



THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
JANUARY 19, 2011
DODD HALL AUDITORIUM
3:35 P.M.

I. Regular Session

The regular session of the 2010-11 Faculty Senate was held on Wednesday, January 19, 2011. Faculty Senate President Eric Walker presided.

The following members attended the Senate meeting:

J. Ahlquist, B. Altman, T. Baker, E. Baumer, D. Bernat, J. Bowers, M. Burmester, K. Burnett, J. Carbonell, E. Chicken J. Clendinning, J. Cobbe, R. Coleman, D. Cooper, A. Darrow, J. Dawkins, J. Diaz, R. Doel, G. Doran, J. Dorsey, I. Eberstein, C. Edrington, J. Fiorito, S. Fiorito, K. Gallivan, L. Garcia-Roig, J. Geringer, D. Gilbert, R. Hauber, C. Hofacker, E. Hull, P. Iatarola, R. Ikard, B. Jackson, T. Keller, H. Kim, J. Koslow, W. Landing, D. Latham, B. Lee, M. Leeser, J. Leiber, S. Leitch, S. Lewis, J. Lickson, W. Logan, L. Lyons, T. Ma, C. Madsen, H. Mattoussi, T. McQuade, W. Mio, D. Moore, A. Mullis, J. O'Rourke, R. Pekurny, N. Piquero, M. Radey V. Richard Auzenne, G. Rogachev, J. Saltiel, R. Schwartz, T. Stallins, J. Standley, J. Tull, G. Tyson, R. Van Engelen, D. Von Glahn, E. Walker, I. Zanini-Cordi.

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

G. Allen, P. Born, P. Bowen, W. Carlson, A. Chan Hilton, T. Chapin, I. Chiorescu, M. Craig, L. Edwards, R. Eger, K. Erndl, S. Foo, A. Gaiser, K. Harris, G. Houlihan, Y. Kim, T. Kolbe, T. Lindbloom, T. Matherly, B. Menchetti, R. Mizelle, M. Mesterton-Gibbons (A. Agashe), T. Plewa, R. Radach, J. Sickinger, L. Spainhour, G. Tenenbaum, F. Tolson, D. Tsilimingras, C. Upchurch, O. Vafek, S. Valisa (E. Alvarez).

II. Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of the December 1, 2010 meeting were approved as distributed.

III. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as distributed.

IV. Report of the Steering Committee, S. Lewis

The Faculty Senate Steering Committee has met 5 times since our last Senate meeting on the first of December, including one time with President Barron.

It seems like a long time ago, but the Steering Committee met in December with David Johnson, Chair of the Graduate Policy Committee, to get clarification of some changes that were being made to the Bulletin copy related to graduate degree requirements. A presentation of these proposed changes will occur immediately following this report. During our meeting, we urged Dr. Johnson to convey to the GPC our concern that requiring masters degree students to adhere to the same deadlines as those imposed on doctoral students is impeding their willingness to become engaged in research. President Walker offered to speak with the GPC about these concerns.

Other issues discussed included President Barron's invitation to submit specific budget reduction/savings ideas to the Budget Crisis Committee, the proposed Voluntary Separation Program, the recommendations of the Board of Governors' Ad Hoc Committee on Articulation, Coordination and Coherence of Academic Delivery across the State University System, the status of the recommendations included in the Non Tenure Track Faculty report, issues related to interdisciplinary programs, changes to the PECO list, and the reinstatement of some of the academic degree programs by the Board of Trustees.

The Steering Committee met with Tom Jennings, the new Vice President for University Advancement, to discuss a faculty component of the new capital campaign. We reviewed a draft of a plan to make a fund-raising drive for the University Libraries a "featured initiative" of a faculty component, which would still encourage other patterns and targets of faculty giving. With a generous seed donation from President and Mrs. Barron, the library project would be shaped annually to honor those faculty members granted tenure with named items in the library collections. We will continue to work with Vice President Jennings over the coming months on the details of the plan, including the identification of faculty campaign leadership.

The meeting with President Barron last Friday focused on three related items, including the assessment of Deans and other administrators, potential changes to the promotion and tenure process, and the annual academic evaluation. President Barron shared his thoughts on these topics and listened to the Steering Committee's reactions to his ideas. The proposed form for evaluating deans includes 38 questions to which faculty and staff would be asked to respond anonymously. These items address the following broad areas: mentorship, leadership, student-centeredness, administrative function, interpersonal skills, and the quality of the work environment. Among the ideas that were raised regarding changes to the P&T process were (a) separating the annual evaluations and promotion and tenure progress reports, (b) including narratives to explain the promotion and tenure votes of faculty committees, (c) increasing the opportunities for tenure earning faculty to be formally evaluated (perhaps in year 2 and year 4), (d), requiring an outside letter from an

international colleagues, and (e) increasing the number of outside letters required for promotion or tenure from 3 to 5. Finally, Dr. Barron indicated that he is committed to increases in both base salary and merit pay and would like to see a more sensitive system developed for the annual academic evaluation and the identification of those faculty for whom merit increases are deserved.

Dr. Kathy Burnett also met with the Steering Committee last Friday and discussed with us the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Integrity. You have received a copy of this report and will have a chance to hear more about it from her in a few minutes.

Finally, the Steering Committee has developed a proposal for electing the members of the Salary Plan for Professors' Review Committee (or the SPPRC). As you can see from the materials distributed, we are proposing that members of the Faculty Senate be provided a list of all professors who are not planning to apply for a SPP award for the purpose of nominating up to 7 professors for this review. From those nominations, an election ballot will be prepared that will be composed of at least 14 names of professors with the highest number of nominations who have also agreed to serve in this capacity. From this ballot, 7 individuals will be selected through an election held at the February Senate meeting, with the final membership of the SPPRC being comprised of representatives from at least 4 colleges (with no college being represented by more than 2 members).

President Walker - First of all I wanted to make a few comments about the Provost search. Nicole Piquero - anything happening with the Provost search.

(Nicole) No, we're just taking applications, so right now it's a quiet phase.

(Dr. Walker) I think you said Quiet phase with a capital Q, at the moment. Cliff Madsen said Don Gibson, Dean of College of Music, said "At the moment, we don't even know who's applied"... so it's very quiet. It's going to happen, and it's going to break fast, in Spring. But we're going to bring news, when we have news about that.

Second, I notice in the Steering Committee report in December that we had given you a heads up about a possibility schedule change that has to do with football, and that was the athletic department has requested us to talk about a Thursday night game and a holiday connected to Veterans Day... that's gone away. We received a memo from the athletic director, someone from the athletic department probably decided who they were playing on next week, this was not a good idea. So you can forget that we were asked to think about that idea but the athletic department did thank us for being willing to work with them on this project.

I wanted to say a quick work about a Trustee meeting that occurred between the December meeting and this meeting, and that is there was a conference call meeting, as you've probably seen, on the Friday of the first week of classes, on January the 7th, and there were a couple of important actions at that Trustee meeting that I wanted to make sure you were alert to. And

one of those, I think the primary purpose of the meeting was for the Trustees to approve the voluntary separation plan, and it was moving fairly quickly through administrative channels through Joyce Ingram's shop, and then negotiation with the Union and the Trustees blessed the voluntary separation plan. Of course whenever they have the chance to meet there are a couple of other items on the agenda. The most important thing, in the wake of the layoffs and the cancellations academic programs which occurred at the Trustee meeting in June 2009, at this telephone conference on January 7th, several of the academic programs which had been suspended and placed in suspended reanimation, were reactivated. Not all were reactivated - the geology degrees, the mathematics education degree was reactivated, a couple more... I don't want to get lost in the details but I asked the Provost Bradley, "What's the process for what go reactivated and what did not?" Because a couple did not, and he said "It's a work in progress and this was not the final list, and that central administration, the Provost office, was depending upon the initiatives to reanimate the programs coming from the Deans." So the message from me to you would be—if you're in a unit or college that had a degree program suspended as part of the budget cuts from '09, and you want to have a conversation in your college with the Dean about sending appealing, it needs to start in your college with your Dean.

