



MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
MARCH 19, 2008
DODD HALL AUDITORIUM
3:35 P.M.

I. Regular Session

The regular session of the 2007-08 Faculty Senate was held on Wednesday, March 19, 2008. Faculty Senate President Jayne Standley presided.

The following members attended the Senate meeting:

T. Adams, J. Ahlquist, M. Allen, P. Aluffi, T. Baker, G. Bates, S. Beckman, P. Beerli, S. Bellenot, P. Bowen, B. Bower, J. Bowers, R. Bruschiweiler, G. Burnett, J. Cao, E. Chicken, J. Clendinning, E. Cormier, L. deHaven-Smith, J. Dorsey, I. Eberstein, L. Edwards, J. Fiorito, S. Fiorito, A. Gaiser, K. Gelabert, J. Geringer, P. Gilmer, J. Hellweg, L. Hogan, T. Houpt, P. Iatarola, A. Kercheval, D. Latham, S. Lewis, D. Lick, S. Losh, C. Madsen, B. Maier-Katkin, N. Mazza, V. Mesev, W. Mio, M. Mondello, D. Moore, R. Morris, A. Mullis, J. O'Rourke, R. Pekurny, R. Radach, D. Rice, V. Richard Auzenne, J. Scholz, R. Schwartz, L. Shepherd, J. Sickinger, J. Standley, G. Tyson, C. Upchurch, E. Walker, Y. Wang, P. Ward, M. Wasko, C. Weissert, W. Weissert, P. Young.

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

C. Alamo, I. Audirac (C. Schmertmann), G. Blakely, R. Blaufarb, D. Cartes, J. Cobbe, V. Costa, F. Davis, B. Diskin, J. Dodge, K. Erndl, M. Frank, C. Greek, W. Hochwarter, L. Keller, G. Knight, B. Landing (B. Nowach), T. Lee, W. Leparulo, C. Luongo, C. McCann (J. Druash), T. Matherly, K. Myers, R. Neuman, A. Opel, A. Payer, R. Roberts, F. Rodriguez, H. Schmidt, O. Steinbock, E. Trowers, J. Turner, T. Welsh, C. Wiebe, S. Wood.

II. Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of the February 20, 2008 meeting were approved as distributed.

III. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved with one amendment to add Susan Fiorito's report on the University-wide committee on Four Hour Courses.

IV. Report of the Steering Committee, E. Walker

Since the February Senate meeting, the steering committee has met twice.

At our February 21 meeting, we were joined by Randy Spetman, the new Athletic Director, and by Karen Laughlin, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, to discuss the athletic program and academic issues.

At our March 6 meeting, we received reports from the Liberal Studies committee, chaired by Robert Pekurny, and the ad hoc committee on a 4-credit hour curriculum model, chaired by Susan Fiorito. Digital copies of those reports are available in your meeting materials for today which were emailed and on the Senate website. In the fall term, the Undergraduate Policy Committee will focus on and discuss as a set three reports: the Liberal Studies report, the 4-hour ad hoc committee report, and a report from the ad hoc committee on academic quality chaired by Ken Goldsby. We also approved the motion from the Graduate Policy Committee concerning definitions of full-time and part-time status that is on the agenda for your action today. Finally, we prepared our agenda for our monthly meeting with the President and the Provost, which is scheduled for tomorrow, Thursday March 20.

This concludes the report of the steering committee.

V. Report of Standing Committees

a. Elections Committee, L. Edwards

i. Nominations for the University Committee on Faculty Sabbaticals

There were no additional nominations for the University Committee on Faculty Sabbaticals.

ii. Nominations for the Grievance Committee

There were no additional nominations for the Grievance Committee.

b. Graduate Policy Committee, G. Bates

Full time vs. part time status of graduate students - See addendum 1. It is moved that the full time status of international graduate students be at 3 hours when they are finishing their dissertation.

An motion was put forth to amend that "doctoral" be inserted on page 2 in the next to last sentence. The amendment died on lack of a second.

The policy was amended to include the words “at least” in front of 9-12 hours each time it is used.

The motion passed with 66 yes’s and 2 no’s.

- c. Liberal Studies Coordinating Committee, B. Pekurny

See addendum 2 – End of year committee reports.

- d. Budget Advisory Committee, C. Madsen and B. Bradley

The Budget Advisory Committee considers University budget policies, procedures and practices, with special emphasis on the academic budget. The Committee consults regularly with the President of the University and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Our most recent meeting was on Feb 22nd.

Committee Members are: Pam Coats, Carol Darling, Jayne Standley, Joe Beckham and Eric Walker—I’m Cliff Madsen. As Chair I’m sorry to report that there is very little, if any, good news.

To put this in perspective 450 million of our total budget comes via our E & G allocation. For the most part all of the other money cannot be used or even creatively manipulated. And, because the E&G money includes salaries almost 85% of that total allocation is not malleable. The State of Florida tax revenues have and will drop by a total of at least 3 billion with corresponding cuts across all agencies. Our administration predicts that the total cut for FSU will be @ 30 million. This could go to 40 or even 50 million depending on revenue.

FSU in anticipation of past, current and future cuts has made contingency plans. For example we have admitted 1,500 fewer students for this coming fall; 1,000 FTIC and 500 transfers. My friends in the English department have made this real by telling me that 10 sections of Freshman English have been dropped.

The good news is that we will probably be OK for this fiscal year 2007-2008. The substantive problems will come later starting in 2008-2009.

What about raises? The Budget Advisory Committee has asked this at every opportunity and in every meeting. As you might know every 1% faculty raise constitutes 1.5 million; a 5% tuition increase will generate @

5.5 million per year but only when it applies to all students. That is enough for a 2% faculty raise. Of course, all of these issues require deliberation with the United Faculty of Florida.

Legislators downtown are creating new budgets and budget ideas *de jour*. We probably will not know precisely where we are until they have gone home or perhaps not until after November or perhaps even later.

Our administration does listen to our input. One small but important example has been holding the Library as harmless as possible throughout this process as first suggested by our Committee.

I've asked Bob Bradley to be with us today to answer any questions; perhaps the president will do so as well. In an ongoing attempt to keep you as up-to-date as possible the Committee will give another report this coming April 19th when Ralph Alvarez will be with us.

- e. Four Hour Course Committee, S. Fiorito

See addendum 3.

VI. Old Business

There were no items of old business.

VII. New Business

There were no items of new business.

VIII. University Welfare

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

You may recall that our February meeting ran late and I did not report then. I hope you have had time to read my remarks on "Peter Pan and the Three Musketeers" in the minutes.

Since our last Senate meeting faculty and administration bargaining teams held one brief meeting. There was no substantial progress. Both sides recognize that the legislative and budget environment are a source of critical uncertainty, making for difficult bargaining. Regrettably, as matters become more certain they seem to become bleaker. Nonetheless,

our teams are scheduled to meet again Friday next week and we are hopeful of progress in future sessions.

Speaking of the legislature, our statewide UFF and our UFF-FSU Chapter have joined Faculty Senates statewide in opposing efforts to gut the Board of Governors. I trust everyone has been following this issue and realizes the importance of faculty speaking up against further politicization of Florida higher education. Further information is available at the UFF-FSU web site.

Faculty must remain vigilant not only on budget matters and SUS governance, but also on academic matters. Budgetary problems should not be used as a pretext to bypass the faculty in academic affairs. Current discussions of restructuring and discussions about giving control of faculty hiring decisions in at least one area to ideology-driven private funding sources are potentially serious threats to academic freedom and shared governance. These are concerns to both Faculty Senate and UFF.

