



FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29, 2020
FSU ZOOM
3:35 P.M.

I. Regular Session

A special session of the 2020-21 Faculty Senate was held on Wednesday, April 29, 2020. Faculty Senate President Eric Chicken presided.

The following members attended the Senate meeting:

T. Adams, S. Aggarwal, I. Alabugin, P. Aluffi, E. Alvarez, J. Ang, J. Appelbaum, A. Askew, J. Atkins, J. Bahorski, E. Bangi, A. Barbu, H. Bass, B. Birmingham, D. Bish, M. Blaber, M. Bourassa, R. Brower, J. Brown Speights, M. Buchler, G. Burnett, M. Carrasco, E. Cecil, E. Chicken, I. Chiorescu, P. Doan, J. Du, R. Duarte, M. Duncan, D. Eccles, V. Fleury, H. Gazelle, R. Goodman, T. Graban, S. Grant, A. Gunjan, K. Harris, E. Hilinski, E. Hinchman, P. Hoeflich, C. Hofacker, P. Hollis, A. Huber, M. Hurdal, P. Iatarola, J. Ingram, E. Jakubowski, K. Jones, C. Kelley, H. Kern, E. Kim, E. Klassen, T. Lee, S. Lester, V. Lewis, T. Mariano, P. Marty, C. Marzen, C. McClive, M. McFarland, C. Moore, R. Morris, J. Munn, A. Muntendam, I. Padavic, J. Palmer, C. Patrick, E. Peters, D. Peterson, J. Proffitt, A. Rhine, L. Rinaman, N. Rogers, E. Ryan, G. Salazar, A. Semykina, J. Sobanjo, S. Stagg, J. Standley, L. Stepina, R. Stilling, B. Stults, P. Sura, G. Tyson, T. Van Lith, A. Vanli, M. Ye, Q. Yin, and I. Zanini Cordi.

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

A. Ai, P. Andrei, P. Beerli, T. Chiricos, F. Dupuigrenet, S. Foo, D. Kim, I. MacDonald, C. Madsen, K. Reynolds, R. Singleton, and M. Swanbrow Becker (**Fengfeng Ke**).

II. Approval of the Minutes, April 22, 2020 meeting

The minutes were approved as distributed.

III. Approval of the agenda, April 29, 2019 meeting

The agenda was proposed to have the Graduate Policy Committee before the University Curriculum Committee under the Reports of Standing Committees and to postpone the FSU Constitution to the fall. A motion was made and seconded to amend the agenda. **The motion passed.**

IV. Special Order: Announcements by President Thrasher

No announcements were given.

V. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Graduate Policy Committee—David Johnson (See addendum 1)

- Discussion began on proposed changes to the grade appeals policy. Along with minor changes for clarification, the main proposed revision was to the time window students have to appeal a grade, changing from 30 calendar days to 15 class days. This revised timeframe would mean that holidays and breaks would be taken into consideration and prevent situations where the deadline expires during a time in which the student could not properly engage with the process. The proposed changes would also establish that the student panel formed for a grade appeal should be comprised of students at the same level as the appealing student.
- **Robin Goodman, Arts & Sciences** – Suggested using the term “business days” rather than “class days.” President Chick responded that both the UCC and GPC are in favor of the term “class days” as “business days” still includes days that the students are not on campus, such as winter break.
- **The motion to amend the grade appeals policy passed.**
- **Ian MacDonald, Arts & Sciences** – Inquired if the proposal shortens the average number of days for appeal. President Chicken responded that it would slightly shorten the time for appeal during regular instruction time, but it would increase the time for appeal during periods with interruption. Jennifer Buchanan clarified that the goal of the change is to increase the amount of time to appeal in which the student and faculty member are both available to do so.

b. University Curriculum Committee—Liz Jakubowski (See addendum 2)