Third and final, we wanted to get you a quick update on the status of the non-tenure track faculty report, which is after about 7 or 8 years at least, if not more, is beginning to get close to the finish line. That is, a consultation committee between the administration and the bargaining agent, the Union, have hammered out an agreement that was presented to the Council of Deans back at the December meeting. Feedback has been given from the Deans to Susannah Miller, and I think it's approached a form that will now, Jack, go to bargaining? Or Ted, is it close to going to bargaining?

(Ted) I'm going to continue meeting with Susannah as soon as she's ready and I don't know how soon it will be, but she's going to let me know. (asks Dean Rowe a question) But at some point, when Susannah's ready, we'll get real discussions.

(Dr. Walker) We're very close to go to bargaining in the final features of this. There are so many details in this, and so many details here and there to put together a package like this, that I must confess that I think it's in fairly, fragile isn't the right word, but it's one of those structures where if you pull out one of the pieces, they all start crumbling. So all sides have agreed that although there may be any number of specific issues that you might want to try to open up and argue about it, the deals have been cut. And it's a poster package that according to this committee that has been working on it from both sides, the administration and the Union, the faculty representative, this looks to be as good as it's going to get. And the Steering Committee has looked at the package and it looks pretty good. I can send you, well Susannah asks that we don't circulate it yet, it's in that state, but talk to me if you want to know some of those details. But we're getting close and I hope we can give you information about the non-tenure track faculty proposal.

Anyway that's all I've got to say, and I want to move on in the agenda to a special order. We have a special guest today, and I want to make an introduction, and I want to do it by saying Thanks. That is, the institution has been under enormous stress in the ways that the institution decided to deal with the budget crisis. A steady friend to the faculty has been the American Association of University Professors... they have been standing by, they've been in correspondence with President Barron when he came on board, they've been willing to step in on our conversations we've been having about the status, particularly the tenured faculty that have been laid off. We have with us today Professor Cary Nelson, whose a member of the English Dept at the University of Illinois. He also happens to be the president of the AAUP, he's been here doing a gig for Modern Languages with the English Department, he met for lunch today with the Union. But I just wanted to say thank you and give you a chance to bring us greetings from the AAUP.

V. Special Order: AAUP, Cary Nelson

I really appreciate the chance to talk to the Senate for a few minutes today. We have been interested in this campus for some months now. I suppose I should say in light of the events last year that its good you have someone from Criminology on your Provost search committee, good way to keep the future in mind. Of course the termination of tenured faculty violates the principles the AAUP laid down in 1915. I'm glad in a few years when we celebrate the 100 year anniversary; we won't have to look back at USF violating those principles as part of the 100 year celebration. That was a terribly important success/victory that you had, as I pointed out to the Union today, it really was a victory to the country as a whole. If the administration here can get away with dismissing tenured faculty with no faculty review process, with no sound proof of financial exigency, it's going to happen elsewhere. These things get copied and so instead the only thing to be copied is a victory. And it's really terribly important, we're proud of it, we were ready to move forward with some actions via the administration. It was a pretty obvious case for an AAUP investigation because it violates the very core of what we are. But there are still issues unresolved on the table that I think still require attention.

On the suspension or the suspended animation for academic programs, without full involvement of the Faculty Senate is also unacceptable. In 1915 not only did we urge job security for faculty, we made it clear the curriculum is something the faculty should be involved with because you actually know something about it and that's the reason why the authority, which resides in the Board of Trustees ultimately, is generally seeded to the faculty, because it's an acknowledgment of your knowledge and expertise. That's what that kind of authority is based on, so those are still open questions. We're still going to have to be in conversation with some of those departments. Some of the damage done affect closure, unfortunately, well it's looking more like closure instead of suspension. We're doing harm to students, we're doing harm to faculty, the consequences ripple through the academy and represent elimination of the structural student body, they represent the elimination of possible conversation and affiliation between faculty in different departments, there's consequences for these kinds of decisions that I think require attention. You're looking at

God knows what else when you face the legislature later this semester. The context does not look good, you may face more stringent actions in the future. I think that in the very least, the Senate and the Union need to collaborate on much greater budgetary transparency than you have now. As I pointed out to the Union earlier today, I really don't regard budgeting on pretty much any campus in the US as truly transparent, by which I mean that the faculty knows where all the money is, where all the special accounts are, and they really know in detail what money is being spent on. Obviously you need access, which I assume you have, to past year's financial statements, which would give you in aggregate terms, info on how money is spent, but financial statements include broad categories in which the devil is in the details and not what's there. So you need to start thinking about using Freedom of Info Acts to request more detail budgetary info.

Moving forward into the future, state support for public education does not look like it's going to recover this year, next year... if I could give a rough, nasty estimate, if things work out okay, by 2017, we may be back to the funding level that we had in 2007. In other words I'm looking at the substantial level of the next decade as broadly difficult for public higher education in the US. I think the only real source of funds to have equitable salary and benefits for everyone on campus, and to insure the proper richness of graduate curriculum is to rethink what we are spending money on now. Do we need that new building? Do we need that 400th vice president? 50 certainly, do we need 50 vice presidents? How much administrative costs should we actually fare? These are all questions the faculty simply has to get involved in. Public higher education can no longer leave the budgeting to someone else. We're going to have to take this on, we're going to have to learn a lot more about budgeting, senates are going to have to be more active in the budgeting of the institution if they expect higher education to be something that they really admire and believe in.

So you've had to take about as definitive a shot across the warning belt as you've had to take. You've had a victory, I think the victory will help you build solidarity on campus, but I think there's a lot more work to be done, and I think the old cliché, "it's going to get worse before it gets better", well it is going to get worse, but it isn't going to get better unless the faculty unites behind the possibility to take full authority and responsibility before campus life. There's just no choice, either that or the future is dark, but it doesn't have to be. Faculty have the power to take the institution back. You have the power in numbers and intelligence to repossess the institution to make it your university. That's the struggle well worth taking on, and I don't think you have a choice, but it's the struggle that the Senate can take a role, especially here if you work closely with the Union on that project. I'm probably not telling you anything you don't already know or haven't thought about, but I think beginning to talk these things through collectively is the first step to making the faculty more responsible for the life of the university.

I passed out a flier for everyone, but it's part of an effort I'm doing to take some of the AAUP principles and put them in a form that's more publicly accessible, and try to do brief summaries of issues like academic freedom and tenure, the piece on parents and children, professors with tenure- the AAUP sent out 400 links to that piece to 400,000 faculty

members. The Chronicle of higher education sent it out to 200 thousand, and Phi Beta Kappa has a quarterly magazine that goes out to half a million people, they sent it out to them. So that's a piece that was distributed to more than a million faculty, students, members, administrators and so forth. It's a pretty good outreach and we're trying to do more of that because in addition to that we have a huge project of public education. To try to get these concepts that are so dear to us and so critical to our professional lives, better understood and better supported by the public at large. Thanks a lot for having me in.

VI. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Undergraduate Policy Committee (see addendum 1)

The Undergraduate Policy Committee, at its meeting last Wednesday, approved the following course as meeting the criteria for Area III, History and Social Sciences:

LIS 3103: Information and Society (effective Spring, 2011)

In addition, upon recommendation by the Area IV Subcommittee, the following course was approved, effective Spring, 2011, as meeting the criteria as (Area IV) Humanities and Fine Arts courses:

CHT 3391: Chinese Film and Culture

Please note that at this time, this course is only being brought to the Senate for approval of its being offered as an Area IV course. There is mention in the syllabus that it also has been approved as meeting the multicultural credit, but no application for this status has been made to the UPC.