There is at least one common thread in all of this. It is a simple but important message: “We *can* do together what you cannot do alone.” That includes achieving better terms in bargaining, retaining faculty influence on academic matters, and a more favorable legislative and budget environment (despite the mess created by previous ill-considered legislative efforts).

One quick announcement: We will be surveying the faculty’s views on bargaining priorities and other matters next month. Please respond, and encourage your colleagues to respond as well. A good response rate helps our UFF-FSU chapter better represent faculty.

Are there any questions?

Thank you for your time, and a special “thank you” to any Senators whose service is ending with this term.

IX. Announcements by Deans and Other Administrative Officers

There were no announcements by Deans and Other Administrative Officers.

X. Announcements by Provost Abele

Provost Abele was not in attendance.

XI. Announcements by President Wetherell

Thank you for inviting me to come by today. I'm trying to find something positive to say real quick, but I'm not sure what that is, to be honest with you. The legislature is in full swing and I'm sure you've been reading all of the stuff that's been coming out. Most of it isn't very positive. You probably read something about a week ago about this latest round of budget cuts. If there's anything positive to say, that's the one we anticipated so that one really won't affect anything you haven't already seen. The problem is they were \$1 billion short and they only cut about one half billion dollars so they're going to have to deal with that in the 2008-09 budget. In addition to that, they were \$3 billion short also so it's not really a very pretty sight to tell you the least. Some of the things we're trying to do to help...most of you tried to help us with our little unnatural disaster plan. The deans are a little frosted about that because they think it's scaring off faculty. I think we've got to remember who's thinking about coming is probably smart enough to Google Florida SUS system and figure out what a mess we're in to start with so I don't think we're letting the cat out of the bag totally. Anyway, we were successful. John McKay did pass his constitutional amendment. And I guess there's good news and bad news in that. One, there will be a ballot issue on the ballot in November that you will be able to vote for. If you vote yes, your property tax will be reduced by about approximately 30%. We will not pay a local required effort from property tax. But that will be made up from a series of other potential taxes. One would be an additional penny...I noticed this yesterday with the incoming speaker...Mr. Sampson wants us to add two pennies and not have to worry about exemptions or anything else. A penny generally produces about \$4 billion. The RLE issue is an \$8 billion issue to the state of Florida. Our motivation was to then go in and to take some of the exemptions on the variety of services as well as products and use those dollars to make up the short fall plus dedicate some of those dollars to higher education. They didn't do that. They did hold education harmless but the bulk of holding harmless is the K-12 system in that process. So that is, you know, one small step for man, one short step for education. In my judgment, it just really didn't do what we wanted it to do. I think when they get into it and realize the magnitude of the problem there will be some dollars come available. One of the problems that they do have right now is they really don't have the money to spend. Now, it's a combination of judgment. I get myself in trouble with the governor's office when I say we're in a recession. The reality is that we are in some kind of a slow down, recession, depression, economic downturn – whatever turn you want to use I guess depending upon where you stand politically. The biggest problem that has happened is not the housing market here in Florida. It's all of a sudden tourism has begun to take a dip and people are projecting \$4 gasoline by September time. It's kind of tough to go drive

down to Disneyworld and not have a dramatic impact on us, as a tourism state. So we will get through it. We're beginning to build contingency plans on what to do. I'm sure the Provost has already talked to some of you. Some of those issues are the same ones that we'd talked about before. What do we do about summer school next summer...not this coming summer ... but next summer. We looked at some kind of a consolidation that Siegel and Gale had in certain academic programs and departments. There are a host of issues there to talk about. There's some collective bargaining issues so I don't get in trouble with Jack and everybody around here...that we would also have to deal with. Clearly, we're going to have less money when legislature adjourns the first of May time of 08 than we had at May of 07. It will probably be in the \$40 to \$50 million range. That's a pretty significant hit. But every other university will be in the same project. Some of those reductions we're already dealt with. Some are yet to come. And I'm sure we'll get some guidance in how we can or can't do that. There's no move or flip right now but I believe there will be to increase tuition. If you try to increase tuition by \$40 million – I think, isn't it a percent for every \$2 million? Is that it, Bob? So we need a...or is it \$1 for 2%? One for two? Okay. So we need a 20% increase in tuition to get back the loss that we suffered before we deal with anything in terms of new dollars so I don't foresee that happening in terms of that much of tuition increase. They're beginning to try to work through that whole thing and deal with it. We tried persuasion; that didn't seem to work. We tried reason and rationalization; that didn't seem to work so if you listen to NPR, now we're trying to embarrass them. And some of the faculty who have taken other positions have kind of helped us with this so basically we're not apologizing. We don't want to see people leave. I hope none of you will. I hope you will stay, but we've basically said, you know, for the first time in at least recent history at Florida State and other universities, faculty are entertaining offers that they wouldn't have entertained in the past. And it's not as much money. It's an atmosphere in Florida that people are just sort of saying, you know, "Where's the future? What's it all about?" And clearly, money has something to do with it. If you talk to Howard and Michelle and people like that... it's, "Where's my future? Do you really appreciate me?" We're beginning to run those things on the air and saying, you know, in a somewhat polite way, "I'm leaving because I don't see a future in Florida." We're going to do the same thing for graduate students. And we're going to take some graduate students who didn't come to Florida State who normally might have or would have and say, you know, "Why did you go to some other institution?" (We would consider them lesser but they're a good institution). We do have an advantage, being in Tallahassee, because they all get up in the morning. They all drive to work. They all go to breakfast. They all go to parties. They all go to receptions. And a lot of them do listen to NPR so by putting that out, I guess we are somewhat embarrassing ourselves and that's part of the issue but at the same

time, we think we're sending a message that needs to be sent. It's got a few people in the Capital frosted but these are kind of tough times and I think our job is to lay a case that we need at Florida State, which, I believe, is the case for the State University System, quite frankly. So we're kind of trying to do that. We're going to do a series of those types of activities during the next sixty days less whatever they've been through...I guess about two weeks now. I hope it will be successful. I can't tell you with all of a straight face that we all will come out of this thing with more money than we went in, that somebody is going to wave a magic wand and it's going to happen. I don't think that's going to happen. I just think we're going to try and survive this as about the best we can do. If you look at the economic forecast that they had, as scary as 2008-09 is, you will be even frightened to death with 2009-10 when you begin to look at that. The economic indicators do not suggest that we're coming out of this anytime soon. The good news is Florida usually comes out of a recession or a depression – whatever we're calling this thing quicker than most states, mainly because of the dependence upon sales tax. So we will continue to monitor that and move ahead. That's going to be, you know, I think, troubling for all of us in this room. It's going to put a lot of pressure upon this system. It's probably going to mean that we're going to have to work together more than we have in the past. I think people at Florida State have had a tendency to come together, to pull together to the extent that they can ... but I think it will be a challenge. There's no doubt about that. So we will be working with you to the extent we can.

A couple of other issues: We're going to meet with the deans tomorrow and talk with the Deans' Council about some of things we're talking about here. One of the issues that we're going to talk about is textbooks. I know we're all concerned about the price of textbooks and how they go up. We can do some things that will help students by changing some dates on textbooks ordered. There's some issues we're going to talk to them about. But whatever we can do to protect the cost of students in terms of books and those issues we're going to do to the extent we can. We're probably going to ask for your help and assistance there. It's an issue that really is getting a lot of national attention and I think it's something that we need to at least be cognizant of and start looking at it.

