



THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
APRIL 20, 2011
DODD HALL AUDITORIUM
3:35 P.M.

I. Regular Session

The regular session of the 2011-12 Faculty Senate was held on Wednesday, April 20, 2011. Faculty Senate President Eric Walker presided.

The following members attended the Senate meeting:

J. Adams, J. Ahlquist, B. Altman, D. Armstrong, A. Askew, TJ Atwood, E. Bernat, T. Chapin, E. Chicken, J. Clendinning, J. Cobbe, R. Coleman, D. Cooper, A. Darabi, A. Darrow, J. Dawkins, L. DeBrunner, L. deHaven Smith, R. Dumm, I. Eberstein, L. Edwards, B. Ellingson, G. Erickson, K. Erndl, S. Fiorito, A. Gaiser, J. Geringer, K. Harper, C. Hofacker, G. Houlihan, R. Horton-Ikard, J. Ilich-Ernst, B. Jackson, F. Jordan, M. Kapp, T. Keller, D. Latham, R. Lee, M. Leiser, S. Leitch, S. Lewis, J. Lickson, T. Lindbloom, W. Logan, C. Lonigan, L. Lyons, C. Madsen, R. Marrinan, M. Mascagni, H. Mattoussi, T. McQuade, U. Meyer-Baese, W. Mio, D. Moore, A. Mullis, J. Ohlin, J. O'Rourke, N. Piquero, V. Richard Auzenne, J. Saltiel, N. Schmidt, K. Schmitt, R. Schwartz, L. Spainhour, P. Steinberg, J. Standley, L. Stepina, E. Treharne, J. Tull, G. Tyson, M. Uzendoski, O. Vafek, S. Valisa, D. Von-Glahn, W. Weissert.

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

S. Aggarwal (X. Yuan), E. Aldrovandi (E. Hironaka), E. Baumer, J. Bowers, W. Carlson, M. Craig, J. Diaz, J. Doran, C. Edrington, W. Francis, M. Hanline, A. Hirsch, Y. Kim, W. Landing (F. Froelich), J. Leiber, T. Ma, B. Menchetti (A. Gallard), M. Mesterton-Gibbons (A. Kercheval), R. Mizelle, T. Plewa, G. Rogachev, J. Sickinger, M. Teasley (S. Tripodi), G. Tenebaum, F. Tolson, D. Tsilimingras, C. Upchurch (A. Avina).

II. Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of the March 23, 2011 meeting were approved as distributed.

III. Approval of the Agenda

The amended agenda was approved.

IV. Election of the Faculty Senate President, E. Walker

Faculty Senate Steering Committee Vice-chair Sandra Lewis was nominated and unanimously elected Faculty Senate President.

I'd like to say thanks to all of you for this demonstration of support. I feel extremely honored as I think about the trust you have in my ability to represent you over the next year. I also want you to know that I am scared to death of what lies ahead, but know that I will be able to call on each one of your to help me through the challenges ahead.

We've been through a rough two years and at this time I'd like to ask you to join me in thanking Eric Walker for his leadership during this time. I know that Eric has anguished over the fact that the faculty layoffs occurred, as he would say it, "on his watch." I am convinced that none of us could have done better than Eric to manage the situation, which he did with careful attention to the thousands of documents and e-mails that came before him, with his knack at developing strong interpersonal relationships, and his sensitivity to the plight of the displaced faculty. We owe him much gratitude, and in what can only be a futile attempt to express our appreciation, I'd like you to join me in another round of applause.

I don't know how many of you are aware of it, but Eric's wife will graduate on Saturday with her Ph.D., so it appears as though both of their lives will be in for significant changes in the next month or so. To help get you started, Eric, we want you to accept this bottle of champagne. Celebrate well!

V. Election of the Steering Committee, L. Edwards

There were no additional nominations from the floor of the Senate. There are five vacancies on the Steering Committee. The ballot for election consisted of: Burt Altman, Jane Clendinning, Susan Fiorito, Vall Richard Auzenne, Jayne Standley, Lee Stepina, Gary Tyson, Lance deHaven Smith, Kathleen Erndl, Kris Harper, Don Latham, Lisa Spainhour, and Elaine Treharne.

On the first ballot, Susan Fiorito and Gary Tyson were elected. Burt Altman, Jane Clendinning Vall Richard Auzenne, Jayne Standley, Lee Stepina and Kris Harper received the next highest amount of votes and were placed on the second ballot.

On the second ballot, Jayne Standley, Lee Stepina and Kris Harper were elected. Kris Harper will be filling the remaining 1 year of Sandra Lewis' term.

VI. Report of the Steering Committee, S. Lewis

The Provost Search has been the primary topic discussed by the Steering Committee at the four meetings it has held since the last Faculty Senate Meeting. Prior to the candidates'

campus visits, we brainstormed questions to ask during both our private meeting with the four candidates, and during both the open sessions with faculty and the time periods specifically set aside with the Faculty Senate. After Dr. Stokes completed her final open forum last Friday, we met again to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the four candidates. President Walker shared the substance of this discussion with the Search Committee at its meeting on Monday morning. We, like you, are anxiously awaiting Dr. Barron's decision on this matter.

At the Steering Committee meeting on March 30th, several other topics were considered, including the low response from the Faculty Senate to Joe McElrath's request for ideas on possible Quality Enhancement Initiatives to be included in the next SACS accreditation review. Also at this meeting, Senators Clendinning and Fiorito provided an update on the organizational meeting of the Salary Plan for Professors Review Committee and President Walker presented a report on the meeting of the Advisory Counsel of Faculty Senates, at which information about the budget outlook and BOG activities were discussed.

Athletics have been addressed at two of the Steering Committee meetings. On April 6th, the issue regarding the increase in numbers of student athletes who are taking online courses was raised and the monitoring related to this practice that must occur. This issue will be further explored by the Athletic Board Academic Committee. The Steering Committee did want to recognize recent efforts to upgrade academic performance standards by coaches and strongly urge all involved to continue in that direction.