- The University Curriculum Committee (UCC) brought forth the amended Americans with Disabilities (ADA) proposal with suggestions from the April 22, 2020 Faculty Senate meeting. The previous meeting’s discussion brought forth concerns about aspects of the accommodations. The current proposal specifically aims to clarify for students the steps in seeking accommodation, and the UCC will address other concerns once this proposal is considered.
- **Tarez Graban, Arts & Sciences** – Expressed concern with the removal of the third step of the ADA process, in which the student having received approval for accommodations from the Office of Accessibility Services is required to meet with their instructor in the first week of classes. This Senator informally polled colleagues on the removal of the third step in the accommodation process and concluded that students may receive mixed signals were the change to occur.
- **Hank Bass, Arts & Sciences** – Requested clarification on the previous Senator’s remarks and also expressed approval of the current proposal.
- **Tarez Graban, Arts & Sciences** – Clarified that the previous concern was in regards to the removal of the third step in the accommodation process, that the student be required to meet with their professor about the accommodations. Liz Jakubowski responded that the current language is designed to strongly encourage a meeting between student and instructor but not require it. This was in response to feedback that suggested displeasure amongst the faculty in requiring the meeting, but this displeasure is not unanimous.
- **Bridget Birmingham, Libraries** – Added that one of the concerns within the steering committee was that many of the accommodations for students are uncontroversial and

requiring a face-to-face meeting between student and professor for every accommodation request is not time-effective.

- **Monica Hurdal, Arts & Sciences** – Expressed the opinion that students should be required to meet with their professor for accommodations.
- **Jayne Standley, Music** – Expressed concern that if the Office of Accessibility Services were to have the authority to approve accommodations, they could approve accommodations that go against the requirements of the course. This Senator uses an example in which a student with anxiety could receive an approved accommodation for a musical performance class without the input of the instructor, who may not wish to approve said accommodation. This Senator suggests re-implementing the third step of the ADA process requiring students to meet with their professor before receiving approval of accommodations.
- **Kathryn Jones, Arts & Sciences** – Commented that the current “third step” requirement that students must meet with their professor before receiving approval is especially difficult for instructors of large classes.
- **Elizabeth Jakubowski, Education** – Responded that in the Student Statement of Understanding, it is made clear to the student requesting accommodation that meeting with the instructor is strongly recommended.
- **Veronica Fleury, Education** – Expressed support for the proposed ADA statement, as it does not invalidate a student’s opportunity to receive accommodation should the first week meeting with their professor not occur.
- **Hank Bass, Arts & Sciences** – Supported the new wording, as the current system’s required meeting between student and professor is in many ways a formality. Jennifer Mitchell, Department of Student Support and Transitions, responded that once the Student Accommodation letter is sent to the professor the accommodations become legally binding. As such, it is correct to say that the meeting is meant to be an opportunity for the two parties to discuss the implementation of accommodation and not an absolute requirement of the process.
- **Jayne Standley, Music** – Reiterated concern that the requirements of the course would not be considered by the Office of Accessibility Services. Erin Ryan responded that the process of approval is separate from the implementation of accommodations. Jennifer Mitchell responded that the approval process done by the University is based on the student’s disability, not their individual courses. The Office of Accessibility Services would work together with faculty members in situations such as the hypothetical put forward by Jayne Standley to make sure that accommodations consider the course requirements.
- **Tarez Graban, Arts & Sciences** – Expressed support for Senator Standley’s concerns and acknowledged Kathryn Jones’s point that the current process is difficult for instructors of large classes. This Senator suggested modification to the current proposal to make clear what the relationship is between the student, instructor, and Office of Accessibility Services during the process of approving accommodations.
- **Erdem Bangi, Arts & Sciences** – Spoke in favor of making the meeting between the instructor and student a requirement but felt that this discussion need not necessarily be done in-person.