Oh, and the Board of Trustees will have a conference call next week, I guess it is, Tuesday or Wednesday. Pretty much, I don't think there's anything on there of any significance. An update of where we are, etc. There were some issues that we didn't deal with in January because we dealt with the budget issues and they're mostly issues of having to ratify certain budget amendments and things of that nature have gone on and I don't believe there's anything of major controversy on there but they will meet and we'll bring them up to date. Most of

the major decisions will be made in the May meeting, once we see what the legislature does and go from there.

I will report that we have about 2,500 students on a wait list that on or about the 15th of April we will notify those students who is eligible for admission ... well, they're all eligible for admission ... but who we will accept and who we won't. There will probably be about 1,500 of those students we will not take. Normally, we would have taken all 2,500 of those students. There's another 1,200 transfer students that do not have the CLAST test, the foreign language, some issue that holds them back and unless you are CLAST score certified, foreign language certified, we basically said, "I'm sorry we don't have room in the inn for you." That will get a lot of heat. It also happens to be around the time that conference committee starts. The legislature will feel the pain of that. We're doing everything we can to let them feel that pain without totally P.O.ing them but by then, when you see the numbers, you're probably going to want to P.O. them a little bit because you'll be as frustrated as I am. They usually don't fire faculty but they do fire presidents so maybe I'll be one of you in about a month, sitting out here. But anyway, that wouldn't be a bad gig. For the students we don't have space for, that we're not going to accept, we have three options we're going to offer: First, we have a program with TCC called Partners. It allows a student's application to be electronically transferred over there. They're admitted at TCC. They take their AA program of study over there. They are eligible to come to Florida State in the lecture series and be in the band and those certain types of student activities. We will offer that to those students that we don't accept. These are pretty good students. These are 1100 + SAT, 3.5 GPA. These are real good students. We'll also have a program on our international campuses that allows students to enroll as freshmen in one of the international centers and spend a year there and transfer back to Florida State. That will give some students some options they did not have ... particularly out of state students because they then come in as in-state student, which will help them with their tuition. We were working on a program with Panama City, Florida. We have about 500 FTE over there, about 800 students. And we've got space over there, quite frankly. And this is one of the quirks in the state system that's frustrating. So what our plan was to say to those students, "We cannot admit to Florida State University, Tallahassee but we do have space in Panama." And you would go over there and take a core of certain courses. The community college objected to that because they have an agreement - basically, we don't offer lower-division courses. We felt it wouldn't be right for us to offer admission to Gulf Coast Junior College when you had applied to Florida State University so we wanted to admit you to Florida State. Our plan was to teach a core of courses for those students, probably an English, a math, a history, a humanities, a whatever. The sciences we probably would have contracted with Gulf Coast Biology or some of

the labs they have that we don't have a specialized place. They objected and said they had to teach all the courses, use all of their faculty and we said that kind of won't get it. I wanted to get in a fight with them, but the trustees were a little bit more, you know ... maybe they're smarter. I don't know. It just seems to me that that kind of student with an 1100 SAT, a 3.5 and would have normally been admitted, you've done great work ... and to get a letter saying, "You can't come to Florida State" with no options is a pretty hard way to treat a student. So we withdrew that offer and we're not going to make it. We're still negotiating with Panama City but as you look at the kind of money being spent over there and the number of students over there, there's going to be some tough decisions if we take a \$25 to \$30 million hit ... of how you deal with that. So we're looking at those options and I'm a little frustrated by them not being in these tough times, a little more open. I don't know how many of those 1,500 would have come, to be perfectly honest with you. I doubt very many. But I just think sending a letter saying, "Here are some options," is a lot better than saying you can't come to Florida State. So anyway, those are some things we're trying to work through in that process. I'm sure you'll hear more of that.

I'm sure some of the deans will be talking to you and department chairs as we go into the spring a little bit deeper and start thinking about next year and contracts and summer school and what are we going to do on A term and all those kind of things we have to do with. There will also be a host of other issues that pop up almost it seems like an hourly basis. When the legislature has no money, that's not a good thing. It also means they time to delve into more philosophical issues and things of that nature. Today it seems to be distance learning. They've decided to fix that for us now. We didn't know it was broken; but they're fixing it. And they've decided to change the fee structure on that and we're just rolling our eyes a little bit but we'll work through that one and usually this will be a whole lot of huppaloo and then we'll go find another problem and then that will be another huppaloo. So it will be frustrating to deal with but that's kind of where we are on that. Is there anything else I'm supposed to ... Does anybody have a question, right off the bat?

(question was asked) ... You know, the Board asked me to stay out of it. But since you asked ... I didn't like the thing from the get-go. I'll be honest with you. I thought what would happen did happen. I don't mean to say, "I told you so." I think when you look at strong Board of Trustees that we had, as supportive as they've been, I think what we've done makes a lot more sense than the Board of Governors and if you think the Board of Regents was political, I mean, this bunch has put them to shame, in my business so I think Senator Pruitt will eventually pass that out of the legislature and I think that he will probably have the House. They'll trade out and it will be on the ballot. You know, I was

hopeful that we'd have a commissioner of education and take the politics out of education and hire somebody and they'd be an advocate for education and yada yada yada. That didn't happen and at least when you have an elected commissioner who had to go out and get votes and do things, I think we came out with a better system, to be honest with you. So I believe it will be on the ballot. I believe the editorial boards have missed the boat and all they're worried about is tuition – who levies tuition, the legislature ... They've missed it and they don't look at proliferation of programs and things that the Board of Governors is supposed to do so I think we'll probably have a little bit more vocal statement come in September....

(question was asked): Transfer students, by law, we have to take the AA transfer that is fully certified, etc. Outside the state, as you had mentioned, it's becoming more and more difficult to bring them outside of that system. For the student in ... Our admission policy was if you were eligible for admission as a freshman and you went off to a community college, UCF, wherever you went, then decided after a year you'd transfer back in, if you had been eligible to come back in, we'd have taken you. That's not the case right now. So with all of this, we're still about 500 students overenrolled right now. And the Board of Governors, our friends and advocates for us, did not ask for any new enrollment money. We happened to be one of the highest overenrolled. Most of our over enrollment is a result of what is done in term of retention. The legislature told us to retain students and graduate them, but now they don't want to pay us for that, so you go figure that one. So, yes, that's a problem. (second question was asked): That's amazing as it seems. They haven't been cut at all, though the rest of us have so that's another thing I've got with the Board of Governors. Our two new medical schools are on schedule. They have gone the ACME, whatever process ... Both have received provisional accreditation. Both are beginning to hire faculty and staff and for instance, I believe, UCF ... I don't know what the particular individual's position was ... say he was making \$400,000 at Shands. They hired him for \$500,000 at UCF. So they're beginning to raid because they have pots of money, currently faculty, staff, and people. So they're moving ahead. One of the issues we're going to have to deal with is the medical school has a provision that we would only recruit in-state students to go to medical school. If you look at the qualified potential application as both of those schools go online, we may well be at a significant disadvantage but we will probably move somewhere during this session to allow us to bring a portion of students in from outside the state. But, yes, both of those are still moving ahead.