On behalf of the Undergraduate Policy Committee, I move approval of these 2 courses by the Faculty Senate. **The motion passed unanimously.**

b. Graduate Policy Committee, D. Johnson

The discussion and vote of the bulletin changes were postponed until the February meeting.

VII. Old Business

a. Ad-hoc Committee on Academic Integrity, K. Burnett

(See addendum 2.) The report recommendations were adopted unanimously.

VIII. New Business

a. Salary Plan for Professors Review Committee (SPPRC), E. Walker

(See addendum 3.) The election procedures for the SPPRC were approved unanimously.

IX. University Welfare

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

AAUP President Cary Nelson's Visit

We are pleased to help bring Professor Nelson to FSU. The AAUP is among the few influential national organizations that truly understands the importance of tenure in higher education, and Professor Nelson and his AAUP colleagues have forcefully articulated the case for tenure. This understanding of tenure's importance is part of the AAUP's very fabric. The AAUP has been a supportive ally of FSU faculty, and for that support we are grateful.

Collective Bargaining

New Voluntary Separation Program (VSP). The key change, one our faculty bargaining team urged unsuccessfully in the 2009 plan, was to expand eligibility by lowering the minimum age for participation. It has now been lowered from age 70 to age 65. This increases the potential number of participants by roughly a factor of five. VSP participation relieves pressure on FSU to consider involuntary cost-cutting. It also may free up resources for new hires and salary adjustments. More information is available on the VSP at the UFF-FSU "Bargaining News" page (<http://www.uff-fsu.org/cbac>)

Salary Plan for Professors (SPP Awards). This is a great innovation in our latest collective bargaining agreement, one that many consider long overdue. Two points need to be stressed in this initial implementation:

1. The SPP is intended to be **analogous to a promotion**. The stress is on **qualification, not** competition.
2. Accordingly, there is **no provision for ranking** in this program. Rumor has it that some administrators have suggested this term when addressing the fact that the number qualifying is likely to exceed the number of SPP awards that can be made during at least the first few years of implementation. The contract language for SPP awards clearly stipulates that the only legitimate criterion for rationing or ordering is years of service as a Full Professor or Eminent Scholar at FSU. This part of the agreement reflects the fact that length of service and under-compensation strongly correlate at FSU, and is consistent with the Faculty Senate study on market equity. Please be assured that the UFF-FSU will be vigilant in monitoring SPP implementation. I encourage all present to help ensure that implementation complies with our contract.

State Government

I am hopeful that the new Governor and Legislature will realize that desirable Florida futures require adequate support, not cuts, for public higher education. The realist in me says that we need to be prepared for less optimistic legislative outcomes. A strong and united voice for faculty is our best hope.

b. Resolution, Gary Tyson

Whereas the generation of student credit hours (SCH) is used as a performance metric for academic units; and

Whereas the SCH metric can be used to justify resource allocation and/or program elimination for an academic unit;

Therefore be it resolved by the Faculty Senate for the Florida State University that the student credit hours associated with a course shall be credited only to the academic units where the instructors for that course are appointed.

The motion passed.

X. Announcements by Deans and Other Administrative Officers

There were no announcements.

XI. Announcements by Interim Provost Bradley

Interim Provost Bradley was not in attendance.

XII. Announcements by President Barron

President Barron was not in attendance.

XIII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.



Melissa Crawford
Faculty Senate Coordinator

Information & Society
LIS 3103
Web-based Course

Instructor

Debi Carruth, Doctoral Candidate
College of Information
dcarruth@mailier.fsu.edu

Course Materials

The following is a required text for this course:

Quaratiello, A.R. (2007). *The college student's research companion, 4th ed.* New York: Neal-Schuman Publishers, Inc.

This text is available through the amazon.com, but apparently not through FSU's bookstore. Sorry about that. Free shipping with amazon, though! Bonus! I will supplement occasionally with outside readings, and self-assigned readings, available either through the course site or through online databases and search engines.

Prerequisite

No prerequisites.

Note that this is an online course -- we will not meet face to face, so you must have access to a computer with an internet connection and Microsoft Word or other advanced word processing software. Microsoft Works is NOT a viable word processing software -- if that is all you have, try to find some open source word processors, because if you don't have Works (and I don't) you can't read Works files. Which means a '0' on any assignment submitted in that format. Help us both out, k? (note that this means *any file with an extension of .wps* -- totally unreadable by me)

A Note About Influenza or Other Illness

If you become terribly ill during the course of the semester, you must immediately inform me and your other instructors, *before you start getting behind*. We are happy to work with you if you contract Swine Flu or any other Dread Disease, but *not after the fact*. It is ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL that you find some way to communicate with me to let me know what is happening, and crawl out of your deathbed at least once a week to keep me posted as to your progress, until you again have a clean bill of health. The **Late Policy** for this class (below) applies if I do not find out about your illness until after you have attempted to turn something in late.

Course Description

Information & Society is an asynchronous, web-based course that will examine the major issues of living in the Information Society, including information literacy, information security, identity theft, privacy, intellectual property, and information ethics. Students will gain skills in power-searching the web, electronic databases, and print resources. Students will learn to locate, evaluate, and use information in effective and ethically responsible ways within three broad areas: personal information management, academic information, and career/professional information.

Course Objectives

After completing the course, students will be able to:

- Understand and describe various issues related to the Information Society, including information literacy, information privacy/security, intellectual property, and information ethics
- Define and articulate an information need
- Identify a variety of types and formats of information
- Construct and implement effective search strategies
- Articulate and apply criteria for evaluating both the information and its sources
- Synthesize main ideas to construct new concepts
- Compare new knowledge with prior knowledge to determine the value added, contradictions, or other unique aspects of the information
- Synthesize new and prior information in planning and creating a presentation
- Appropriately acknowledge the use of information sources in presenting information
- Understand the ethical, legal, and socio-economic issues surrounding information and information technology.

Course Policies

- ✓ Time spent on course
 - Since this class will never meet face to face, it is up to you to set aside time *each week* to spend on work related to the class.
 - On average, you should expect to spend a **minimum of 6 hours per week** working on this class, including *checking and responding to email, posting and responding on discussion boards, reading course materials, completing individual assignments, and participating in group work*
 - Note also that this course is **not** designed for you to go at your own pace. There work due **each week**, as well as group work that is set to a tight schedule of completion. You are expected to keep an eye on deadlines, and stay on top of requirements from week to week. The **Course Schedule** (a link from the main menu of the Course Site) will be helpful (read: *ESSENTIAL*) in this regard.
- ✓ Visiting the BlackBoard site

- You must log in and spend quality time on our course site at least **three separate times per week**. You will likely need to spend more time as the group project deadline approaches, but *three visits is the bare minimum expected*.
- Check and respond to your email **every day**. Reliable communication is ESSENTIAL. Your instructor will send emails out, your classmates will send emails out, and you will typically need to respond promptly. ***If you do not commit to checking and responding to your email on a daily basis, please drop this class now.*** We are all too busy to hunt you down, and you are grown enough to be responsible for communicating in an appropriate and timely manner.

✓ Late work

- ***Discussion Boards***: We will often have a required discussion forum prompt in the main classroom. You must post your initial response to the prompt **no later than Wednesday midnight** of the week it is posted. Subsequent responses must be completed by Sunday midnight, but the idea behind the discussion forums is, strangely enough, discussion. Conversation. You cannot have conversations if you're making all your posts on Sunday night. ***Note, also, that you must post three full substantive times in a week in order to get any discussion credit for that week.***
- ***Group Work***: If you have any late work related to your group projects, you will need to work that out with your group-mates. Consistent tardy work, or lack of communication, will affect your evaluations and your final grade on group projects (and ultimately, your grade), but if you keep communication open, you are less likely to annoy your group-mates and will instead help to contribute to a successful project. *Please visit the **Course Library** for resources that will provide guidance and support for effective collaboration.*
- ***Individual Work***: All individual written assignments are due by **Sunday midnight** of the week in which they are assigned, unless otherwise specified. Late individual work **will not** be accepted. Remember: There is work due in this class on an almost weekly basis.

