate Library Committee, should be represented in The Faculty Senate Library Committee calls upon the University this process. Administration to have the Search Committee for the new Director of Libraries constituted and active no later than May 15, 2006, in order for the position to be advertised no later than early June, prior to the ALA Conference June 22-28, 2006. Other open Librarian positions in the University Libraries should be advertised nationally following the best practices for a position of that type, and all searches should be handled in an open manner, following appropriate University guidelines.

3) Acquisitions, Collections, the Library Catalog, and Stack Maintenance

- a) The QER documented that the primary concerns expressed by faculty regarding the University Libraries involved the research collections, including the following: gaps in the research collections because requested items were not purchased through the Library's acquisition profiles for specific subjects; poor stack maintenance and inventory control, where items the catalog indicated that the University owned could not be located on the shelves; and inability to quickly secure missing or needed items through Interlibrary Loan that were not in the Library holdings. The incoming transitional Library Director should review the Library's QER Action Plan to determine whether the proposed approaches to these problems are the best solution, and continue work on rectifying these problems.
- b) The new Library Administrative team should develop procedures, in consultation with the Faculty Senate Library Committee, that address the following: regular review of acquisitions profiles in consultation with Faculty; ongoing maintenance of the collection, including stack and catalog maintenance and inventory control, and correction of existing problems in the catalog and inventory; efficient handling of Faculty materials requests, including serials; and improvements to the Interlibrary Loan program.

4) Communications

a) The QER and Library Climate Survey both highlighted serious communication problems in the University Libraries, especially between the Library Administrative team and

Faculty Librarians and Library staff, between Library personnel and University Faculty, and between the Florida State University Libraries and other state, regional, and national libraries with whom we solve problems, including the statewide transition to ALEPH, and share resources, such as the exchange of materials through Interlibrary Loans. The incoming Library Director should prioritize re-establishing trust and open communications both within the Library organization and between Library personnel and Faculty. A collegial work environment will be necessary to recruit and retain outstanding Library employees to meet the needs of faculty, staff, and student users of the Libraries, and to build the kind of national reputation necessary to create strong working relationships with other university libraries within the state, region, and nation to take the University Libraries to Research I and AAU status.

b) The new Library Administration should develop policies, in consultation with the Faculty Senate Library Committee, that ensure regular and effective communication between the Libraries and Faculty, especially in areas involving collection development, acquisition of serials, and accessibility of materials.

5) Facilities

a) The QER outside reviewers highlighted the need for a new research library space, either a new building or a major addition to Strozier Library, to meet the needs of the University and especially researchers in the Humanities, Fine Arts, and other related areas. At the first meeting of the Faculty Senate for 2005-06, the Faculty Senate approved a resolution calling on the University Administration to prioritize funding for additional library space, and the University Administration responded by placing library facilities on the PECO list. We reaffirm that this goal is a high priority of the University Faculty, and is necessary to meet the needs of researchers in the Humanities, Fine Arts, and other related areas and to provide high quality graduate student education for programs dependent on library research materials.