(question was asked by Jack): Well, the legislature statutorily abolished ... They changed the government's structure to what was then proposed to be a K-12 system. It was partially constitutional for the elimination of an elected

commissioner of education. The creation of a state Board of Education, which was appointment by the governor It was supposed to be a seamless, K-20 system, was their vision at that point in time. Now, there's a lot of debate about why that occurred and who did what. Governor Bush gets a lot of credit. Mr. Thrasher gets a lot of credit. The House gets a lot of credit. There's actually a napkin that's framed somewhere that has it all drawn out on it that was done at 3:00 in the morning. So, that's what how the system that started got into place. Now, I don't know whether that's better or worse than what we had. In that whole process, a Board of Trustees was then placed at each university similar to, the vision was, that they would be similar to community college system had those powers and duties which allowed institutions to make their own decisions programmatically. I'm sure most of you remember about that time when the chiropractic issue started popping up of legislature giving us the money to do that, we supposedly wanting that to happen and that was about to transition between Sandy and I. And so that was in some people's minds, a legislature mandate. In some people's minds, the legislation was responding to a request made or at least agreed to by the university. Then, Jack, as you know, Governor Graham got all frosted about that because he was a big centralized guy and got on the stump and created what we now have as the Board of Governors. And there was a constitutional amendment put up to create the Board of Governors. I think Governor Graham had better lawyers than Governor Bush did, quite frankly, because what was said, in proposal to what the Board of Governors was going to do and what the constitutional language says clearly court is going to have to rule on some of that. I think clearly Governor Graham, John Mills, Robin Gibson and some of them that wrote that knew exactly what they were writing and maybe didn't totally explain that as they did the editorial boards, etc. So we've been stuck for the last five years in a confrontation that really rounds between the legislature and the Board of Governors. For instance, the Board of Governors before the Board of Trustees ever voted on the chiropractic program – forget if you want the thing or if you don't want it. The reality is the legislature said, "Here's a program." And for the first time in my recent memory, maybe since the Moffat Cancer Center, actually fully funded the whole, cotton-picking thing, with revenue. And the Board of Governors says, "I don't care what the legislature says. You can't put it in and we won't release the money." And my time in the Florida legislature, I've never seen that done. And that was kind of the beginning of the bickering between two groups of who had what power to raising of authority, to spin legislative procreation, to tuition, to a variety of other issues – selective bargaining included in that process. So, if you look now at the two medical schools, for instance, are a product of the Board of Governors' process that came to be. And they approved those medical schools and the legislature went along with some funding by it. So, if you look at that, if you look at certain PhD programs, some over graduate programs that have showed

up at other institutions, I think it's fair to say maybe they would have grown under the other. I don't know. Maybe they would have been two medical schools under the Board of Reasons concept. FSU got its one under the Florida; Reason's concept so I don't know if they would or they wouldn't. But the reality is that the Board of Governors was sold as a group that would lead the Board of Trustees in place. We would have a strong, local Board of Trustees, a government system that each institution could deal with however they chose. And this body was going to look at graduate programs and professional degrees. If you go to any Board of Governors meeting, 90% of it is something other than those two things. They approved the PECO list. They now have a master plan deal that they're looking at full master planning system. They're looking at Baccalaureate degrees. They're looking at a whole variety of things. So, I mean, you can argue whichever way you want to go, I guess, which way you want to go on that. Like I said, to be fair about it, I was never a great big supporter of it. It seems to me that when it went into place, the concept of a seamless, K-20 system clearly changed and you ought to rethink that. And there's a variety of different ways to do that.

(question was asked): The Board of Governors didn't deal with that \$80 million because it was a private institution. My frustration with the Board of Governors, again, I just didn't like the system. But my frustration right now is we're educators, we live here. This is our world we're in. Each one of use that's here probably has different perceptions of what the government's structure of the state of Florida's higher education is and would probably equally sure that we are correct. Now, if I'm a dean or provost, president, vice president, and I'm trying to recruit a faculty member who has the ability to go to a variety of different places, and we set down and try to explain it to him, we can't do it. No matter how sincere I am and correct I am, if they go somewhere else and they say, "I don't care what that president said. Here. Look at this." It's a big, darn mess. And to me, it needs to be clarified one way or the other. If you don't like the Pruitt deal, then pick one but let's get someplace one way or another. I mean, on your collective bargaining issue, now we have eleven different universities doing eleven different bargaining agreements with faculty alone ... that doesn't count nurses, all the rest of them. And what happens is, you pick up the paper and you say, "Well, they're given 7% at the University of Florida. Why can't we get 7%?" Well, they fired twenty-two people, got ride of IFAS, and seventeen other things that we don't have the ability to do ... or FAMU's doing this ... or somebody ... You get mixed signals about what the system is. We've been supportive of a common system, quite frankly and nobody else seems to like that but I think in the old days when you at least knew what the salary system was going to be and the schedule was going to be and you had the ability locally to supplement it, you knew it. But it sends so many mixed signals that I don't

think can be explained to the higher ed community that we deal with internally and that's frustrating to me. That's my problem. More than who gave them this program or what.

XII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:57 p.m.



Melissa Crawford,
Faculty Senate Coordinator

01/15/08

Full-time vs part-time status of graduate students

Status:

Current policy stipulates that a graduate student in full-time status must enroll for 9 to 12 hours per semester. Students receiving assistantships e.g. TAs and RAs must enroll for 9 hours. University Fellows must enroll for 12 hours. Generally students without an assistantship or fellowship must enroll for 12 hours to be considered full-time; international students are considered full-time by enrolling in 9 hours because allowance is made for non-native English speakers.

Issue:

The number of credit hours for which a student registers should reflect time commitment and also a use of university resources. However, there is no obvious reason for requiring that a student be enrolled full-time for 9 to 12 hours other than to ensure timely completion of the degree. Indeed over the years it seems that more and more of our students are pursuing degrees part-time. This is not a problem for domestic students as they can pursue their studies part-time (less than 12 hours). Indeed many of our domestic doctoral students who are not supported on assistantships or fellowships drop down to the minimum required number of two dissertation hours after they have passed prelims. However, federal regulations stipulate that international students must enroll full-time so they cannot reduce their credit hours with the current rule. Since international students can never be declared instate for tuition purposes this places a heavy financial burden on these students, especially those who are self-payers as well as the academic department for those who receive waivers.

Registering for 9 to 12 hours seems particularly appropriate during the early stages of a program when students are taking formal courses. Once a doctoral student has passed prelims and completed the required 24 dissertation hours or a master's student has completed required coursework and a minimum of 6 thesis hours, it seems appropriate to offer alternative registration options for all students as they complete the degree.

Policy Change Recommendation:

Establish new categories of full and part-time status as follows:

Doctoral students: Prior to completion of prelims and 24 hours of dissertation a full-time doctoral student must enroll for 9 to 12 hours per semester. Students receiving assistantships e.g. RAs and TAs must enroll for a minimum of 9 hours and students on fellowships (internal or external) must enroll for 9 to 12 hours as stipulated by the fellowship requirements. Domestic students without an assistantship or fellowship may opt for part-time status with the approval of their program. Federal guidelines require that international students be enrolled full-time.

01/15/08

After completion of prelims and 24 hours of dissertation full-time status requires that a doctoral student must enroll for a minimum of 3 hours per semester (of which at least 2 must be dissertation hours) until completion of the degree. Students receiving assistantships e.g. RAs and TAs receiving a stipend and waiver must enroll for a minimum of 9 hours (of which at least 2 must be dissertation hours) and students on fellowships (internal or external) must enroll for 9 to 12 hours (of which at least 2 must be dissertation hours) as stipulated by the fellowship requirements. Domestic students without an assistantship or fellowship may opt for part-time status with the approval of their program in which case they must enroll for a minimum of 2 dissertation hours. Federal guidelines require that international students be enrolled full-time.

Masters students: Prior to completion of required coursework and 6 hours of thesis (if enrolled in a thesis masters program) a full-time master's student must enroll for 9 to 12 hours per semester. Students receiving assistantships e.g. RAs and TAs must enroll for a minimum of 9 hours and students on fellowships (internal or external) must enroll for 9 to 12 hours as stipulated by the fellowship requirements. Domestic students without an assistantship or fellowship may opt for part-time status with the approval of their program. Federal guidelines require that international students be enrolled full-time.