✓ Group work

- Bottom line: You need to take care of your peeps. ***If you prove yourself unreliable, you will get a ZERO on the project.*** You are training, at the university, for the real world, and the real world doesn't let you get away with letting collaborators down. Nor will I. What this means is that if you go more than three days without communicating with your group, you will be dropped from the project and receive a failing grade. Note that this is *three times* the bare minimum required for course participation. If you have an emergency, call or email to let your group-mates know what is going on, and do it sooner (before the fact) rather than later (after).

Grading/Evaluation

Individual written wk (5)	225 points
Discussion board postings (6 weeks—3 per week)	360
Group Project (1)	200
Quizzes (2) [1 @ 50 pts.; 1 @ 65 pts.]	115
Final Project (1)	<u>100</u>
TOTAL	1000

Final grades will be awarded as follows:

930-1000 points	A
900-929	A-
870-899	B+
830-869	B
800-829	B-
770-799	C+
730-769	C
700-729	C-
670-699	D+
630-669	D
600-629	D-
0-599	F

Assignments/Responsibilities

Weekly written activities: You will have 5 individual activities to complete during the semester. Specific instructions for each activity are posted under the “Assignments” section of the course website. Each activity is worth 45 points. Note that neatness counts, but you don’t have to be formal -- just demonstrate that you’re *proud of and engaged in your work*. TOTAL = 225.

Discussion board postings: You are expected to post to the class discussion board on 6 different weeks. You must post a **minimum of three times for each discussion prompt** —once in response to the discussion topic posted by the instructor and twice in response to what other students have posted. Each post is worth up to 20 points for a total of up to 60 points per week. Posts will be assigned points based on the level of discourse -- engaging with and extending the topic will earn more points than simply meeting the minimum requirement. *If you have not posted the minimum in any given week, however, you will receive no credit for that week.* Ongoing discourse is an essential tool to success in this class. As such, you will need to make your initial post no later than Wednesday of each week, to allow time for your peers to reflect, respond, and challenge you, and vice versa. TOTAL = 360.

Quizzes: There will be two quizzes during the semester, covering the readings and course lectures. They are cumulative quizzes. These quizzes are designed to be formative evaluations rather than summative -- as such, you are permitted to discuss the quizzes with your classmates

and consult any sources necessary in order to complete the quizzes successfully. In fact, I strongly encourage you to do so. The only stipulation is that I don't want you supplying answers directly to classmates. You can discuss, you can hint, just no exact answers -- help your classmates learn, as opposed to helping them 'get by.' One quiz is worth 50 points, the other is 65. TOTAL = 115.

Group project: There will be one group project. Specific instructions are provided under the "Assignments" section of the course website. Your grade on the project will have two components—the instructor's evaluation of your work (100 points) and your other group members' evaluation of your contribution to the project (100 points). Remember: If you let your group mates down consistently, or if you go more than 72 hours without communicating with them or me, you will receive a zero on the group project. TOTAL = 200.

Final project: Your final assignment is a cumulative assignment where you will be expected to apply what you have learned all semester in creating an effective and compelling Career Portfolio. You will use the tools and skills we've covered, and utilize critical and creative thinking to market yourself to a company of your choosing. TOTAL = 100.

Course Content

Personal information

What is information?
Information impacts on society
Accessing Internet resources
Evaluating Internet resources
Information privacy
Knowledge creation (part 1)

Academic information

Academic resources (part 1)
Academic resources (part 2)
Knowledge creation (part 2)
Academic resources & plagiarism
On being a scholar

Career/professional information

Professional resources (part 1)
Professional resources (part 2)
Knowledge creation (part 3)
Ethics & sources

University Attendance Policy:

Excused absences include documented illness, deaths in the family and other documented crises, call to active military duty or jury duty, religious holy days, and official University activities. These absences will be accommodated in a way that does not arbitrarily penalize students who have a valid excuse. Consideration will also be given to students whose dependent children experience serious illness.

Academic Honor Policy

The Florida State University Academic Honor Policy outlines the University's expectations for the integrity of students' academic work, the procedures for resolving alleged violations of those expectations, and the rights and responsibilities of students and faculty members throughout the process. Students are responsible for reading the Academic Honor Policy and for living up to their pledge to ". . . be honest and truthful and . . . [to] strive for personal and institutional integrity at Florida State University." (Florida State University Academic Honor Policy, found at <http://www.fsu.edu/~dof/honorpolicy.htm> <http://www.fsu.edu/~dof/honorpolicy.htm>).

Americans with Disabilities Act:

Students with disabilities needing academic accommodation should:

- (1) Register with and provide documentation to the Student Disability Resource Center; and
- (2) Bring a letter to the instructor indicating the need for accommodation and what type. This should be done during the first week of class.

This syllabus and other class materials are available in alternative format upon request. For more information about services available to FSU students with disabilities, contact:

Student Disability Resource Center
874 Traditions Way
108 Student Services Building
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306-4167
US +1 (850) 644-9566 Call (voice)
US +1 (850) 644-8504 Call (TDD)
sdrc@admin.fsu.edu <http://www.disabilitycenter.fsu.edu/>

Liberal Studies Statement:

The Liberal Studies Program at Florida State University has been designed to provide a perspective on the qualities, accomplishments, and aspirations of human beings, the past and present civilizations we have created, and the natural and technological world we inhabit. This course has been approved as meeting the requirements for **Liberal Studies Area III, History and Social Science**, and in combination with your other Liberal Studies courses, provides an important foundation for your lifelong quest for knowledge.

Syllabus Change Policy:

Except for changes that substantially affect implementation of the evaluation (grading) statement, this syllabus is a guide for the course and is subject to change with advanced notice.

SYLLABUS
CHINESE FILM & CULTURE

CHT 3391 01, Spring 2011
6:45-7:45 PM, Monday, 204 DIF
6:45-9:00 PM, Wednesday, 128 DIF

Dr. Aaron Feng Lan (Office: 334 DIF)
Office Hours: TBA
flan@mailier.fsu.edu (Tel: 644-8389)

COURSE OBJECTIVES

This course is offered for students who are interested in Chinese cinema and Chinese culture. Ever since film was introduced into China at the end of the nineteenth century, it has become a major medium of mass communication there, and has played an important role in China's long march towards modernity. By presenting representative films from mainland China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan, this course enables students to study Chinese cinema both as a unique genre of modern arts and as a powerful social and political discourse. Upon completing this course, students will have attained 1) an overall view of the development of film in China, 2) the necessary skills for interpreting the cinematic language by which Chinese filmmakers articulate their ideas, 3) some basic knowledge of Chinese literary and aesthetic conventions, and 4) an appropriate understanding of the social issues and cultural customs illuminated on the Chinese screen. No knowledge of the Chinese language is required.

This course can be taken for major or minor credits in Chinese as well as in Asian Studies, and fulfills the Multicultural requirements and Liberal Studies requirements.

The Liberal Studies Program at FSU has been designed to provide a perspective on the qualities, accomplishments, and aspirations of human beings, the past and present civilizations we have created, and the natural and technological world we inhabit. This course has been approved as meeting the requirements for Liberal Studies Area IV, Humanities and Fine Arts, and in combination with your other Liberal Studies courses, provides an important foundation for your lifelong quest for knowledge.