This morning, the Steering Committee also discussed an issue related to athletics. The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) has voted to endorse recommendations made by the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics for strengthening accountability of college athletics by requiring greater financial transparency and maintaining academic integrity that they would like its member senates to affirm. The Steering Committee quickly reviewed the document and decided to ask Pam Perrewé, the Faculty Athletic Representative, to review it more carefully to determine if it represents standards we want to support.

Also this morning, the Steering Committee reviewed the proposed 2011-2012 academic calendar, discussed a proposal from the GPC to adopt policies related to university-wide standards for teaching assistants at FSU, including graduate teaching assistants whose first language is not English, brainstormed ways the faculty can contribute to the upcoming capital campaign, and received a quick update on the degree reinstatement process for the Anthropology program.

On a personal note, I'd like to welcome new members of the Senate who are with us for the first time today, and thank you, as well as the many members who are returning, for your service. I wish you the best as you complete your assignments for this academic year and start on summer projects. One of my major projects will be identifying members of numerous Faculty Senate Committees for which there are vacancies and I hope that you will respond kindly and enthusiastically if you should receive a message from me requesting that

you provide additional service. Please, if there is a committee on which you are particularly interested in having a voice, let me know and I'll try to make that appointment happen.

Finally, I have one item of business to bring before you, and that is to get your approval for the proposed dates for the Faculty Senate to meet this next year. These were distributed by mail. (See addendum 1) Do I hear a motion to accept them? **The motion passed.**

VII. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Budget Advisory Committee, C. Madsen and R. Alvarez

Dr. Madsen – The senate budget advisory committee considers university budget procedures and policies with special emphasis on the academic budget. This committee meets regularly on behalf of the University budget Advisory Committee. I have asked Ralph Alvarez to be with us today to answer any questions.

Ralph not only runs a very confident shop but has been a long time friend of the faculty, as has Bob. As chair of the committee, I am sorry to report that there is very little, if any good news. As you know the house and senate are getting ready to negotiate as we speak both of the extremely bare-bones budgets that may well result in even more draconian measures than have already been exposed. And frankly from a personal point of view, they have not yet met to resolve this.

To put this in perspective we have a total budget of 1.125 billion dollars. Most of the budget that has a direct effect on us comes from our E&G operation and our tuition. Most of the other money cannot be used or manipulated. And because the E&G money contains salaries approximately 85% of the total E&G does not amount. Furthermore, substitute problems may arise later. This is probably not the time to become creative, a deep prudence would suggest that we wait until the Legislature leaves town because we won't know where we are until they go home, and after the governor has exercised his veto power or perhaps even then. Our administration does listen to our input and the budget committee continues to give input. The next meeting is tomorrow. The Committee members are Pam Coats, Jim Cobbe, Carol Darling, Jayne Standley, Eric Walker and myself.

Ralph Alvarez - Good Afternoon. We are in the process of passing an appropriation bill between now and when we have some more serious negotiations which is probably On Mon April 25th. They will move all the appropriations around between all the allocation committees, and we'll know a little more. As of yesterday the committees had nothing to report, there's still discussions there. The sessions is scheduled to end on May 6th, but the notification period will have to be done by May 3rd so we're less than 10 working days away from ending the session, we could possibly extend it. Overall the revenue totals on both sides of the chambers and the appropriations bill, the revenues are estimated to be collected next year somewhere between 500 million and a billion dollars. --- not happy about that. He believes that

money will end up beefing up the budget stabilization to fund which is required to be over 5% over a period of time. Some of that money can work itself into some appropriations committee, maybe not. We aren't quite sure where they are in financing the entire budget, maybe there's a slight --- over there, but I don't know if I would count on too much overage at this time.

On the tuition increase side we control tuition increases pretty much except the current undergraduate raised increase tuition which is controlled by the legislature. All our plans for our financial flexible plans are based on 8% for the next few years. Right now the house has a 5% increase on the raised tuition increase, the senate doesn't have anything. Should they agree on any increase, it would fall to statutes which call for adjustment plans with the consumer price index which in turn are 1 and a half %. The other tuitions like graduate tuition, out of state tuition, is controlled by the Board of Trustees up to a certain percent is left. If we get to that 8% level we'll have to adjust our levels of revenue.

We've talked enough about pension, contributions from employees. You know last year there started, late in the session they even considered some pay cuts, and they came back to it this year and it looks like it's almost inevitable, they're going to do it somewhere around 3% which is what the House has or when the Senate has that 2% for the first 25,000, 4% for the second 25,000, and 6% after that. They're not finished so you never know.

On the health insurance side, there was a recommendation from the governor to cast the state contribution towards either 500 single coverage to 5,000, whereas the state currently priced it around 1200 dollars to get a faculty plan working. But that was recommended by the governor, 12 and 13 dollars. The House, late yesterday ran a bill to maybe try to take it up this year, but I don't think it will make it in for this year, so we'll continue to monitor that.

On the construction side, there's really no money for new construction. There's money for the main things, buildings or fixing rooms and doing ADA expansion. Right now it's really at a wasted level for renovation and fixing rooms, except for the Senate where there's some creations in there for something going on for the South Florida Center. Other than that, there's no budget. I understand it may last one more year because it lost --- with tough communications, etc. It may be more than just a local problem. As you know the state has a matching program for both gifts and facilities and for several years there's a back log for several million dollars, but neither side has money for that skin.

On the potential reductions side, one chamber has about 100 million in reductions, the other has 180 million dollars in reductions. We do say to our level our reductions could potentially be somewhere between 5% to 8% just looking at the range between the two. For budget and tuition it's about 121, it's not a huge

number but it's a very significant number still because we're not quite in balance between our current revenues and our recurring applications. We're still down a little bit so adding to that about half, but again there's no telling what will happen.

One side of the chambers has a reduction for them to make over 200 thousand dollars a year, I hope that goes away. Right now the president has limitation about statute and we pay the rest from private funds. Both the house and Senate have an ad-backed mind and we're not sure where that is. In the end the House has about a 32 million dollar ad-back which you could consider as an offset and the Senate has still 142 million in ad-back, but they label it "stem program areas" and something to be matching private funds. That's the end of the appropriation bills and the numbers will be redistributed the allocations and the conference but the rumor is the 142 is going to be disappearing soon but we haven't seen it yet. If that did happen then you could take those cuts and say the ad backs were smaller in the end, but you just have to go through the process and see where it all winds up.