After completion of required coursework and 6 hours of thesis (if enrolled in a thesis masters program) full-time status requires that master's student must enroll for a minimum of 3 hours per semester (of which at least 2 must be thesis hours) until completion of the degree. Students receiving assistantships e.g. RAs and TAs receiving a stipend and waiver must enroll for a minimum of 9 hours (of which at least 2 must be thesis hours) and students on fellowships (internal or external) must enroll for 9 to 12 hours (of which at least 2 must be thesis hours) as stipulated by the fellowship requirements. Domestic students without an assistantship or fellowship may opt for part-time status with the approval of their program in which case they must enroll for a minimum of 2 thesis hours. Federal guidelines require that international students be enrolled full-time.

Explanation and Justification:

1. The 2-hour minimum thesis/ dissertation hours rule remains in effect.
2. The Residency rule remains in effect.
3. It is expected that students who are appointed as RAs and TAs and thus receive a stipend and tuition waiver are those who are fully engaged in the FSU academic community and dependent upon maximal use of the university's resources for their studies. This justifies the requirement that they be enrolled for 9 hours.

Annual Reports to the Faculty Senate Included in the March 2008 Minutes

Faculty Senate Distance Learning Committee Annual Report, March 2008 Howard Goldstein, Chair

The Distance Learning committee was convened in January for the first time in two years. Members include: Howard Goldstein (chair), Michelle Kazmer, Jim Sickinger, Sandy Lewis, George Bates, Susan Fiorito, Susann Rudasill, and Bonnie Armstrong.

The committee is working on four issues:

1. Procedures for assessing student performance in distance learning courses
 2. Teaching evaluations for distance learning courses
 3. Access to BlackBoard for adjunct instructors and new faculty needing to prepare courses
 4. Preparation of an Orientation Packet for instructors developing and delivering distance education courses
-
1. Procedures exist to provide for secure testing for distance learning courses. However, many instructors may not be aware of the strategies that should be considered for testing in conventional as well as distance learning courses. The committee is preparing a summary document for faculty with recommended practices for testing. Those practices will vary based on different contexts: low- versus high-stakes testing, on-line versus in-class administration, and levels of supervision available. In addition, a related tutorial is being prepared for the CTL website.
 2. The committee is proposing that teaching evaluation procedures be applied to distance learning courses as uniformly as possible. Procedures are needed to increase the dismal response rate for student evaluations of on-line courses. We are working with the Teaching Evaluation Committee to develop appropriate procedures.
 3. The committee is trying to facilitate a process (through APPS, the Registrar, and Human Resources) that will allow adjunct and new instructors to prepare courses using BlackBoard prior to their personnel paperwork being finalized.
 4. The committee has asked APPS staff members prepare an Orientation Packet for instructors developing and delivering distance education courses. The committee will ensure that updated information concerning Form 2 and associated university policies is included.

Faculty Senate Library Committee - Year End Report for the Academic Year 2007 – 2008 Martell Teasley, Chair

Summary

The Faculty Senate Library Committee met three times during the Fall 2007 semester and will meet four times before the Spring 2008 semester concludes. Committee members welcomed the incoming Library Director, Julia Zimmerman, reviewed the implementation of plans to improve library operations and services; considered the ramifications of budget changes; and reviewed decisions related to personnel issues. The committee reviewed and offered advice to the Library Director on operational issues as they arose throughout the year and recommended the approval of over \$100,000.00 in subscription requests from faculty. The Committee was active in working with the Director of the FSU Libraries in reviewing the operations of the various college libraries and methods for enhancing services.

Individual Meeting Summaries

The September meeting witnessed the introduction and greeting of committee members and the incoming University Library Director, Julia Zimmerman. Administrative details related to committee functioning were

discussed. General operating procedures were established and standing subcommittees were formed. The Director of the FSU Libraries gave a detailed report on actions taken over the summer to address issues of concern, especially in the areas of employee morale, hiring practices for vacant positions, and future student and faculty service initiatives. In particular, budgeting reductions resulted in the elimination of 12 positions. The operating budget for the next academic year was cut by 4% for a reduction of \$324,000; however, new money included \$500,000 recurring and \$2,000,000 non-recurring.

The start of the Strozier Library Basement Floor renovation project was announced, and plans for a new undergraduate library are underway. Several announcements were made by autonomous and college libraries to include information on initiatives and personnel allocations.

The October meeting was cancelled due to travel obligations by the Library Director and a large volume of subcommittee work that committee members were obligated to undertake. In particular, the Primary Source Subcommittee had the task of reviewing faculty grant proposal criteria prior to advertising the call for proposals.

The two November 2007 meetings can be describe as finding resolutions to outstanding issues and the announcement of new faculty and student library services. During the November 7, 2008 meeting the University Library Director announced salary increases for USPS library staff. Two concerns were addressed with this move: (1) the need to increase the compensation for those below the threshold and (2) to help reduce high employee turnover, as it relates to salary compensation. A new “faculty express delivery services” was announced by the Library Director. This service allows faculty to place orders for office delivery to FSU Libraries for holdings such as textbooks and journals. Over 200 items were delivered during the first month of October 2007. While faculty members across campus signed-up and utilized the service, initial reports find greater usage among English, math, classics and law faculty members.

The November 28, 2007 meeting witnessed a lengthy discussion on a proposal by the Primary Source Subcommittee Chair. A motion was put forth for the redesign of funding criteria for faculty proposals in order to meet the changing demands of faculty research, given informational and technological advancements. Essentially, faculty within some departments have expressed an interest in purchasing limited access research materials that funding from Primary Source Grants could facilitate; yet, such materials would not ultimately be a part of holdings for FSU Libraries, which criteria for purchase through the grant specified. The proposal was also put forth with consideration of FSU Libraries role in supporting research related to the Pathways of Excellence campaign. The results of the deliberation emerged in the creation of the Faculty Research Library Materials Grants. The subcommittee is in the process of developing appropriate criteria for next year’s announcement.

The highlight of the meeting was the roll-out of a plan to keep Strozier Library open 24 hours during the fall final examination week. Strozier Library continues to offer 24 hour library services to students. To date, this initiative has received high marks for success and great fanfare from students. The increased service hours have highly increased student interest and utilization of Strozier Library services.

In the January 2008 meeting the Library Director discussed findings from the FSU Libraries Response to Audit Report. As an overall summary, the Director notes that “the library complied with the University’s financial policies.” She further states that:

Although we identified instances where expenditures were not always consistently and appropriately classified, the misclassifications appear to have resulted from isolated mistakes, with there being no indication of systemic problems.

As Chair of the Committee, I concur with my immediate predecessor, Dr. David Paradice, where he states in the 2007 report that, “The current administration and operation of the FSU Libraries has been characterized by marked improvement in customer service and Library faculty and staff morale.” He further noted that the

recent audit by the FSU Office of Audit Services should be viewed as an opportunity to establish a baseline of operational performance for the incoming Director. I concur with this determination and contend that in the future, the Faculty Senate Library Committee should continue its high level of interest and attention to detail in reviewing the Library's administration, operations, and services.

Information from autonomous and college libraries included:

- Dan Clark, Music Library: Stated that the month of November was to most heavily used month the library has ever had. This consisted in of almost 26,000 visits recorded in one month, which is considered a high volume since there are approximately 1,000 students in the College.
- Pam Doffek, Goldstein Library: She was elected as the Vice President/President Elect of the Florida Special Libraries Association. She also related that budget cuts have not effect the purchase of books. Over 23,000 visitors have come to the Goldstein Library since July 2007.
- Sharon Schwerzel, Dirac Science Library: Stated the library witnessed an increase in spring users.