- **Todd Adams, Arts & Sciences** – Expressed the belief that there ought to be very few situations where accommodation cannot be provided for a student.
- **Tarez Graban, Arts & Sciences** – **Made a motion to amend the ADA statement to change the required language to (3) discuss any approved accommodations with each instructor to whom a letter of accommodation was sent to ensure that all accommodations can be made in the best possible way.**
- **Gloria Salazar, Human Sciences** – Agreed that there are very few situations in which instructors should not be able to provide accommodation to a student.
- **Jennifer Mitchell** – Suggested bringing the conversation back around to the document at hand.
- **Todd Adams, Arts & Sciences** – Spoke against the motion, as it does not solve the problem that instructors of large classes face in scheduling meetings for each student in the first week of class.
- **Gary Tyson, Arts & Sciences** – Expressed interest in clarifying if instructors have the capability to deny the accommodations approved by the Office of Accessibility Services if they are incompatible with the goals of the course. Jennifer Mitchell responded that instructors cannot outright deny requests for accommodation approved by the Office of Accessibility Services, as it is preferred that the instructor work with the Office of Accessibility Services in accordance with the Americans With Disabilities Act.
- **Todd Adams, Arts & Sciences** – Clarified that the approval of accommodations is done by the Office of Accessibility Services independent of courses.
- **Jayne Standley, Music** – Reiterated the example of a student with anxiety's accommodations conflicting with the goals of a performance class. Jennifer Mitchell responded that the Office of Accessibility Services is completely available to handle the sort of cases suggested by Jayne, and that the requirement for instructors to work with OAS when the accommodations pose problems with the course material is part of compliance with the ADA.
- **Erin Ryan, Law** – **Made a motion to postpone the discussion of the ADA statement to the fall.** Jennifer Mitchell suggested getting recommendations from the body before the discussion continues in the fall.
- **Petra Doan, Social Sciences & Public Policy** – Pointed out that part of the issues with current syllabus statements come from old material that references the body which handles accommodations as the SDRC, not the current title of Office of Accessibility Services. This Senator advocated for approving any sort of update to the ADA proposal that fixes these discrepancies. President Chicken suggested that Petra Doan could introduce a motion to make the minor change needed to correct this once the motion to postpone discussion is passed.
- **Gary Tyson, Arts & Sciences** – Inquired as to whether the motion to postpone discussion takes precedent over the motion currently introduced by Tarez Graban to amend the statement. President Chicken clarified that the motion to postpone does take precedent over the motion to amend.
- **The motion to postpone the ADA statement to the fall passed.**

VI. Old Business

a. **FSU Constitution**

- Postponed.

VII. New Business

a. **Resolution – Michael Buchler (see addendum 3)**

- The proposed resolution regards the use of the FEAS system and the effects of the coronavirus pandemic on cancelled faculty events.
- **Janet Kistner, Vice President of Faculty Development and Advancement** – Stated that the adjustment suggested by the resolution has already been made by the FEAS team. There is now an option in FEAS to designate an event as cancelled due to the pandemic. Michael Buchler disagreed with Janet Kistner and clarified that the goal of this resolution is to have those faculty who have had their presentations, performances, and exhibitions cancelled due to the pandemic adjust their participation in the event from “accepted” to “presented.”
- **Michael Blaber, Medicine** – Questioned if the intent of the resolution is to have FEAS change the wording around the “cancelled due to COVID-19” options. Michael Buchler responded that the main intent of the resolution is to account for faculty members who will not be able to reschedule their event. Janet Kistner spoke again to clarify that events cancelled by the pandemic will still appear on CVs at the same location as events that did occur, but it is more accurate to state in postscript that there was not a presentation.
- **Jessica Ingram, Fine Arts** – Expressed a preference for the current “cancelled due to COVID-19” implementation, as many faculty members may be uncomfortable stating that they presented at an institution/event that did not actually occur.
- **Tahirih Lee, Law** – Agreed with Jessica Ingram and expressed concern that the resolution would cause confusion.
- **Todd Adams, Arts & Sciences** – Expressed support of the resolution, as in many cases the prestige of getting the invitation to present at this event is more important than the actual presentation. The resolution gives guidance to those who must choose between “accepted” and “presented” as one of these must be selected to go along with the “cancelled due to COVID-19” postscript.
- **Mark Bourassa, Arts & Sciences** – Spoke about feedback previously received by colleagues that CVs which contain obviously untrue elements cause confusion and concern. To have faculty state that they have presented at an event which was cancelled due to the pandemic could be seen as dishonest by those outside of the University and may pose problems in the future. Senator Tarez Graban concurred with Senator Bourassa’s sentiments.
- **Jessica Ingram, Fine Arts** – Expressed the same concern as the previous senators that the proposed resolution would allow for an unethical representation of having a presentation at an event/location that did not actually occur.
- **Hank Bass, Arts & Sciences** – Sought clarification if it is possible to add a third category to the event designation of “Accepted but cancelled due to COVID-19.” In addition, the Senator expressed concern that the CV notes which would include the clarification that an event was cancelled are not always attached to a CV when sent.