COURSE STRUCTURE

The course materials are presented from both historical and critical perspectives. We will examine films from the 1930s to the past several years. There will be two sessions each week: one for introducing and screening a film, and the other for lecture and discussion on the film that has been screened. The screenings of films are organized around a number of topics that would allow students to approach each film with a critical focus and to put several films in a comparative context. Such topics include the family and tradition, China's peasants, the individual versus class/the state, the impact of the Cultural Revolution, gender, the post-Mao economic reform, and the challenge to the Chinese nationhood by the special cases of Hong Kong and Taiwan, etc.

ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADED WORKS

ESSAYS: Students will write two critical essays. The first essay is about 1,000 words and the second essay about 2,000 words. Detailed descriptions of assignments will be posted online at the Bb course site. Pay attention to the due dates in the course schedule.

QUIZZES: There will be four quizzes throughout the semester. Each quiz consists of a series of identification questions and written answers about the films and materials covered in the previous several weeks. Pay attention to the quiz dates in the course schedule.

PRESENTATION: For every lecture-discussion class, a number of students will each be given the chance to make a five-minute presentation on the film screened during the previous class. To that end, in his/her presentation a student can either choose to elaborate on one of the questions that I raise in the weekly "Study Guide" on the film posted on the Bb course site, or articulate his/her own thought on one

aspect of the film. This short presentation, which will be graded, is expected not only to reflect the student's grasp of the film but also to be thought-provoking in order to generate discussions in class. The list of presenters' names for each session will be posted at the Bb course site.

ONLINE DISCUSSIONS: To compensate for the insufficient time of class meetings, we will extend our class discussions by using Bb's discussion platform. After every screening class, each student is required to post a comment on the film's forum in the Bb "Discussion Board." Post the comment either as a new thread or as a response to comments by other students. Your posting should be at least a passage consisting of several sentences. Deadline for each week's postings is Friday 5:00 PM. Later postings will not receive credits.

READINGS: In preparation of each screening, students are required to study carefully the assigned readings. In addition, students should be familiar with the question in the weekly "Study Guide" on the film.

GRADING

Attendance	10%
Presentation + Class & Online (Bb) Discussions	20%
Four Quizzes (4 x 6%)	24%
Essay I (20%) + Essay II (26%)	46%
(A = 95; A- = 90-94; B+ = 86-89; B = 82-85; B- = 80-82; C+ = 76-79; C = 72-75; etc. F = 59)	

ATTENDANCE POLICY

Attendance for both sessions of screenings and lectures-discussions is mandatory. At each class an attendance sheet will be provided for students to sign on. According to FSU's **University Attendance Policy**, "Excused absences include documented illness, deaths in the family and other documented crises, call to active military duty or jury duty, religious holy days, and official University activities. These absences will be accommodated in a way that does not arbitrarily penalize students who have a valid excuse. Consideration will also be given to students whose dependent children experience serious illness."

ACADEMIC HONOR POLICY

The Florida State University Academic Honor Policy outlines the University's expectations for the integrity of students' academic work, the procedures for resolving alleged violations of those expectations, and the rights and responsibilities of students and faculty members throughout the process. Students are responsible for reading the Academic Honor Policy and for living up to their pledge to ". . . be honest and truthful and . . . [to] strive for personal and institutional integrity at Florida State University." (Florida State University Academic Honor Policy, found at <http://dof.fsu.edu/honorpolicy.htm>.)

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

Students with disabilities needing academic accommodation should: (1) register with and provide documentation to the Student Disability Resource Center; and (2) bring a letter to the instructor indicating the need for accommodation and what type. This should be done during the first week of class. This syllabus and other class materials are available in alternative format upon request. For more information about services available to FSU students with disabilities, contact:

The Student Disability Resource Center / 874 Traditions Way / 108 Student Services Building / Florida State University / Tallahassee, FL 32306-4167 / (850) 644-9566 (voice) / (850) 644-8504 (TDD) /

SYLLABUS CHANGE POLICY

Except for changes that substantially affect implementation of the evaluation (grading) statement, this syllabus is a guide for the course and is subject to change with advance notice.

COURSE MATERIALS

I. FILMOGRAPHY (in Chinese with English subtitles):

1. Ang Lee. Dir. *Eat Drink Man Woman*, 1994.
2. Chen Kaige. Dir. *Yellow Earth*, 1984.
3. Dai Sijie. Dir. *Little Chinese Seamstress*, 2002.
4. Hou Hsiao-hsien. Dir. *Good Men, Good Women*. 1995 (or *The Puppetmaster*, 1993)
5. John Woo. Dir. *A Better Tomorrow*. 1986 (or *The Killer*, 1989.)
6. King Hu. Dir. *Touch of Zen*. 1969.
7. Lou Ye, Dir. *Suzhou River*, 2000 (or Jia Zhangke. Dir. *Unknown Pleasures*, 2002)
8. Lu Ren. Dir. *Li Shuangshuang*. 1962.
9. Wu Tianming. Dir. *Old Well*, 1987.
10. Wu Yonggang. Dir. *Goddess*, 1934.
11. Xie Jin. Dir. *Stage Sisters*, 1965.
12. Zheng Junli. Dir. *Crows and Sparrows*, 1949.
13. Zhang Yimou. Dir. *Raise the Red Lantern*, 1991 (or *Red Sorghum*, 1987).
14. ----. Dir. *To Live*. 1994.
15. Zhou Xiaowen. Dir. *Ermo*, 1995.

(The following films are recommended for outside-class viewing and are available in VHS versions in the Media Room of 130 DIF)

16. Chen Kaige. Dir. *Farewell My Concubine*. 1993.
17. Jia Zhangke. Dir. *Xiao Wu*. 1997.
18. Joan Chen. Dir. *Xiu Xiu: The Sent-Down Girl*. 1998.
19. John Woo. Dir. *The Killer*. 1989.
20. Huang Jianxin, *Black Canon Incident*. 1985.
21. Shen Fu. Dir. *Ten Thousand Lights*. 1948.
22. Tian Zhuangzhuang. Dir. *Horse Thief*. 1986.
23. Tsai Ming-liang. Dir. *Vive L'Amour*. 1994.
24. Wang Bin and Shui Hua, *The White-Haired Girl*, 1950.
25. Xie Fei. Dir. *Women from the Lake of Scented Souls*. 1993.
26. Xie Jin. Dir. *The Red Detachment of Women*. 1961.
27. Yang, Edward. Dir. *Yi Yi*, 2000.
28. Zhang Yimou. Dir. *Hero*. 2002.

(A study guide will be provided for each film. The document will be placed in the "Study Guides" folder at our [Blackboard course site](#) prior to the screening of the film. You are expected to read the guide before the class scheduled for discussing the film.)

II. REQUIRED READINGS:

The reading assignments consist of the following articles and essays that are available online at the Blackboard course site (in the "Course Readings" folder). I urge you to print out a copy of each article and bring it to class for discussion.

1. Berry, Chris. "[Sexual Difference and the Viewing Subject in Li Shuangshuang and The In-laws.](#)" Berry, ed., *Perspectives on Chinese Cinema*. Ithaca: Cornell East Asia Papers, 1985. Rprt. London: British Film Institute, 1991. 30-39.