At all Faculty Senate Library Committee meeting throughout the year, there was representation and reporting from autonomous and college libraries. There continues to be a good working relationship between the Director of the FSU Libraries and the directors of the autonomous and college libraries.

On February 12, 2008 FSU Libraries hosted Joan Lippincott, an expert on library "commons" renovations and student use of libraries. Ms Lippincott gave a public talk at 10 am in Moore Auditorium (Oglesby Union) titled "Net Gen Students: Learning & Libraries". This presentation was open to the entire FSU community. The Library Director invited all committee members.

At the February meeting, the Primary Source Subcommittee of the Faculty Senate Library Committee presented the results of their review of requests for new subscriptions and monographs. Requests totaling \$215,607.97 were submitted within 32 faculty proposals. Working with a budget of \$100,000.00, the Subcommittee made a recommendation for funding requests that totaled \$106,006.97. The Director of the FSU Libraries indicated that the Library could provide the additional funding needed to fully fund the Subcommittee's recommendations.

In summary, the Faculty Senate Library Committee continued its mission of oversight for the academic year. While there are many challenges that face FSU Libraries, current trends are positive and are moving towards the development of a more efficient system with enhanced services for faculty and students. The past academic year witnessed greater student access, interest, and participation in library services. Ongoing library administrative actions undertaken by the incoming Library Director have improved and/or ameliorated concerns identified in the University's recent audit of the library. The proactive initiative displayed by the University's Library Director gives the Committee full confidence on continued improvement in the FSU Libraries. Ms. Zimmerman's leadership is the correct formula for developing the best that FSU Libraries can aspire to be.

Report of the Liberal Studies Coordinating Committee - March 11, 2008
Bob Pekurny, Chair

The committee met two times this year. At our first meeting we discussed possible roles for the committee this year.

At the second meeting we addressed two issues:

- (1) A four-credit hour model for Liberal Studies courses: Our committee met the day after the campus-wide committee met to discuss the same issue. The LSSC agreed with the campus-wide committee's report that after examining a move from three to four credit hours per course the benefits did not outweigh the costs. Our recommendation was that this proposal not be pursued any further regarding liberal studies courses.

(2) The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Undergraduate Education's draft report was discussed and the LSCC approved its general recommendations which would be pursued only if there were a mandate from the Faculty Senate. These recommendations from that Strategic Planning Subcommittee include:

- (a) Reinvent the Liberal Studies curriculum at FSU, with an emphasis on creating multidisciplinary courses that focus on development of identified skills or learning outcomes. Consider ways to weave together vocational interests and the perspectives of a liberal education. Given the increase in acceleration credit among our FTIC students, expand the concept of liberal studies beyond the 36-hour requirement and into the entire curriculum.
- (b) Create outcomes including:
- Graduate well-informed citizens capable of thinking critically, engaging in civil discourse, and participating actively in society.
 - Graduate interculturably-educated students who are citizens of the world and who understand and respect the worth and dignity of all people.
 - Create a university environment that develops the whole student and helps students define and meet their own personal growth objectives.
- (c) Create a goal such as:

"FSU is recognized as a university that produces well-rounded students who demonstrate excellence in their major and in the breadth of knowledge and skills required to be informed and active citizens who are capable of engaging in leadership, civil discourse, and lifelong learning in a diverse and global society."

(3) The LSCC chair met with the Faculty Senate Steering Committee to discuss this report to the Senate. This LSCC report should be taken as part of a larger constellation of forthcoming reports including those from Strategic Planning Subcommittees and the Goldsby Committee. Decisions on what actions, if any, to take will be made at a later date once all the reports have been submitted.

Teaching Evaluation Committee Annual Report John Geringer, Chair

The Committee has discussed two issues of substance this academic year:

- 1) We approved a departmental request to allow administration of SPOT evaluation during finals week as an exception to the usual deadline prior to finals. The approval specified that if a department has courses for their own majors that meet as a group only during finals week, then evaluations may be given at that time. This information was passed along to the Center for Assessment and Testing.
- 2) Our chief work this year has been the consideration of the possibility of initiating online teaching evaluations for regular (face to face) classes. Online administration would seem to have a number of advantages over the traditional paper administration of SPOT, including possible increases in response rates (although decreases are possible as well), greater anonymity, more substantive written comments, and greatly reduced costs for paper supplies and human processing.

Obviously there are also several problems that need to be addressed to make such a system functional and valid; such as ensuring that participation rates are not only high, but also that appropriate security protections are in place for both students and faculty.

Following discussion with Bonnie Armstrong and Jean-Marc Wise of the Center for Assessment and Testing, the Committee agreed to pilot test online teaching evaluations (for face to face courses) with a limited number of departments on a voluntary basis, possibly beginning as soon as Summer 2008. After further investigation of what is actually possible this summer, I will send an invitation to participate to Deans, Chairs, etc

Then in the Fall, we should be able to do a larger scale study to look at response rates and other issues that may come up. In the long run, it might be desirable to have a standard section completed by all students in addition to the SUSSAI, and individualized sections drawn from an item bank (items could be chosen by college/departments and additional items chosen by individual instructors). We will also coordinate recommendations with the Distance Learning Committee which has also discussed online evaluations of distance learning courses this year.

I wish to thank the members of the committee: Woody Carlson, Patrick O'Sullivan, Cecil Greek, Elizabeth Jakubowski, Eric Walker, Jon Bailey, Tom Welsh, and Patricia Young.

University Curriculum Committee 2007 – 2008 Annual Report
Susan Fiorito, Chair

The University Curriculum Committee (UCC) consists of the following members:

Susan Fiorito, Chair,
Ivonne Audirac, Urban and Regional Planning
George Blakely, Art
Beverly Bower, Education
Pam Coats, Business
Dianne Gregory, Music Therapy
Laura Keller, Biology
Cheryl Ward, Anthropology
Non-voting members include:
Melissa Crawford, Faculty Senate Coordinator
Sheila M. Mitchell, Office of Academic Publications, Curriculum, Scheduling and Space

The purpose of the UCC is to consider curricular policies and procedures at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. All new courses to be taught at the University for credit must be approved by the UCC before being offered. If a unit intends to offer a new course by an alternative mode of instruction, such as distance learning, it must first get approval for the course by submitting the Curricular Request and FSU File Syllabus forms detailed below and also complete the Form 2 request. All courses must enter the University's curriculum system having completed the traditional curricular request forms. To offer a course without face-to-face instruction in the classroom, a unit must justify [via the Form 2 process] the educational equivalence of the alternative mode of instruction. If requesting a change in course hours or objectives from a previously approved course, the old syllabus and the new/proposed syllabus must be submitted. Faculty must submit a syllabus to the registrar every time a special topics course is offered. A regular course number for the special topics course must be submitted after the third time the course is taught.

Since our last report to the Faculty Senate in March 2007 the UCC met eight times: March, April, June, September, October, December, January and February.
During these eight meetings, we reviewed:

131 New courses
65 Course changes, and
26 Courses to be deleted
222 Courses Reviewed

In addition to reviewing, meeting, discussing and making recommendations for courses the committee also began working on a complete Curriculum Manual that will be available to departments and colleges shortly that will contain examples of all forms and explanations of how each form should be completed. This will be available for download on the Faculty Senate Website, in addition to all the electronic links that are currently available.

Thank you to all the members of this committee for their hard work, attention to details and constructive comments.