Our budget committee is meeting tomorrow; we did complete a survey of all the Deans. We did produce a 1.1 million fundable credit hours per year, and about 65 thousand of those hours are being funded by federal stimulus dollars. By the end of June 30 the state can maintain the credit hours ...The results were almost even there with new pockets of concerns by a couple colleges, but overall came close to the 1.1 million fundable, tentatively early.

For other plans for next year, like I said the targets with those numbers and those markups and we have our plan for next year to just continue from where we are. There's no reason to change the size of the freshmen student and transfer class. The size of the student population.

And lastly the Provost has been thinking if our budget is somewhere in the low digits between 1 and 5% that potentially we could manage them in our 3 year flexible plan without having to further invade the budgets of the units, but of course that remains to be seen depending on what happens in the rest of the session- they could go down or stay the same.

In a nutshell this is year 4 after 2007 and 2008 we had 2 mid-year crisis in the state, 08-9 we had cut in the middle of the year, a special session for 2 consecutive years, and in 09-10 we had our largest cut just at the beginning of the year and a cut of \$45 million dollars. In 10-11 all the numbers were groomed once again but we got away with a 3 million dollar cut, something you can all rejoice about. So this year what's going to happen I don't know, Dr. Bradley may know better, but that's the way it looks to me.

VIII. Old Business

There were no items of old business.

IX. New Business

There were no items of new business.

X. University Welfare

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

Collective Bargaining

A complete copy of the “final” Collective Bargaining Agreement for 2010-13 is at long last posted at the UFF-FSU web site. I hope that we can distribute printed copies by next month. Coincidentally, next month we begin bargaining on a limited set of issues, “re-openers,” including salary. We expect the Salary Plan for Professors (SPP) and Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) reclassification will also be part of this year’s negotiations. We held another consultation with President Barron since the previous Senate meeting. The SPP and NTTF were prominent among many topics covered in a cordial and constructive discussion.

UFF-FSU Faculty Survey

Our almost-annual faculty survey has not been forgotten. We typically conduct that poll in April, but we are running late this year. You should expect to hear more about it in May. When you do, please respond.

State Government and the Budget: The “Session of Misdirection” Continues

The multi-pronged attack on public employees, including faculty, continues. Current plans call for anywhere from a 3% to 5% pay cut in the guise of “pension reform” (despite expectations that imminent reports will show that the Florida Retirement System is comfortably over-funded). Health insurance “reform” plans are also in the works, with the Senate’s current plan calling for about a \$2000 pay cut via increased premiums. There is no serious discussion of real tax reform, despite some glaring inequities such as sales tax exemptions for luxury sky boxes and yachts. A popular saying around the Capitol these days is “Facts don’t matter.”

Not only our incomes are under attack. Various bills attack faculty rights as well. The most immediate concern is the requirement of majority *membership* to retain representation rights. If less than a majority of FSU faculty become dues-paying members of the UFF, there will be no representation rights and no contract. As stated last month, our membership is rising fast, but we still have a long way to go. We are currently at about 34%.

b. SACS, J. McElrath

I'm Joe McElrath and I came here a few months ago to ask for your cooperation in all the operations of SACS. SACS comes up every 10 years so I am here to report and say thank you, and here are the most popular suggestions that we received. We will pass on these suggestions to the next committee that's participating, that's the undergraduate policy committee, and then it will be time to get the students involved once we have a chance to bring up all the possibilities to consider.

So what we have is ...

- improvement of writing skills
- improvement of critical thinking skills
- improvement of reading skills, this is a surprise because apparently there are folks in this area, maybe an adjustment in this generation, but reading skills and qualitative and quantitative
- next was electronic media sophistication
- and then there was a suggestion for more research experiences for undergraduates
- and finally suggestions that we need to do more to develop leadership for domestics and our students.

Thank you, the undergraduate policy committee and faculty are going to work together to refine the possibilities to really effective quality enhancement plans

XI. Announcements by Deans and Other Administrative Officers

There were no announcements by Deans or Other Administrative Officers.

XII. Announcements by Interim Provost Bradley

There is a meeting of the budget crisis committee that's being scheduled for May 9th. They will take up what the legislature has done but there's some presumption that we will know more by May 9. They were supposed to finish the 6th, they may not. The difficulty is that the later they go and the more damage they do it will be harder to put it in place by the end of June. So it's going to be a very rushed process if they do something large. The budget crisis committee wants them to play a larger role in doing something if the cuts are that large and so that could be an interesting process so we wait for that in the next month. Because we now have our board of trustees send that info forward, and the board of governors is meeting in the middle of June so we may have to have them give an approved budget.

Our own board of trustees is meeting in Panama City at the very beginning of June. They're going to have a workshop that will focus on 2 things: college town euphemistically, this is an issue hit by the Alumni Association to promote some use of the land directly south of the panhandle and that's not very contentious on the board of trustees so they're going to workshop that issue. And then they're going to workshop the instructor for P&T about

doing their own business which should have some ramifications in various committees. That may not seem that important but there are many decisions that go through the board of trustees that get through the easy fashion right now.

At the mid June meeting of our board of trustees and board of governors, we'd like to send something to the board of governors called our annual workplan. This is followed by our annual report. So we have to comment on the setting of the buzzword city here. We had to comment on the goals that the board has established for our request and then we had to leave those to our legislative budget request of which we can have 5 totaling 28.1 million dollars. This is the first time that the board of governors and board of trustees will take a wrestle with this initiative by the board of governors they call program coordination. Most of the colleges have been sent surveys some time ago coming from the board of governors where we had to justify programs that didn't reach various levels of productivity. We had over 500 periods and 30 bachelors degrees. In masters you had to have 20 masters degrees and 15 PhDs. Between sending in those results, we had many programs cut because of that criteria about 10 all together. So those are what we take to the board of governors and they can do what they want with it. So they can eliminate programs. I don't think they'll do that, we're supposed to be in negotiations with the board staff now over the rationales that you've provided and we summarized. Every program that we couldn't come to agreement on by May 23 has to be on our annual work plan and then that has to be discussed by our board of governors. So if we are having disagreements on the rationale of why you would want to keep a program, that program will be explicitly discussed at the subcommittee at the board of governors. Not only are there a lot of buzz words involved in this.