2. Bordwell, David. ["All Too Extravagant, Too Gratuitously Wild."](#) *Planet Hong Kong*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2000. 1-13.
3. ----. ["Film Criticism: Sample Analyses."](#) *Film Art: An Introduction*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1986 (2nd Ed). 287-342.
4. Chen, Xiaoming. ["The Mysterious Other: Postpolitics in Chinese Film."](#) *Boundary 2*. 24.3 (1997): 123-41.
5. Chow, Rey. Chow, Rey. ["Digging an Old Well: The Labor of Social Fantasy in a Contemporary Chinese Film."](#) Gledhill, Christine (ed.) and Williams, Linda (ed.). *Reinventing Film Studies*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001. 402-18
6. ----. ["We Endure, Therefore We Are: Survival, Governance, and Zhang Yimou's *To Live*."](#) *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 95:4, Fall (1996): 1039-64.
7. Ciecko, Anne. ["Transnational Action: John Woo, Hong Kong, Hollywood."](#) *Transnational Chinese Cinema: Identity, Nationhood, Gender*. Ed. Sheldon Lu. Honolulu: U of Hawaii P, 1997. 224-37.
8. Ciecko, Anne and Sheldon Lu. ["Televisuality, Capital, and the Global Village: ERMO \(Zhou Xiaowen, 1994\)."](#) *Jump Cut* 41 (1998): 77-83.
9. Clark, Paul. ["Film and Chinese Society before 1949."](#) *Chinese Cinema*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge UP, 1987. 4-21.
10. Dariotis, Wei Ming and Eileen Fung. ["Breaking the Soy Sause Jar."](#) *Transnational Chinese Cinema*. 187-220.
11. Deppman, Hsiu-Chuang. ["Body, Space, and Power: Reading the Cultural Images of Concubines in the Works of Su Tong and Zhang Yimou."](#) *Modern Chinese Literature and Culture*, 15:2 (2003 Fall): 121-53.
12. Fu, Poshek. ["Between Nationalism and Colonialism: Mainland Émigré's, Marginal Culture, Hong Kong Cinema, 1937-1941."](#) *Constructing Nationhood in Modern East Asia*. Ed. Kai-wing Chow et al. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001. 247-77.
13. Havis, Richard James. ["Changing the Face of Chinese Cinema: An Interview with Chen Kaige."](#) *Cineaste* 29.1 (Winter 2003): 8-11.
14. Jays, D. ["Balzac and the Little Chinese Seamstress."](#) *Sight & Sound* v. ns13 no. 5 (May 2003): 39-40.
15. Kaplan. E. Ann. ["Reading Formations and Chen Kaige's *Farewell My Concubine*."](#) *Transnational Chinese Cinema*. 265-75.
16. Lan, Feng. ["Reframing the Chinese Cultural Revolution in Diaspora."](#) *Film Literature Quarterly* 32.3 (2004): 193-98.
17. ----. ["Zhang Yimou's *Hero*: Reclaiming the Marital Arts Film for 'All under Heaven.'"](#) *Modern Chinese Literature and Culture* 20.1 (2008): 1-43.
18. Lau, Jenny Kwok Wah. ["Farewell My Concubine': History, Melodrama, and Ideology in Contemporary Pan-Chinese Cinema."](#) *Film Quarterly* 49.1 (1995): 16-27.
19. Lieberthal, Kenneeth. [Excerpts from *Governing China*](#). New York: Norton, 1995. 98-121.
20. Marchetti, Gina. ["Two Stage Sisters: the Blossoming of a Revolutionary Aesthetic."](#) *Transnational Chinese Cinema*. 59-80.
21. Naficy, Hamid. [Excerpts from *An Accented Cinema: Exilic and Diasporic Filmmaking*](#). Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001. 3-39.
22. Searls, Damion. ["Suzhou River."](#) *Film Quarterly*, Vol. 55, No. 2. (Winter, 2001-2002): 55-60.
23. Silbergeld, Jerome. ["Hitchcock with a Chinese Face: Suzhou River."](#) *Hitchcock with a Chinese Face: Cinematic Doubles, Oedipal Triangles, and China's Moral Voice*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 2004.
24. Tang Xiaobing. ["Rural Women and Social Change in New China Cinema: From Li Shuangshuang to Ermo."](#) *Positions* 11.3 (2003): 647-74.

25. Yau, Esther C. M. ["Yellow Earth: Western Analysis of a Non-Western Text."](#) *Perspectives on Chinese Cinema*. 20-29.
26. Ye, Tan. ["From the Fifth to the Sixth Generation: An Interview with Zhang Yimou."](#) *Film Quarterly* 53.2 (2000): 2-13.
27. Yip, June. ["Constructing a Nation: Taiwanese History and Films of Hou Hsiao-hsien."](#) *Transnational Chinese Cinema*. 139-68.
28. Zhang, Yingjin. ["Prostitution and Urban Imagination: Negotiating the Public and the Private in Chinese Films of the 1930s."](#) *Cinema and Urban Culture in Shanghai*. Ed. Zhang Yingjin. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999. 160-80.
29. ----, ["Cinema and the Nation-State in the PRC."](#) *Chinese National Cinema*, New York: Routledge, 2004. 189-216.
30. ----, ["Cultural Revolution and Beyond: 1966-1978."](#) *Chinese National Cinema*, 216-24.

III. RECOMMENDED REFERENCES AND WEB SITES

1. Bordwell, David. *Film Art: An Introduction*. NY: Knopf, 1986.
2. Zhang, Yingjin, *Encyclopedia of Chinese Film*, London: Routledge 1998.
3. Internet Movie Database:
<http://www.imdb.com/>
4. Film Terms:
<http://www.filmsite.org/filmterms.html>
5. Yale Film Studies Site:
<http://classes.yale.edu/film-analysis/>
6. Chinese Movie Database:
<http://www.asiaonline.net.hk/~dianying>
7. A Chinese Cinema Page:
<http://www.chinesecinemas.org/>
8. UCSD Chinese Cinema Web-based Learning Center:
http://chinesecinema.ucsd.edu/links_ccwlc.html

CLASS SCHEDULE

Week 1	Screening:	1. <i>Goddess</i> (in-class screening)
	Reading:	1. Paul Clark, "Film and Chinese society before 1949." 2. Yingjin Zhang, "Prostitution and Urban Imagination."
	Discussion:	Introduction to Chinese cinema.
Week 2	Screening:	1. <i>Crows and Sparrows</i> (in-class screening) 2. <i>Ten Thousand Lights</i> (recommended for outside-class viewing)
	Reading:	David Bordwell, "Film Criticism: Sample Analyses."
	Discussion:	How to write a critical essay on film.
Week 3	Screening:	1. <i>Li Shuangshuang</i> (in-class screening) 2. <i>The White-Haired Girl</i> (recommended for outside-class viewing)
	Reading:	1. Yingjin Zhang, "Cinema and the Nation-State in the PRC." 2. Berry, Chris. "Sexual Difference and the Viewing Subject in Li Shuangshuang and The In-laws."
	Discussion:	Class struggle and cinema: nation-building and visual propaganda.

Week 4	Screening:	1. <i>Two Stage Sisters</i> (in-class screening) 2. <i>The Red Detachment of Women</i> (recommended for outside-class viewing)
	Reading:	Gina Marchetti, " Two Stage Sisters: the Blossoming of a Revolutionary Aesthetic. "
	Quiz	Quiz 1: covering films and materials in the previous three weeks.
	Discussion:	Socialist realism in cinema.
Week 5	Screening:	1. <i>Old Well</i> (in-class screening) 2. <i>Black Canon Incident</i> (recommended for outside-class viewing)
	Reading:	1. Yingjin Zhang, " Cultural Revolution and Beyond: 1966-1978. " 2. Rey Chow, " Digging an Old Well. "
	Discussion:	1. Chinese cinema during the Cultural Revolution. 2. The fourth-generation directors: between idealism and pessimism.
Week 6	Screening:	1. <i>Yellow Earth</i> (in-class screening) 2. <i>Horse Thief</i> (recommended for outside-class viewing)
	Reading:	1. James Havis, " Changing the Face of Chinese Cinema: An Interview with Chen Kaige. " 2. Esther C. M. Yau, " Yellow Earth: Western Analysis of a Non-Western Text. "
	Discussion:	The emergence of the new Chinese cinema.
Week 7	Screening:	1. <i>Raise the Red Lantern</i> (in-class screening) (or <i>Red Sorghum</i>) 2. <i>Red Sorghum</i> (recommended for outside-class viewing)
	Reading:	1. Tan Ye, " From the Fifth to the Sixth Generation: An Interview with Zhang Yimou. " 2. Hsiu-Chuang Deppman, " Body, Space, and Power. "
	Quiz	Quiz 2: covering films and materials in the previous three weeks.
	Discussion:	Gender, sexuality, and the viewing subject.
Week 8	Screening:	1. <i>To Live</i> (in-class screening) 2. <i>Farewell My Concubine</i> (recommended for outside-class viewing)
	Reading:	1. Kenneth Lieberthal, excerpts from Governing China. 2. Rey Chow, " We Endure, Therefore, We Are: Survival, Governance, and Zhang Yimou's To Live. "
	Assignment	First essay due in class.
	Discussion:	The individual and the state in Maoist Revolution.
Week 9	Screening:	1. <i>Ermo</i> (in-class screening) 2. <i>Women from the Lake of Scented Souls</i> (recommended for outside-class viewing)
	Reading:	Anne Ciecko and Sheldon Lu. " Televisuality, Capital, and the Global Village. " Xiaobing Tang. " Rural Women and Social Change in New China Cinema. "
	Discussion:	China's economic reform: the temptations of developmentalism.
Week 10	Screening:	1. <i>A Better Tomorrow</i> (in-class screening) (or <i>The Killer</i>) 2. <i>The Killer</i> (recommended for outside-class viewing)