- **Michael Buchler, Music** – Clarified that the intention of this resolution was to be advisory. This Senator also clarified that the concern that warranted this resolution was that “accepted” is seen as inferior to “presented” by some when evaluating a CV.
 - **Jessica Ingram, Fine Arts** – Mentioned that many deans are planning on putting letters in files for those impacted by the pandemic to accompany any internal system acknowledgements of the pandemic situation.
 - **Gary Tyson, Arts & Sciences** – Proposed to amend the resolution to include “FSU’s Faculty Senate resolves that the classification “cancelled due to COVID-19” should retain the same weight as “presented” in all faculty evaluations.
 - **The amendment to the resolution to include the wording “FSU’s Faculty Senate resolves that the classification “cancelled due to COVID-19” should retain the same weight as “presented” in all faculty evaluations” passed.**
 - **The resolution passed.**
- b. **Kim Barber & Robert Fuselier**
- Discussed distance learning fees for students. Courses that were previously approved to be delivered via distance learning will be charged the distance learning fees. Courses that are usually taught in-person but are being taught online due to the coronavirus will not be charged the distance learning fee.
 - Discussed the challenges that the University Operations team has faced in implementing the responses to the pandemic, such as starting the summer semester in a completely remote manner. Faculty workgroups have been formed to discuss two larger topics, those being “labs, clinicals, and field placement” and “fine and performing arts and media production.” These workgroups have been instrumental in recognizing what concerns and issues need to be addressed, as the Faculty are informed on what factors have yet to be addressed.
 - The fall semester is currently unknown. Guidance outside the university is a factor, including the Governor and CDC. Some plans have been considered, but more information and parameters are needed from those outside groups before any real plans can be developed.
 - In regard to changes to the grading policy, the university has existing policies regarding S/U grading options. The university will return to those policies regarding S/U grading options at the end of the spring 2020 semester.
 - **Kathryn Jones, Arts & Sciences** – Inquired about the likelihood of a hybrid teaching model for the fall semester. Kim Barber responded that a hybrid teaching model will likely be the model chosen for the fall semester but reiterated that planning for the fall semester is contingent on guidance from the Governor and CDC.
 - **Jayne Standley, Music** – Commented about students seeking to fulfill internship and graduation obligations outside the state of Florida and inquired as to the removal of blanket statements of limitations on student’s internship options. Kim Barber responded that decisions such as those will likely be made towards the end of June, as many institutions across the country are looking at models that suggest the situation will be more clear at that time.
 - **Ian MacDonald, Arts & Sciences** – Inquired about the possibility of students returning and then getting sick and the plan in place if that were to happen. Kim Barber responded

that the plan for such a situation remains in early stages that will change as the public health situation evolves.

- **Eric Chicken, Arts & Sciences** – Inquired about the timeline in which decisions will be made about the fall semester. Kim Barber responded that the decision will be made at the end of June or the first week of July.
- c. **Petra Doan, Social Sciences & Public Policy** – **Made a motion to modify the ADA statement to reflect the new office name and information. The motion was seconded. The motion passed.**

VIII. University Welfare

a. **United Faculty of Florida, Florida State University Chapter, Michael Buchler**

- Spoke of the proposed time to begin bargaining in the spring and mentioned the open public bargaining meetings that are currently occurring online.