At the meeting there will be the annual evaluation of the president by the board of trustees and then they're discussing some other matters having to do with by-laws. That will be in Panama City and it will all be webcast.

XIII. Recognition of Anne Rowe

Dean of the Faculties Anne E. Rowe, who is retiring in May, was presented with flowers and a framed version of the resolution below:

Whereas Professor Anne Rowe has a rich history with The Florida State University, first as an outstanding undergraduate student; returning as an Assistant Professor in the Department of English; becoming a full Professor and chairing the department; and assuming the position of Associate Dean in the College of Arts and Sciences, and

Whereas while serving as a skillful administrator she has maintained an enviable scholarly record in her specialty, Southern American literature, also being recognized with a University Teaching Award for her ability to instill in her students a passion for learning as she introduced them to the richness of southern culture, and

Whereas she has embodied the ideal of faculty service at department, college, and university levels, and has contributed her wisdom and expertise to local, state, and national professional organizations, and

Whereas she has been a tireless advocate for faculty as Dean of the Faculties, demonstrating a steadfast courage and when necessary going beyond normal advocacy, sometimes at great personal cost,

Therefore be it resolved that upon the occasion of her retirement the Faculty Senate commends and thanks her for a career of outstanding service to the faculty, staff, and students of Florida State University.

XIV. Announcements by President Barron

President Barron was unable to attend the meeting.

XV. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:42p.m.



Melissa Crawford
Faculty Senate Coordinator



THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE

PROPOSED DATES FOR
FACULTY SENATE MEETINGS
2011-2012
DODD HALL AUDITORIUM
3:35 P.M.

CLASSES BEGIN: MONDAY, AUGUST 29, 2011

FINALS END: FRIDAY, DECEMBER 16, 2011

SENATE MEETINGS

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2011

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2011

(**VETERAN'S DAY HOLIDAY**, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 11, 2011)

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2011

(**THANKSGIVING**, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 2011)

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 7, 2011

CLASSES BEGIN: WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 4, 2012

FINALS END: FRIDAY, APRIL 27, 2012

SENATE MEETINGS

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 18, 2012

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2012

(**SPRING BREAK**: MARCH 5 - MARCH 9, 2012)

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 2012

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 18, 2012

Faculty Senate Honors Policy Committee Report 2010-11
Submitted by Helen Burke, Committee Chair, April 25, 2011

The committee met once in the fall semester (on Sept. 28, 2010) and once in the spring semester (on January 21, 2011). During the fall meeting, the committee took up the following issues:

- **Augmenting classes by contract for upper division students in the major:** At the suggestion of Dr. Jim Mathes, the Director of the University Honors Program, the committee discussed and approved changing the existing policy so that individual students could contract with a faculty member to “augment” up to 6 hours of classes in their major. For the Guidelines on augmenting courses by contract, see attached PDF file.
- **Graduate Courses for Honors Students:** At the suggestion of Dr. Mathes, the committee discussed the possibility of granting Honors credit to students taking graduate courses. We agreed that “basic competency” graduate courses (e.g. a language-reading course) should be excluded from this provision. Subsequent to the meeting, Dr. Mathes sent the committee the guidelines for this proposed change, and we approved this proposed change by voting on line
- **Certificates with Honors:** Dr. Mathes proposed that we consider granting Honors credit for existing undergraduate certificates. Further discussion on this proposal was postponed until our spring meeting
- **Honors Thesis Awards Subcommittee:** Mike Burmester, Pam Coats, and I agreed to evaluate the fall applications for the Bess Ward Thesis Award.

At this fall meeting, Dr. Mathes, also presented the data on the enrollment for the 2010 Honors freshman class, and he updated the committee about the new admissions policies that he intended to implement in the coming year, both for incoming freshmen and for Lateral Admits. This change in admission procedure is necessary as the size of the program has increased dramatically in recent years (768 matriculated this year, which puts Honors well above the goal of admitting 10% of the incoming class).

During the spring meeting, the committee took up the following:

- **Certificates with Honors:** The committee resumed its discussion of granting Honors credit for existing certificates, and this change was approved. For the criteria for earning a certificate with Honors, see Appendix 1.
- **Faculty Mentor Award:** At Dr. Mathes’ suggestion, the committee approved returning to the previous practice of giving an award for Honors Teaching as well one for mentoring Honors in the Major students. In future, therefore, there will be two awards: one for teaching Honors classes, and one for mentoring thesis work.

As chair, I had two subsequent meetings with Dr. Mathes to discuss honors program activities and developments. Noteworthy accomplishments within the program, a result of his strong leadership and hard work of his staff, include the following:

- **Revision of Admissions process for the Honors Program.** Several development meetings with Admissions staff led to a new model for evaluating FTIC applicants for the Honors Program. Rolling scales for SAT/ACT, recalculated GPA, and strength of schedule were established, as well as consideration of disadvantaged students. Approximately 2700 honors invitations were extended; to date approx 1300 have accepted the invitation. The Lateral admissions process was also revised to require student submission of an on-line application rather than automatic invitation. The number of lateral admits for Spring 2010 was scaled back to 200 which allows for a manageable class size for their required research colloquium.
- **Revision of structure and requirements for Honors Colloquium.** Use of iclickers for attendance and quizzes was implemented. Students were assigned optional events outside of class to earn points, e.g. *Graduate and Professional School Fair, Undergraduate Research Creative Activity Award Symposium*. A final exam was also implemented based on the semester's lectures and discussion.
- **Honors Preview Weekend.** For the first time, an honors preview weekend was held for 18 out-of-state students who had been invited to Honors Program. Each student was provided housing and meals. By all accounts the weekend was a huge success and included a dinner at the president's home. Students in this group who do choose to attend FSU were promised a one-time \$400 scholarship. Funding for all of this was through HSA and Admissions.