	Reading:	1. Poshek Fu, "Between Nationalism and Colonialism: Mainland Émigr"ls, Marginal Culture, Hong Kong Cinema"
		2. Anne Ciecko, "Transnational Action: John Woo, Hong Kong, Hollywood."
	Quiz	Quiz 3: covering films and materials in the previous three weeks.
	Discussion:	The emergence of Hong Kong cinema in the colonial context.
Week 11	Screening:	1. <i>Touch of Zen</i> (in-class screening) 2. <i>Hero</i> (recommended for outside-class viewing)
	Reading:	1. David Bordwell. "All Too Extravagant, Too Graciously Wild."
		2. Feng Lan, "Reclaiming the Marital Arts Film for 'All under Heaven.'"
	Discussion:	Hong Kong Cinema and Martial Arts Films
Week 12	Screening:	1. <i>Good Men, Good Women</i> (or <i>The Puppetmaster</i>) 2. <i>Yi Yi</i> (recommended for outside-class viewing)
	Reading:	June Yip. "Constructing a Nation: Taiwanese History and Films of Hou Hsiao-hsien."
	Discussion:	Redefining the Chinese nationhood: the Taiwan complex.
Week 13	Screening:	1. <i>Eat Drink Man Woman</i> (in-class screening) 2. <i>Vive L'Amour</i> (recommended for outside-class viewing)
	Reading:	Wei Ming Dariotis, "Breaking the Soy Sauce Jar."
	Quiz	Quiz 4: covering films and materials in the previous four weeks.
	Discussion:	Tradition and modernity.
Week 14	Screening:	1. <i>Suzhou River</i> (in-class screening) (or <i>Unknown Pleasures</i>) 2. <i>Xiao Wu</i> (recommended for outside-class viewing)
	Reading:	1. Damion Searls, "Suzhou River."
		2. Jerome Silbergeld, "Hitchcock with a Chinese Face: Suzhou River."
	Discussion:	The 6th-generation directors and neo-realism in Chinese cinema.
Week 15	Screening:	1. <i>Little Chinese Seamstress</i> (in-class screening) 2. <i>Xiu Xiu</i> (recommended for outside-class viewing)
	Reading:	1. D. Jays, "Balzac and the Little Chinese Seamstress."
		2. Hamid Naficy. Excerpts from <i>An Accented Cinema: Exilic and Diasporic Filmmaking</i>.
		3. Feng Lan, "Reframing the Chinese Cultural Revolution in Diaspora."
	Assignment	Second essay due in class.
	Discussion:	Re-imagining China in Diaspora.

Report to Senate From the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Integrity 2010 (revised: 11/30/2010)

The Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Integrity (AHCAI) consists of the following members:

Faculty: Kathleen Burnett, Communication and Information

Faculty: Amy McKenzie, Education, chair of the university Academic Honor Policy committee

Faculty: Patrick Maroney, Business, former chair of the senate Distance Learning Committee

Faculty: Charles Upchurch, College of Arts & Sciences, Dept. of History

Representative appointed by the Dean of the Faculties office: Jennifer Buchanan, Associate Dean of the Faculties

Representative appointed by Academic and Professional Program Services (APPS) and the Center for Assessment and Testing (CAT): Jean-Marc Wise, Assistant Director

The Faculty Senate Steering Committee created the AHCAI “Especially because of rapidly increasing concerns about online testing methods and heavy demand on secure testing facilities ... to take an inventory of current policies and resources and make recommendations for any necessary changes and actions.” Specifically, the AHCAI was charged to complete the following tasks:

1. A quick inventory of current policies (Academic Honor Policy, Faculty Handbook, Student Handbook, CAT policies, college / depart. policies, distance learning policies)
2. A quick inventory of current resources (CAT, Blackboard, final exam policies & classrooms)
3. Identify urgent problem areas (CAT space, for example; Blackboard testing security)
4. Identify possible solutions and/or actions needed

Inventories and Documentation

The AHCAI met once in April 2010, just prior to the end of the summer semester. It resumed meeting every other Friday in September. At the April meeting, the committee agreed to proceed with the development of the inventories, and to collect information from chairs regarding their current practices, resources, and perceptions regarding problem areas.

To commence this work, a Blackboard organizational site to support creation of a repository for the documents included in the inventories (see 1 and 2 above) was created. This organizational site is now available to the Faculty Steering Committee. Over the summer, Chuck Upchurch drafted and the committee reviewed interview questions to facilitate collection of information from the chairs, and the committee proceeded with the interviews, primarily through email, into the fall semester.

Jean-Marc Wise provided the committee with data regarding assessment conducted through Blackboard, the most heavily used course management system at FSU (See Appendix A). Content analysis was conducted of the interviews with the chairs (See Appendix 2), and it was determined that further information was needed. Many chairs indicated that decisions regarding practices related to electronic testing and unsupervised testing were left to individual instructors, and that they were not aware of their practices. Many chairs also expressed the opinion that the lack of supervision or proctoring was a problem that needed to be addressed regardless of whether the tests or exams were taken electronically or on paper.

The committee met with Joe McElrath, Associate Vice-President for Academic Affairs and University Liaison to SACS, to ensure that it was fully informed as to the relationship between its charge and SACS accreditation, and Michelle Kazmer, Chair of the Faculty Senate Distance Education Committee, to ensure that that committee would have input into the committee’s work.

The committee revised and reordered the questionnaire developed for the chair interviews for use as a survey to be administered to all faculty using Blackboard. Jean-Marc Wise and Aaron Kim prepared this survey for online delivery (See Appendix C). The survey was made available for 10 days in October, and 319 responses were collected. Amy McKenzie and Kathleen Burnett performed content analysis of the open-ended questions to supplement the report produced by the survey software (See Appendix D & E). The results of the faculty survey chair interviews were used to identify urgent problem areas and develop recommendations.

Results

Twenty-four percent of survey respondents indicated that they had electronically administered one or more major exams in the most recent course they taught using Blackboard, for a total of 152 exams. The percentage of the grade coming from these exams ranged from 5 to 90, with the average being 23%. According to the survey data, 22% of these exams were proctored at the CAT testing center, 13% were proctored in campus computer labs, 5% were proctored in off-campus centers, 11% were proctored otherwise, and 50% were not proctored.

Of 305 responses, 81% indicated that they had not used and had not considered using the CAT to administer an exam, test or quiz during the past year; 8% had used the CAT; 1% had considered using the CAT but were unable to reserve a space; and 10% considered using the CAT, but did not do so for reasons other than space. Only 33% consider it a priority to create more space in the CAT.