IX. **Announcements by Deans and other Administrative Officers**

No announcements were given.

The meeting adjourned at 5:27 p.m.

Eric Chicken
Digitally signed by Eric
Chicken
Date: 2020.06.02
07:59:55 -04'00'

Eric Chicken
Faculty Senate President

GRADE APPEALS SYSTEM
Approved by Faculty Senate_____2020

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

Step 1.

Within 15 class days (defined throughout the Grade Appeals System as Mondays through Fridays during regular fall, spring, and summer semesters, as noted in the FSU Academic Calendar maintained by the University Registrar. Class days are not dependent on whether an individual student has class on a particular day) following the date that final grades are made available to students, the student must contact the instructor in question to discuss the grade and attempt to resolve any differences. The student should document any attempts to contact the instructor in order to establish that the appeal was begun within this 15-class-day period. In the event that the instructor is not available, the student should provide that documentation to the instructor's program or department chair. It is expected that the student will first attempt to resolve the grade dispute with the instructor; however, either the student or the instructor may consult with the appropriate department chair, school director, or designee during this process.

Step 2.

If no resolution is reached within this 15-class-day period, after the student's documented attempt, the student has an additional 10 class days to submit a written statement to the department chair, school director, or designee. This statement must include an account of attempts to resolve the issue, as well as the evidence that forms the basis for the appeal.

Within 20 class days thereafter, the department chair, school director, or designee will set a date for a meeting of a grade appeals screening committee composed of three students enrolled in the academic unit offering the course to review the appeal. These students should be either undergraduate or graduate students, depending on the enrollment status of the student challenging the grade. The meeting should occur within that 20-class-day period, if practicable. Appropriate students who have no conflict of

interest will be chosen to serve on this screening committee by a student organization associated with the program or department, if such an organization exists. If none exists or if members of such an organization are not available, the department chair, school director, or designee will select appropriate students who have no conflict of interest. Both the student and the instructor may attend the meeting, as may the department chair, school director, or designee.

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

Step 3.

Within 15 class days of a positive decision from the grade appeals screening committee, the department chair, school director, or designee will appoint and arrange for a meeting of a grade appeals board. The meeting should occur within that 15-class-day period, if practicable. The board is composed of three faculty members and two students other than those who served on the screening committee. These students should be either undergraduate or graduate students, depending on the enrollment status of the student challenging the grade.

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

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

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



Florida State University

**OFFICE OF
ACCESSIBILITY SERVICES**

DEPARTMENT OF STUDENT
SUPPORT & TRANSITIONS

Syllabus Statement

Americans With Disabilities Act

If a student with a disability is requesting academic accommodations, they must:

- (1) register with and provide documentation to the OAS; and
- (2) request a letter from the OAS to be sent to each instructor indicating the need for accommodation and what type.

Students are strongly encouraged to discuss any approved accommodations with each instructor to whom a letter of accommodation was sent.

This syllabus and other class materials are available in alternative format upon request.

For the latest version of this statement and more information about services available to FSU students with disabilities, contact the:

Office of Accessibility Services
874 Traditions Way
108 Student Services Building
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306-4167
(850) 644-9566 (voice)
(850) 644-8504 (TDD)
oas@fsu.edu
<https://dsst.fsu.edu/oas>

Resolution on FEAS and Evaluation During the COVID-19 Pandemic
April 29, 2020

Whereas many academic conferences have been cancelled or reconfigured due to the worldwide coronavirus pandemic and many galleries and performance halls have been closed; and

Whereas juried conference presentations, performances, exhibitions, and other location-specific events are often important aspects of faculty promotion, tenure, and merit vita; and

Whereas the juried aspect of such in-person events occurs in advance of the event itself;

FSU's Faculty Senate resolves that the classification "Cancelled due to COVID-19" should retain the same weight as "presented" in all faculty evaluations.