Subsequent to these meetings, Dr. Mathes also sent me admissions, retention, and financial data on the Honors Program for 2010-11 (see Appendix 2)

Appendix 1

Undergraduate Certificate with Honors

The proposed criteria for earning a certificate *with honors* as an undergraduate, which would be noted on a student's transcript, are as follows:

1. A 3.2 overall GPA and a 3.5 GPA in all certificate courses
2. *One* of the following three options for certificate course work:
 - a. one additional academic course approved by the certificate director
 - b. one graduate (5000) level
 - c. one augmented honors among the those required for the certificate, contracted with the instructor (honors students only)
3. A paper of at least seven pages that offers a reflection and synthesis of the certificate program and experience, to be approved by the director of the certificate program

Like the Honors in the Major, the Certificate with Honors would be open to all students, including honors and non-honors students. Course options and paper would be subject to approval of the certificate director.

NOTES: The 3.2 GPA is taken from the Honors in the Major program criteria. The seven-page minimum for the paper is taken from the Global Pathways Undergraduate Certificate. Cadence Kidwell directs that program and we had a very productive meeting about this proposal. She and her staff are enthusiastic about this idea.

It is hoped that his model can be applied to other certificate programs across campus, subject to the approval of individual directors. Perhaps some sort of capstone project may be substituted in lieu of the paper, and certificate directors may specify the content or intent of the paper.

Appendix 2

Section II: SACS Outcomes/Other Financial Data 10-11, as supplied by Dr. Mathes

FTIC Admission

	Regular Admits	Petition Admits	Total
Fall 2011	pending		
Fall 2010 (5/12/10)	751	60	811
(Fall 2009)	634	48	682)
(Fall 2008	485	118	603)

Lateral Admission for

Fall 2010/Spring 2011: 200 (number at Spring 2011 orientation)
Fall 2009/Spring 210: 425 (number at Spring 2010 orientation)
Fall 2008/Spring 2009: 232 (number who registered for Fall 2009 Sophomore Colloquium)

Medallion Earners 2010-11 (as of April 22, 2011)

Summer 2010: 27 (8 Finishers, 18 HITM, 1 both)
Fall 2010: 34 (21 Finishers, 10 HITM, 3 both)
Spring 2011: 203 (94 Finishers, 78 HITM, 31 both)
Annual Total: 264 (83% increase over last year)

Honors in the Major Completed: 2010-11

Summer 10: 18
Fall 10: 10
Spring 11: 78

Total: 106 (18% decrease compared to 120 of Fall09/Spring10)

Bess Ward Expenditures

Travel Scholarships, 2010-11

Fall 10: 9 @ \$1500 \$13,500
Spring 11 11@ \$1000 \$11000
Summer 11 9 @ \$500 \$4,500

Total Cost: \$29000 (in 09-10\$19,500)

in 08-09 \$32,000;
in 07-08 \$12,500;
in 06-07 \$24,000)

Thesis Grants, 2010-2011

Fall 10: 16 grants (16 full, 10 partial) = \$11, 913

Spring 10: 11 grants (full) = \$10,335

Total = \$22, 248 (in 09-10 \$26,320 08-09 \$ 20,175; in 07-98 \$ 31,107)

Thesis Award Luncheons:

Total Cost: \$692.90
(\$1,447.50 on 10
(\$1,275 in 09)

Recognition for Student Service Lunch (Delegates & HSA)

Total Cost: \$229
(\$476 in 09)

Outstanding Senior Scholars:

\$127.80

\$400 (\$100 @4 students)
(4 plaques)

Honors in the Major Mentor Award

Two faculty members @ \$2,000 each

\$4,000 (same as 10, 09)

Medallion Recognition Ceremony

Fall

Spring

\$465.78 (HSA Funds)
\$400.00 (4 musicians @ \$100.00)
Total 865.78
(\$429.50 in 10; \$367 in 09)



Individual Honors-Augmented Course Contract Guidelines

Purpose and Description:

The Individual Honors-Augmented Course Contract has been implemented to give honor students additional opportunities to enrich course requirements in their majors and earn honors credits towards the Honors Medallion. Honor students may earn up to six (6) individual honors-augmented credit hours in upper-division (3000-4000 level), non-honors courses in their major by contracting with faculty to complete additional work in the courses. The honors-augmented contract was developed for honor students in majors in which separate upper-division honors courses are not available. The option is not meant to replace the offering of separate honors courses whenever resources are available to offer them.

To earn individual honors-augmented credit, the honor student and faculty member must complete a contract (see below) within the first two weeks of the semester. The student must satisfactorily complete all the regular course requirements plus an extra research, writing, or creative project; additional readings with an appropriate evaluative component; or any other reasonable assignment on which the student and faculty member agree. The contract will include a description of the additional honors requirements for the course. The student and faculty are expected to meet at least twice during the semester to discuss progress on the honors requirements. A Confirmation of Individual Honors-Augmented Credit form must be submitted to the Honors Office by the faculty to verify completion of the honors requirements after the course is completed. Honors credit hours will be posted on the student's transcript upon receipt of the confirmation form (see below).

Student Eligibility and Responsibilities:

1. To earn honors-augmented credit, the student must be a member of the University Honors Program.
2. Students can contract a maximum of six (6) upper-level honors credit hours in their major.
3. In addition to completion of contracted requirements, the student must receive a course grade of B- or higher.
4. Students normally should contract only one honors-augmented course per semester.
5. The student must complete and submit the contract, signed by the student and the faculty, to the University Honors Office *by the 10th day of classes. There are no exceptions.*

Individual Honors-Augmented Course Contract Guidelines

Faculty Responsibilities:

1. Discuss and approve additional honors requirements for the course with the student.
2. Review and sign the contract once completed by the student.
3. Assign a grade for the course based on the standard course requirements and criteria. The grade is independent of the contracted honors requirements.
4. Once the honors requirements are submitted, determine if the work fulfills the contract and that honors credits are merited.
5. Send the completed Confirmation of Honors-Augmented Credit form to the University Honors Office. Campus mail is University Center A3600, code 2380. The fax is (850) 644-1841



Individual Honors-Augmented Course Contract

(Please read the contract guidelines before completing this form.)