Most instructors (84%) were unaware of the CAT recommendation that a test be given in a secure facility if it counts for 20% or more of the total grade. Although 74% indicated that this is a reasonable guideline, less than half (47%) think this guideline should be implemented as a university policy. When asked who should be responsible for decision-making regarding proctoring of electronic tests and quizzes, only 29% indicated that it should be the university. Seventy one percent indicated that this responsibility should rest with the academic unit (28%) or individual faculty (43%).

Most respondents (88%) indicated that unsupervised testing presents problems for academic integrity; and 70% think that limiting the amount of unsupervised electronic testing in a given course would improve academic integrity. Slightly less than half (48%) indicated that electronic testing presents special problems for academic integrity beyond those presented by unsupervised testing in general.

Although it was not a focus of the survey, two questions were included about the use of tools for detecting plagiarism. Less than half of instructors (47%) indicated that they use Safe Assign when collecting homework, papers, or essays using Blackboard. Fifty percent of those who made comments about anti-plagiarism tools indicated they had little or no experience with them; 43% indicated that the nature of their assignments made the use of such tools unnecessary; and less than 1% indicated they had a prior bad experience with such tools. Twenty-three percent of the comments about Safe Assign were positive; 17% were negative; and 6% were mixed. Regarding anti-plagiarism tools in general, 8% were positive and 3% were negative. Instructors use a variety of strategies to ensure that academic integrity is maintained ranging from doing nothing/trusting the students (14%), assigning group work or open book work (14%), providing strict guidelines or having students sign contracts (8%), assigning individualized projects (5%) to specialized testing procedures (6%) and carefully analyzing assignments (14%). The adoption of pedagogical and assessment strategies other than testing to ensure academic integrity was a general theme that emerged in both the chairs' interviews and the faculty survey.

Urgent Problem Areas

Committee discussions on the identification of urgent problem areas took place iteratively as the

information was collected. During the two final meetings, the committee discussed the interview and survey results, the identification of problem areas, and the nature of the recommendations to be developed to help address those problem areas. Current problems fall into four areas: infrastructure, awareness, policies and procedures, and monitoring compliance.

Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of available technology and resources to prevent academic dishonesty in all classroom, distance, online, and hybrid courses • Skepticism about the effectiveness of anti-plagiarism tools
Awareness/Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of awareness of faculty and departmental responsibility concerning SACS requirements • Lack of awareness of existing resources and services among faculty and department chairs
Policies & Procedures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of departmental policies and procedures to govern the enforcement of academic integrity • Skepticism about the implementation of university-level policies or guidelines related to testing and assessment
Monitoring Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Absence of clearly defined goals and measures to ensure consistent university-wide academic integrity in testing and assessment • Lack of independent, systematic review of academic units with respect to effectively enforcing academic integrity in testing and assessment

Recommendations

The committee determined that it would provide recommendations to address each of the urgent problem areas. To supplement current best practices (e.g., guidelines for proctoring of high-stakes tests and exams, and the development of alternative pedagogies and assessments), the committee expressed interest in directing a portion of the revenue collected through technology fees to providing technological support for monitoring as these become available. The chair agreed to draft the report and recommendations for the committee's comment and approval. The Committees' recommendations follow.

A. Infrastructure

Recommendation #1: A portion of the technology fees (to be determined) be reserved for use to ensure that the infrastructure for monitoring electronic testing and assessment for all courses taught through Florida State University, whether on-campus, hybrid, or distance, meets or exceeds the SACS Best Practices For Electronically Offered Degree and Certificate Programs (<http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/081705/commadap.pdf>). This infrastructure should be understood to include both human proctoring and technology-supported monitoring.

Recommendation #2: The Center for Assessment and Testing, in cooperation with the Academic Honor Policy Committee, be charged to conduct an assessment of the current state-of-the-art in monitoring technology and prepare a plan to ensure that testing and assessment for all courses **offered on Florida State University campuses** meets or exceeds the best practices outlined by SACS for electronically offered degree and certificate programs (<http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/081705/commadap.pdf>). This plan should include both central and distributed testing and assessment sites, and should consider and compare both human proctoring and

technology-supported monitoring to provide flexibility in tailoring the services to meet the needs of individual programs while still allowing for a system of accountability.

Recommendation #3: The Distance Education Committee, in cooperation with the Academic Honor Policy Committee, be charged to conduct an assessment of the current state-of-the-art in monitoring technology and prepare a plan to ensure that testing and assessment **for all hybrid and distance courses offered by Florida State University** meets or exceeds the SACS standards for academic integrity. This plan should consider and compare both human proctoring and technology-supported monitoring to provide flexibility in tailoring the services to meet the needs of individual programs while still allowing for a system of accountability.

B. Awareness/Education

Recommendation #4: The Center for Assessment and Testing, the Academic Honor Policy Committee, and the Distance Education Committee meet with faculty at departmental faculty meetings or through other means to ensure that faculty understand the SACS standards for academic integrity and are informed of the options available to them to support their efforts to ensure academic integrity.

C. Policies & Procedures

Recommendation #5: Departments and programs are charged to develop policies and procedures to ensure that the courses they teach, whether on-campus, hybrid, or distance, meet or exceed the standards set by SACS for academic integrity in testing and assessment. Developing these policies at the department level will allow for the greatest flexibility in tailoring the policies to the needs of individual programs while still allowing for a system of accountability.

Recommendation #6: A mechanism be provided for funding to provide departments and programs the resources they require to implement the policies and procedures they establish (see Recommendation #5).

D. Monitoring Compliance

Recommendation #7: The Academic Honors Policy Committee in conjunction with the Dean of Faculties Office initiate the process required for the university to rejoin the Center for Academic Integrity and to oversee a contract with the Center to conduct a survey of academic integrity to assess the efforts to build a stronger culture of academic integrity at Florida State University, and to compare the results of this survey to its performance on the survey of student cheating behaviors of all types and faculty awareness of policies conducted by the Center in 2003.

Salary Plan for Professors Review Committee

From Article 25, Collective Bargaining Agreement:

“25.7 University Process. The University-level process shall consist of a review by the SPP Review Committee (hereafter SPPRC) which is advisory to the President, and a final decision by the President as to whether each candidate has met the SPP criteria.

(a) The SPPRC shall consist of seven (7) full professors, elected annually by the Faculty Senate. None of the members of the SPPRC may be considered for an SPP [award?] during their service on the SPPRC.

(b) The SPPRC shall use the dossiers, the assessments provided by the chairs and deans, and department, college, and university criteria to determine their recommendations regarding whether each candidate has met the SPP criteria, and forward their recommendations to the President.”

Annual Election Process by the Faculty Senate

1. The Senate Coordinator will acquire from the Dean of the Faculties office a list of all current full professors, minus those individuals who are defined as part of the pool allowed to submit application binders in the current year's cycle.
2. The Senate Coordinator will send this list to all current members of the Faculty Senate as a nomination ballot. Each senator will be asked to return the ballot to the Senate Coordinator, with seven (7) names marked.
3. From this nomination ballot, the Senate Coordinator will prepare an election ballot consisting of at least the fourteen (14) names with the highest number of nominations (in case of a tie for the final position on the list, there may be more than 14 names). Those nominated will be asked if they are willing to serve before being listed on the election ballot. At least four different colleges must be represented on the election ballot of 14 names.
4. The election will occur at a regular meeting of the Faculty Senate, under the management of the Elections committee. Each Senator will mark seven (7) names on the election ballot. No more than two individuals from a single college may be elected. Otherwise, the 7 nominees with the highest number of votes will be elected. In case of tie votes for final positions, a run-off procedure will be conducted until the 7 positions are filled.