UPC Annual Report to the Faculty Senate - March 12, 2008
Sandy Lewis, Chair

With one additional meeting planned, the Undergraduate Policy Committee has met 8 times so far during that 2007-2008 academic year. The UPC meets on the Wednesday preceding the Faculty Senate meetings in 201 Westcott.

This Committee is composed of a hard working group of faculty members, all who whom regularly attend meetings, including Michael Allen, Al Bathke, Rinn Cloud, Barbara Cottrell, Leigh Edwards, Andrew Epstein, Lois Hawkes, Patrick Hollis, Aaron Lan, Kim Maddox, Tim Mattherly, Daniel Mears, Tom McCaleb, Donna Nudd, Greg Riccardi, Valliere Richard-Auzenne, Carrie Sandahl, Phil Steinberg, and James Tull. The UPC appreciates the presence at its meetings of Dr. Karen Laughlin, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and Mr. Greg Beaumont, who works in her office. Finally, our work would not be possible without the able assistance of Ms. Cheryl Oakley, who works as our liaison with the faculty.

The charge of the UPC 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. 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.

During the past year, the UPC has approved the following proposals that were submitted for its review:

COURSE #	COURSE NAME	AREAS SUBMITTED	TERM EFF.
ANT 2301	Evolution of Sexuality	Area V: Natural Science	Fall 2007
ANT 2460	Anthropology of Food	Multicultural "X"	Spring 2008
COP 3014	Programming I	Computer Competency	Fall 2007
FRT 3561	French Women Writers	Area IV: Literature	Fall 2008
HEE 3103	Methods of Teaching Family and Consumer Sciences	Oral Communication Competency	Spring 2008
HIS 3464	History of Modern Science	Area III; Gordon Rule	Spring 2008
OCB 2302	Biology of Marine Mammals	Area V	Spring 2008
SLL 3510	The Slavic Vampire	Area IV; Multicultural "X"	Fall 2008

In addition, the UPC has undertaken a review of all courses that previously have been identified as meeting the criteria for the Oral Communication Competency requirement (OCCR). We asked program representatives offering courses previously approved in this area to examine the syllabi and course practices with regard to the OCCR, paying particular attention that the following criteria continue are met:

1. The course provides instruction in the following:
 - generation of an original oral message that clearly presents ideas and/or information;
 - making effective use of both vocal and physical delivery in the presentation;
 - adapting the presentation to the particular audience; and,
 - being receptive to questions and/or criticism.
2. Among the course requirements there must be provision for students to demonstrate the ability to perform competently according to the above criteria using standard American English.
3. The syllabus contains course readings and/or lectures related to instruction in the theory and practice of oral communication.
4. The course syllabus contains the following statement:

In order to fulfill FSU's Oral Communication Competency Requirement, the student must earn a "C-" or better in the course, and in order to receive a "C-" or better in the course, the student must earn at least a "C-" on the oral communication competency component of the course. If the student does not earn a "C-" or better on the oral communication competency component of the course, the student will not earn an overall grade of "C-" or better in the course, no matter how well the student performs in the remaining portion of the course.

5. Evaluation criteria for the "oral communication" components of the class and the resulting impact on the course grade are apparent to the students. Grading rubrics are highly recommended.
6. Faculty assigned to teach the course are certified by their department as having the experience and/or training to evaluate oral communication competence as defined herein.

After conducting this review, program representatives were asked to prepare a short report of findings and present them to the Undergraduate Policy Committee. So far this academic year, 13 individuals have shared information about their program's classes, with 4 others scheduled for the April meeting; 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, but not all, 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: <http://fasenate.fsu.edu/upcpast.html>.

A review of the minutes of the UPC meetings held this year also reveals that the Committee has been engaged in additional activities, including:

- Approved pilot testing of an Academic Success Course for struggling students.
- Provided input regarding the proposal to offer an intercession term.
- Followed the progress of the Office of the Undergraduate Research and Create Endeavors.
- Reviewed comments about undergraduate programs included in the QERs conducted throughout the year.
- Received input on the Global Pathways Undergraduate Certificate proposal.
- Reviewed requests to change scheduled final examination dates in both the fall and spring semesters.
- Received reports on FSU's students' performance on the Collegiate Learning Assessment and on other performance measures.
- Provided input regarding the recommendation to increase the standard number of credits for courses from 3 to 4.
- Begun deliberation on the development of guidelines for the Ethics in Business Scholarship Program.
- Provided input to the SACs portal on students' achievement of established goals.
- Begun deliberation on the possibility of offering an undergraduate major in liberal arts.
- Provided input to committee considering additional ways to challenge undergraduate students.

Annual Reports to the Faculty Senate Included in the February 2008 Minutes

**Student Academic Relations Committee - Annual Report 2007-2008
Laurie Grubbs, Chair**

There were no new cases in 2007-2008.

**Annual Report of the Graduate Policy Committee for 2007-08
George Bates, Chair**

The GPC met nine times in the Fall semester and so far has met twice this Spring.

The GPC is charged with 1. considering changes to university policies affecting graduate students and graduate education, 2. conducting reviews of graduate programs, and 3. considering proposals for new graduate programs.

In the Fall the GPC reviewed the doctoral and masters programs in Management Information Systems, Accounting, Finance, and the School of Theater. Program reviews scheduled for this Spring are Management, Finance, Risk Management and Insurance, the MBA program, and the College of Music.

In the Fall the GPC approved proposals to explore new doctoral programs in Nursing Practice (DNP) and History and Philosophy of Science. At its Jan 28, 2008 meeting the GPC approved the proposal to implement the DNP and this proposal will now go to the Board of Trustees and the Board of Governors for final approval. Due to the university's budget cuts the proposed new doctorate in History and Philosophy of Science has been placed on hold.

Over the course of the Fall and continuing this Spring the GPC discussed five changes in current graduate policies.

1. We discussed, and are continuing to consider, changes in policy that would permit non-tenure-track faculty to have full masters and doctoral directive status.
2. We passed a proposal to permit graduate students to sequester their theses or dissertations to protect the students' right to publish their work through a commercial press. Under this new policy students can elect to restrict access to their thesis or dissertation to users of the FSU Libraries. If students elect this option their thesis or dissertation will be archived by the library in an electronic format that can be viewed but cannot be copied or printed. The Steering Committee has approved this new policy.
3. We have ongoing discussions aimed at clarifying the University's policies and procedures for certifying spoken English competency for graduate teaching assistants. We hope to bring a proposal on this to the senate in the near future.
4. We have discussed and passed a proposal that would define the full-time load for graduate students who are ABD (or AB-thesis) as 3 hours. This proposal has been sent to the Steering Committee and we hope to bring it to the Faculty Senate at the Senate's March meeting.

We had several discussions of Graduate Faculty Status, Masters Directive Status and Doctoral Directive Status and have brought an action item on this issue for the Senate's consideration today. This new policy would collapse DDS and MDS into GFS for all tenure-track faculty and would place the authority for managing GFS with the

**Notes from the Committee Meeting
on February 20, 2008 of the
Consideration of Undergraduate Four hour courses at FSU**

Present:

(Chair) Susan Fiorito, Chair of the University Curriculum Committee
Kim Barber, University Registrar, Director of Admissions
George Bates, Chair of the University Graduate Policy Committee
Sara Hamon, Faculty Administrator, Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Bruce Lamont, Associate Dean of Graduate Programs, College of Business
Karen Laughlin, Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Joe Nosari, Associate Vice President, Office of the Provost
Judy Nunez (representing Bruce Janasiewicz, Undergraduate Studies, Mapping and
Community College Relations)
Bob Pekurny, Chair of the Senate Liberal Studies Committee
Anne Rowe, Dean of Faculties

Charge:

Larry Abele has asked the Senate Steering Committee to consider the feasibility of converting some or all of FSU's undergraduate curriculum to four hour courses. Dr. Jayne Standley, Faculty Senate President invited each of the individuals above to participate in one meeting to open discussion on this topic to see where we go from there. Each person was invited for his/her area of expertise or job function. Susan Fiorito will chair the committee.