Procedures:

1. Meet with the faculty teaching the course and express your interest in an honors-augmented component.
2. Provide the faculty member with a copy of the guidelines for the contract.
3. Discuss and determine honors requirements for the course.
4. Fill out the contract, obtain signature from the faculty and submit the form to the University Honors Office, attn: Mrs. Peggy Allen. *The complete form must be submitted no later than the 10th day of classes.*
5. Upon completion of the course and contracted requirements meet with the faculty to confirm honors credit with the confirmation form.

(Please print all information legibly with a black pen and make a file copy for student and faculty):

Student Name: _____ FSU SN _____

Faculty Name: _____

Course Prefix & Number: _____ Semester & Year _____

Course title: _____

Brief description of additional course report(s), project(s) or assignment(s) that will justify Honors-Augmented credit:

Student Signature **date** **Faculty Signature** **date**



Confirmation of Individual Honors-Augmented Credit

FACULTY MEMBER - please note: This form signed must be faxed or sent through campus mail to the FSU Honors Office after the course is completed. The University Honors Program campus mail is University Center A3600, code 2380; fax number is (850) 644- 2101. Our telephone number is (850) 644-1841. Please feel free to make additional copies of this contract for your use.

(Please use black pen, print clearly and sign in normal cursive)

The additional contracted honors requirements were satisfactorily completed and honors credits should be awarded.

Course prefix and number _____

Course grade _____

Date: _____

Faculty Name (Please Print)

Faculty Signature

Student Name (Please Print)

Student Signature

Teaching Evaluation Committee 2010-2011 Report to the Faculty Senate

The committee met on several occasions this academic year and had productive discussions. We made minor adjustments to forms and brought a more substantive change to the Senate for discussion and approval. Following is a summary of our actions:

1. Minor adjustments to SPOT/SPOTII/eSUSSAI forms (to be implemented in future versions of the forms):

- A. In the top section (A) where descriptive data are requested, item 3: in addition to the letter grades listed (A - F), add bubbles for S and U grades
- B. In the top section (A), item 4: add bubble for "not sure".
- C. Free Response Question (Section G): Current item 1 is "What did you like most about this course? What could be improved? Give examples." Change to "What did you like about the course and/or the instructor? Give examples."
- D. Free Response Question: Current item 2 is "What did you like most about this instructor? What could be improved? Give examples." Change to "What aspects of the course and/or the instruction should be improved? Give examples."

2. Make eSUSSAI and SPOT II forms identical to each other. Sequence of items on eSUSSAI should be altered to be the same as SPOT II.

3. In accordance with past practice regarding the written forms, the Committee agreed that the written and electronic versions should be consistent in treatment of written comments: The following motion was passed: "Written comments and summaries of student comments, for both electronic and written versions of SPOT, SPOT II, and eSUSSAI shall be provided to only the instructor."

4. Committee endorsed the following proposal for action by the Faculty Senate:

All student perception of teaching surveys will use SPOT II. This would include the traditional in-class administration, online administration, and distance learning courses. In other words, the 8 SUSSAI questions would continue, we would encourage student written comments, and units could add questions if they choose.

Background: We agreed that we would like to move to a common set of questions, few in number, that all faculty would use. We feel this would help encourage students to write comments that would be more helpful to faculty in making improvements in instruction. We acknowledged that with a new provost coming in the near future, it may be prudent to delay major changes in forms and methods. Because there is a history regarding the SUSSAI questions, some units making use of only item 8 ("Overall assessment of instructor") and other units using all 8 SUSSAI questions in annual evaluations of faculty, we should keep these questions. This preserves some continuity with previous assessments. This would constitute the "common form" that all faculty would use. If units wanted to use additional questions, they certainly could. This is essentially SPOT II.

The motion was passed by the Faculty Senate at the March 23, 2011 meeting.

Appreciation should be expressed to the members of the committee for their contributions this year: Kay Grise, Elizabeth Jakubowski, Tom Keller, Robert Reiser, Tony Stallins, Candace Ward, Tom Welsh, Mark Zeigler and *Ex officio* members: Jean Marc Wise and Joe McElrath.

John Geringer, Chair, Teaching Evaluation Committee

**Report to Senate
From the
University Curriculum Committee
For the Academic Year 2010-2011**

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

Susan Fiorito, Department of Retail Merchandising and Product Development, UCC Chair
Ted Baker (2010) Robert Van Engelen (2011), Computer Science
Pam Coats, Department of Finance
Dianne Gregory, Music Therapy
Laura R. Keller, Biological Science
Rick McCullough, Dance-VATD
Greg Turner, Assistant Dean
Charles Upchurch, British History
Carol S. Weissert, Political Science

Non-voting members include:

Melissa Crawford, Faculty Senate Coordinator
Sheila M. Mitchell, Assistant Registrar
Freya Rudder, Publications Coordinator
Burt Altman, Library

- 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 or a hybrid, the course proposal must first get approval through the Curriculum Committee chair.
- All courses must enter the University's curriculum system having completed the traditional curricular request forms which can be found at: <http://facsenate.fsu.edu/Curriculum-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 2010 the UCC has met eight times: April, June, September, November, December (handled changes by email), January, February and March.

During these eight meetings, we reviewed:

145	New courses
	42 Course changes, and
	<u>12 Courses to be deleted</u>
199	Courses Reviewed

In addition to reviewing, meeting, discussing and making recommendations for courses the UCC also:

- Updated the Curriculum Manual that is available to departments and colleges that contains examples of all forms and explanations of how each form should be completed;
- Is working on developing policies for courses that are taught to both undergraduate and graduate students to reinforce the importance of a distinction between graduate and undergraduate course levels.
- Will revise the curriculum requests form in order to provide more information on interdisciplinary courses.
- Encourages faculty to read and follow the attached General Suggestions for Curriculum Submissions and Revisions.

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

Respectfully Submitted, Susan S. Fiorito

General Suggestions for Curriculum Submissions and Revisions

- Course objectives must be measurable, suggestions for action verbs according to Bloom's Taxonomy, can be found on page 35 of the UCC Manual on the faculty senate website: <http://facsenate.fsu.edu/Curriculum-Forms>.
- There must be a significant difference between dual enrolled undergraduate and graduate courses with graduate courses having more in-depth assignments, readings and/or meetings.
- The University Attendance Policy, the Academic Honor Policy and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) (<http://facsenate.fsu.edu/Curriculum-Forms/Policies>) must appear on every syllabus. It is understood that all faculty follow these policies. If faculty count attendance as part of their evaluation for their course, the attendance policy must be on the syllabus and the process explained to the student regarding **unexcused absences** and how these will be counted.
- All sections of a course must have the same topics, objectives, and evaluation criteria as stated in the file syllabus that was submitted to the UCC when the course was approved. If any of these three items (topics, objectives, and evaluation criteria) change on the syllabus, a request form for curriculum changes (<http://facsenate.fsu.edu/Curriculum-Forms>) must be submitted.



The Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-1580

Dr. Dennis D. Moore
Chair, Faculty Senate Library Committee
University Distinguished Teaching Professor
(850) 644-1177 or -0811 faxes, c/o FSU English Dept.; e-mail: bryanhall-facultydir@fsu.edu

May 10, 2011

FOR: Faculty Senate colleagues
FROM: Dennis Moore
RE: Summary of the LIBRARY COMMITTEE's activities, 2010-2011

I am pleased to submit this report on behalf of the Faculty Senate Library Committee, including these colleagues whose leadership this year has been indispensable:

Matthew Goff (Religion), Resources subcommittee chair and co-chair of the Task Force on Scholarly Communication that the Library Committee has established this year;

Richard Morris (Communication Science and Disorders), Patron Services subcommittee chair; and

Alysia Roehrig (Educational Psychology and Learning Systems, College of Education), Faculty Library Materials Research Grants subcommittee chair.

This report incorporates the text of the update I presented at the Faculty Senate's February 16 meeting. Julia Zimmerman, Dean of the Florida State University Libraries, attended that Senate meeting and made additional comments following my update, and I was pleased to post the text on the following pages (which includes Dean Zimmerman's comments) shortly thereafter at the Library Committee's Blackboard site.

Meeting with architects who are working on the Libraries Master Plan:

Mark Freeman and Martha Pilgreen, two representatives of the architecture and design firm Perry Dean Rogers Partners, participated in our committee's April 13 meeting so that we could discuss the crucial need for additional library space in light of the current budget problems.

They had conducted a forum at Strozier Library last August, so this meeting with the Library

cc: Julia Zimmerman, Dean of the Libraries
Robert Bradley, Interim Provost
Melissa Crawford, Faculty Senate Coordinator
Members of this year's Library Committee, via our Blackboard site

Committee was part of a second phase of their firm's Libraries Master Plan Study. Facing the reality that construction of any new library building will not begin in the immediate future, we agreed that continuing to collect data is still vital. After a detailed and substantive discussion, we asked Strozier staff to find a way that colleagues on the FSU faculty could be part of this conversation, perhaps via a link at the Strozier website. Associate Dean Rebecca Bichel has indicated that such a link will be available for at least three weeks, beginning as early as today, and that during the Fall semester Strozier will make the link available again and will conduct focus-group sessions for interested faculty members.

Announcing, this spring, next year's Faculty Library Materials Research Grants:

Last Fall our full Library Committee agreed on the importance of getting the word out as far in advance as is practical about the mini-grants that are available through the Faculty Library Materials Research Grants program. During the last week of April Westcott distributed "Important Message" e-mails to all faculty members, and follow-up announcements to Deans and Directors, emphasizing that these mini-grants will again be available during the 2011-2012 academic year.

Progress of the Task Force on Scholarly Communication:

At our March meeting we discussed the two-fold charge of the task force that our committee formed at the beginning of the Spring semester. Its co-chairs are Matthew Goff (Religion) and Jordon Andrade (e-science librarian at Strozier Library), and the task force has a two-fold charge: (1) Helping shape the parameters of a new institutional digital repository at Strozier, which will become the university's main digital platform. Browsers through this site, whose name will be "DigiNOLES: Virtual Institutional Repository of E-Scholarship," will eventually be able to use it to access research and publications by FSU faculty. 2) Formulating a policy regarding the adjudication of Open Access scholarship by FSU faculty for purposes of tenure and promotion. The task force is designing policy guidelines and will be meeting with FSU administrators to recommend a policy for the university to adopt.

The task force will continue to work in the summer and will plan on briefing the full Faculty Senate at its October 2011 meeting. The goal of this presentation will be to inform Senators of the task force's accomplishments and to encourage faculty to use the repository. At the end of

the Fall 2011 semester, the task force will prepare its report, a copy of which will go to the Library Committee for incorporation in its next annual report to the Faculty Senate.

Looking ahead:

Given the crucial budget problems facing the university, and given that a search has been underway this spring for a new Provost, several members of our committee made a point to attend at least one forum with each of the four finalists for that position. We asked each of those finalists to comment on the importance of having a vibrant, well-funded library here at Florida State during these trying economic times and beyond. We trust that in posing the question we have reminded the university's new Provost of how crucial a strong library is to the academic life of this institution.

February 16, 2011

FOR: Faculty Senate colleagues

FROM: Dennis Moore

RE: UPDATE FROM THE LIBRARY COMMITTEE

Thank you, President Walker, and thank you fellow Senators who value the crucial role that a vibrant, well-stocked library plays in the life of a university. We have all seen that role doing a considerable amount of evolving in even the past decade -- and the evolution seems to have accelerated along with the budget crisis that is on everyone's mind.

Three of our most diligent colleagues are leading the Library Committee's subcommittees: Richard Morris, from Communication Science and Disorders, is again chairing the Patron Services group; Alysia Roehrig, from Educational Psychology, is again chairing our "mini-grants subcommittee," which manages the annual competition for Faculty Library Research Materials Grants; and chairing our Resources group this year is Matthew Goff, from Religion. As a member of the campuswide committee addressing the budget crisis, Matthew Goff is an especially logical person to help us help the Florida State Libraries consider the needs of faculty members and graduate students as well as the needs of undergraduates.