The Steering Committee has identified several areas of discussion: What happens to the unified course numbering system? Is there enough space for a 2 hour MW, two hour TTH and no classes on F. configuration? If not this configuration, how would the classes meet? What is the effect of one course in a college on other college's degree programs that require that course due to requirements of outside accrediting or professional associations? With legislative mandate for 120 courses, what topics would we lose in the curriculum? What are the costs pro or con of such a transition?

The following comments were made throughout the meeting and grouped as best as possible by topic

Reasons given for the conversion of hours:

- Students would take fewer courses at one time therefore they would have more time to focus and study topics in depth.
- Faculty and administration would like to see more depth in courses-more writing
- Curriculum does need revisions
- According to the Provost's representative, the driving motivation is to give students a better education
- Some say there would be possible budgetary savings in the long-term

Faculty Senate Steering Committee Questions:

What happens to the unified course numbering system and transfer credits?

- Prerequisites are state mandated

- Liberal studies statewide for the most part are three hours and thus the conversion would create transfer concerns and pose challenges
- Student transferring in without the AA would be difficult to convert a three hour course to a four hour credit
- At lower division – articulation with community college is a concern
- A number of community colleges are now designated as senior institutions offering bachelors so upper division transfer would be problematic as well
- After speaking with the UF, Dean Laughlin felt that the transfer issues may not be insurmountable. Following is a summary of the email regarding this issue:
 - The UF would accept the three credit version and the student would not be required to take any additional credits. UF would simply substitute the three credit course for their four credit course. Also UF would only calculate three credits (instead of four) into the student's pre professional GPA.

Space Concerns:

- Larger classes would be dependant totally on the large classroom building and other lecture halls which are already booked solid
- If classes could be structured as three contact hours and one hour online then the space problem may not be as severe. However not all classes are suited to this scheme.
- With all courses converting to four hours there would be real space issues; space concerns could stop this dead in its tracks
- Monday-Thursday 50 minute scheduling would make it possible but some faculty feel they need to teach their subject matter in one time block
- The 500 seat classroom requests now exceeds accommodation
- It is true that fewer courses would be scheduled however, there would be a loss of time slots with the addition of one hour to each course
- Expanding official University operating hours would be one way to offset the loss of standard meeting time but who will teach at those hours?
- The current University standard meeting time model allows for scheduling classes on MWF's from 8 am – 9:30 pm for a total of 11 standard time slots, however, the last two, late evening slots are not heavily used. When talking about MWF time slots, the typical number used is 9 which is from 8 am – 6:30 pm. The TR schedules have 9 time slots from 8 am – 9:30 pm. For practical purposes, this totals 18 time slots in a week. A two-hour MW/TR schedule within existing operating hours would result in 5 time slots for each day combination, allowing for 15 minutes between classes. Under this model classes would be scheduled from 8 am – 8 pm. This would drop the University from a total of 18 time slots in the existing model to 10. Further analysis would be needed to see if the reduction in time slots would still provide enough space in light of a reduction in course offerings.
- No matter what, core classes would still be there, thus not eliminating the very largest classes
- The only rooms now that we have any consistent degree of flexibility in are classrooms of 30 or less. Most 40+ rooms to the large lecture halls are booked consistently through the week until evening hours or Friday afternoons.
- Maximum efficiency in the scheduling process would be needed. One possible result would be greater centralization of scheduling and enforcement of standard meeting times.

The net result will be a lower priority on instructor choice of rooms, days or times.
Additional staff would be needed

- Another class room building would be invaluable but we can not count on this for two and one half to three years from the time that funding is appropriated
- Class schedules are built approximately one year out so we are talking about a long term planning period
- Mixing a large number of three hour courses with four credit hours courses would complicate the scheduling situation further and might hamper progression to degree if required classes were offered at conflicting times or non-standard start and stop times

Concerns with requirements of outside accrediting or professional associations

- How would AP courses be handled from high schools?
- We would need to revisit the process of handling these students and their credits
- What will happen with Dual enrollment?
- There are concerns with the Engineering program since it is a joint program with FAMU

With legislative mandate for 120 courses, what topics would we lose in the curriculum?

- Liberal studies must be 36 and there is a 120 hour rule for most degree programs (of course there are some exceptions)
- SACs mandates a certain distribution of courses

What are the costs pro or con of such a transition?

- The conversion seems so labor intensive without new faculty- there is a feeling it is a way for a few to do more work
- This must be tied into the AOR
- What are we valuing at FSU? Can there be a Pathways of Excellence in Teaching?
- Some said that faculty morale would be low with the same 2/2 teaching load which would add up to eight hours/semester (16 hours/year) compared to the current typical load of six hours/semester (12 hours/year) unless teaching loads are reduced with a 2/1 load thus assigning faculty to the same number of hours faculty now teach.
- The result of this would be to move students through the University at a much faster rate
- The conversion would mean a 25% increase in teaching time and a 25% reduction in classes, which could mean that all electives would be deleted.
- There may be more control and a more focused vision for the Liberal Studies program
- Having a mixed curriculum offering four and three hour courses at the same time will be difficult. There needs to be some money from Westcott to fund this
- Questions that need to be asked: does this change make our programs stronger?
- This will result in graduate students teaching more hours, is this best for them?
- What will be considered the standard load for graduate assistants on waivers? 8 or 12 hours?
- In a quest to improve graduation rate do we hope that students take 16 hours each semester?
- 2 hour modules would allow programs to cover more breadth
- A positive note is the open door to repackaging courses, cross-discipline, broader approaches
- In order to do this it would probably be about a five year process
- Give rewards and resources for these conversions

- It can energize people to make changes if money is given to do this
- We need to find places for faculty to be excellent
- All mapping needs to be redone as well as all courses need to pass through the curriculum committees at all levels
- What is the motivation for faculty to do this with an ever increasing need to balance teaching and research?
- Details can be worked out with time and money supporting this change
- No matter what, faculty have to buy in for this to work
- One idea to reduce four hours of contact to three hours of classroom time in a four credit course would be for students to take all exams outside class time. This would have scheduling benefits to back out all evaluative processes and move assessments out of the classroom to a testing center
- Increasing the testing center load would require additional space, funding and staff to expand seats and staff resources

Example of four hour conversion in a Graduate Program:

- The College of Business has converted their MBA program and is in the process of converting their Masters and PhD programs to two/four hour courses (modules).
- BL indicated that faculty viewed this conversion as somewhat negative in that the administration was trying to extort more work, more contact hours, more content for same pay. In effect the administration was asking for more teaching and less research.
- One motivation for this change was trouble staffing some courses
- The University of Florida upper division business courses are all four hours.

Examples of courses at FSU that are currently four hours

- modern language
- Statistics
- Some science classes

Questions:

- We need to rethink pedagogically if we can offer this to only upper division
- Can we make it voluntary?
- Should we go to legislature with this idea?

General Summary

Conversion of three hour classes to four hours can be done if:

- Faculty buy into the conversion
- Money and other support (release time) is given to make the appropriate changes
- AOR is tied to increased teaching hours
- Space allocation for classes is turned completely over to central administration with additional staffing
- Some courses such as liberal studies try it out first having enough funds and resources to do it right.
- Enough thought is given so coordination with community colleges.