Throughout the year we work closely with Dean Julia Zimmerman and her administrative staff and members of the library faculty. Our monthly meetings of the full Library Committee begin with an update from Dean Zimmerman, and I am pleased that she has agreed to make a few comments this afternoon in conjunction with this report from the standing committee. I thank President Walker and his colleagues on the Senate's steering committee for scheduling this report at this point in today's agenda, rather than assuming that any comments from the Dean of the Libraries could come only near the very end of the agenda, when some of us find ourselves needing to leave for teaching or for hitting traffic.

My own brief comments amount to a summary of the Library Committee's activities so far during this academic year:

- We had recommended to the Senate's steering committee, last April, that the university rethink its copyright policy. Several of the librarians who had pointed out the current policy's "inadequacy and lack of sophistication" got back in touch last fall to ask what else they

might do to help kick start that rethinking, so we gathered several specific examples of shortcomings in the current policy and relayed them to the steering committee. One example is a question that many of you might well have posed: "I am not a film professor but I want to use movie clips in class. Is this a Fair Use?" Another is "What about materials (such as case studies) that a faculty member has obtained through a subscription and wants to put on e-reserve?"

- In the fall, staff members at Strozier's Scholars' Commons suggested we set up a task force on scholarly communication -- a working group that would bring together members of the teaching faculty, including several of us on the Library Committee, as well as members of the library faculty. At our October meeting we learned from e-science librarian Jordon Andrade and Gloria Colvin about a range of models other universities are using, how they have fared, and which would make sense for us to try applying here. In advance of that meeting, several of us met with two faculty colleagues who had made a presentation for Strozier last fall, "Open Access Resources Available to FSU Faculty": Mark Riley, the chair of Physics, and Paul Fyfe, an assistant professor in English who is playing an integral role in the interdisciplinary "History of Text Technology" cluster. Gary Burnett, a faculty member from Library and Information Studies who is a long-time member of the Senate Library Committee, helped us formulate several basic questions for the Task Force to address. How, for example, might we most effectively bring open-access issues to the attention of those who have an impact on promotion-and-tenure decisions? At our monthly meetings we have been hearing updates on progress toward creating an Institutional Repository. The task force has been circulating ideas and questions via its Blackboard site and will have its first face-to-face meeting this Friday, chaired by Jordon Andrade and Matthew Goff; our committee will hear an update from the task force later this spring.
- This spring we will also be distributing announcements to the faculty about next fall's Faculty Library Research Materials mini-grants. For the past two years we have front-loaded the application process, so that applications are due by the middle of the fall semester and so that we can announce recipients and dollar amounts before the end of November, allowing library staff maximum time and flexibility for actually making the purchases. Last fall we recommended more than \$76,000 in awards, and then at our meeting last week our full committee revisited the criteria. We agreed to continue the emphasis on materials related to the

applicant's research and to continue accepting applications from non-tenure track as well as tenured and tenure-track faculty. At last week's meeting, Dean Zimmerman announced that we could plan on recommending up to \$100,000 for such awards in the cycle that begins this fall.

- At Dean Zimmerman's request, we have also responded to the report that the Office of Audit Services had prepared, last December, for the Office of the Provost. As we have pointed out in a follow-up to Dean Zimmerman and to Interim Provost Bradley, that auditors' report does not address several details that our Library Committee had included in our own recommendations, in January 2010.
- We have discussed and are continuing to discuss the effects of budget cuts on our campus libraries. A crucial concern that we have brought to the attention of the steering committee is the need for a new undergraduate library to be high enough on the PECO list to have a realistic chance of becoming a bricks-and-mortar project.
- On that note, Dean Zimmerman and her staff are working with a group of architects to come up with a Master Plan, and we are hoping that those architects will be able to meet with us on one of their visits to campus. When we have such a meeting on their calendar, we will get the word out to you, as Senators, so that you and your respective colleagues can attend and hear, first-hand, about those plans.

Meanwhile, I am happy to ask Dean Zimmerman to take a few minutes to fill you in on some of the ingenious ways in which our library is stretching the available resources. I believe that we will be able by next week to post the text of these remarks, along with my brief report, via Blackboard. First, we'll hear first-hand from Julia Zimmerman, Dean of the Libraries.

comments from Dean Zimmerman:

Brief Update from the Libraries

Thanks to Senator Moore for the introduction, and thanks to the Senate Library Committee for their advice, counsel and support.

UBORROW:

Major new service debuting in early March. Will "soft launch" around March 1.

UBORROW has been developed by the 11 state university system libraries.

It allows streamlined borrowing of books among the SUS institutions – about 16 million books in all. Loan periods of 30 days with a renewal period of 30 more days.

You'll see a "UBorrow" button on the FSU catalog screen (or the Mango Union Catalog of the 11 state univ libraries). Clicking that button takes you through the steps necessary to borrow books from other university libraries. Delivery should be fairly fast – just a few days.

These systems have been enormously successful and popular in other states that have implemented them.

FSU library staff have been very involved in developing and testing the system. I hope you'll use it and let us know how it works.

E-BOOKS

Due to several collaborative initiatives with the SUS and other consortia, we are going to be providing lots more electronic books, very economically. You'll see many more of these pop up in our catalog over the next year.

Berkeley Electronic Press / DIGITAL COMMONS:

Digital Commons is a portal for faculty to post their scholarship and research.

It will be the site for electronic theses and dissertations.

It can easily host born-digital journals and other works.

Important university administrative documents can be stored there, as well.

Will increase visibility of FSU's scholarship globally.

Will be available late spring – early summer.

A next-generation discovery tool

Funded by Student Technology fee money

Provides single search access to almost all the libraries' resources – books, manuscripts, databases, journal articles, AV materials, and much more. A number of major university libraries have implemented such systems. They dramatically increase usage of library resources because things are so much easier to find.

There are several products on the market; we are currently trying to find the best one for our purposes.

Will be in place late spring-early summer.

***If you have specific questions about any of these projects, please contact us.

***We always want to hear suggestions as to how we can serve faculty more effectively!

Thank you.