MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2019
DODD HALL AUDITORIUM
3:35 P.M.

I. Regular Session
The regular session of the 2019-20 Faculty Senate was held on Wednesday, November 20, 2019. Faculty Senate President Kristine Harper presided.

The following members attended the Senate meeting:

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

II. Approval of the Minutes, September 18, 2019 meeting
The minutes of the September 18, 2019 meeting were approved as distributed.

III. Approval of the agenda, November 20, 2019 meeting
The agenda was amended to have announcements by Provost McRorie after the report of the steering committee. Dean Gale Etschmaier was removed from the agenda due to a conflict. The agenda was approved as amended.

IV. Report of the Steering Committee, Dr. Eric Chicken
• The Faculty Senate Steering Committee met four times since the last Faculty Senate meeting.
• The committee met with Provost McRorie and Vice President Kistner to discuss hiring, rankings, state budget, and departmental bylaws regarding interdisciplinary research.
• Kim Barber, Registrar, discussed issues with implementing online waiting lists for course enrollment.
• The committee met with representatives from the FSU Police Department and discussed current safety issues including the proliferation of fast-moving motorized scooters.
• The committee received demonstrations of voting software and equipment for the Senate’s voting strategy to replace the roll call votes.
• Presentations from institutional research were given to show how FSU graduation rates are monitored.
• The honors committee proposal was discussed and will be voted on during this meeting.
• The committee began a review of Faculty Senate Bylaws.

V. Announcements by Provost McRorie
• President Thrasher and Provost McRorie returned from a meeting with the Board of Governors (BOG). They requested $50 million on behalf of FSU. In a prior meeting, the BOG determined how money would be given to pre-eminent universities. President Thrasher and Provost McRorie were disappointed with the BOG’s determination.
• The BOG determined that FSU would receive $13 million less than the University of Florida and the University of South Florida would receive $10 million less than FSU regarding pre-eminent money from the state. The statute states that the pre-eminent money is to be dispersed evenly amongst the pre-eminent universities.
• Kathryn Jones, Biological Science – Inquired if rationale was given regarding the disbursement of pre-eminent funds. Provost McRorie responded that the determination was initially received via email and administrative personnel were requested to comment on the email.
• FSU highlighted the importance of money to achieve the BOG’s request for FSU to move into the top 15 and eventually top 10 in university rankings.
• FSU’s request of money is for hiring new faculty, faculty retention (raises, promotions, counter offers), graduate student recruitment and enhancement, and student success initiatives.
• President Thrasher highlighted the importance of this money to the BOG for FSU to maintain and improve its success and ranking.

VI. Special Order: Remarks by Dr. Smriti Ingrole and Dr. Galiya Tabulda, Institutional Research (See addendum 1)
• Institutional Research was approached about the disparity in four-year graduation rates for black students compared to white, Asian, and Hispanic students.
• Female students are more likely than male students to graduate in four years.
• FSU can improve graduation rates by encouraging students to take 15-hour course loads and by lowering DFW counts for students. DFW stands for the grades D and F and withdrawals from courses. Institutional Research worked to identify courses with high DFW rates to combat that issue.
• Kathryn Jones, Biological Sciences – Inquired about further information for Pell Grant students. From Jones’s experience, female Pell Grant students are more likely to work on campus and more likely to get accommodations for work schedules compared to males. Dr. Ingrole responded that there is limited access to the information for students working off campus so that was not looked at.
• **Unknown** – Inquired about age in the data analyzed. Dr. Ingrole responded that age was not a predictor for graduation.

• **Tarez Graban, Arts & Sciences** – Inquired about access to the withdrawal reasons for DFWs. Dr. Ingrole responded that reasons are not given so that data does not exist.

• **Unknown** – Inquired about the data on the level of course work students start with when they enter FSU. Dr. Ingrole responded that institutional research did not look into that.

• **Michael Blaber, Biomedical Sciences** – Inquired about a correlation between graduation rates and standardized test scores. Dr. Ingrole responded that ACT scores are in the model, but scores were not a top predictor of graduation rates.

VII. **Reports of Standing Committees**

a. **Technology Committee, Dr. Charles Hofacker**

• The committee began to study the budget model for technology on campus and concluded that there is no specific way for which technology is paid. The model appears to show that at the end of the budget cycle technology is paid for by leftover money.

• This finding leads to questions regarding who and at what level technology should be bought and paid. For example, central administration generally pays for electricity. WiFi, however, is generally paid for by units.

• **Bill Landing, Earth, Ocean, and Atmospheric Science** – Commented about the EOAS department moving to a new building. IT will charge the department for each additional ethernet port activated in each office.

• **Lisa Lyons, Biological Science** – Commented that the biological science department experiences a similar issue.

• If anyone has questions or comments about technology across campus, they are encouraged to reach out to the technology committee.

b. **Honors Program Policy Committee, Dr. Paul Marty/Dr. Annette Schwabe (Director, Honors Program) (See addendum 2)**

• Two years ago, the Faculty Senate approved a pilot program, the Honors Experience Program (HEP). HEP serves approximately 25% of incoming honors students. The cohort receives special, hands-on, high levels of engagement. The pilot program was created to look at improving engagement and graduation with honors.

• The pilot program was approved for three years. The first students entered the program in fall 2018.

• The preliminary results are excellent. To report on graduation success, the program needs a full four years of data.

• HEP emerged from an external reviewer in January 2015 from the National Honors Association. Areas were identified that the honors program needs to really thrive.

• The honors staff expanded from three to nine full-time staff in the past year.

• The average credit hours attained in honors courses were reviewed using the HEP cohort and their honors student peers. The HEP students completed an average of 13 credit hours compared to nine credit hours by their peers at the end of fall 2018.

• **Jennifer Atkins, Fine Arts** – Inquired about the feasibility of extending the pilot program longer than one additional year to gather more evidence from multiple cohorts.
Dr. Marty commented that there is currently more than one HEP cohort but the one-year extension will only provide graduation results for one cohort.

- **Linda Rinaman, Arts & Sciences** – Commented that HEP sounds like a fantastic program. This senator inquired about the entry process to the cohort. Dr. Schwabe responded that students identify on their honors application their desire to be part of HEP. Dr. Schwabe commented about the possibility of selection bias but looked at the demographic differences between HEP and their peers and found the HEP cohort to be a little more diverse.

- **The proposal to extend the final evaluation of the Honors Experience Program to fall 2022 passed unanimously.**

VIII. **Old Business**

There were no items of old business.

IX. **New Business**

a. **Elizabeth Jakubowski, College of Education**

- Requested to include a proposal for the inclusion of specialized faculty to be voted on at the January 15, 2020 meeting.
- President Harper commented that a history of constitutional changes will be emailed along with the proposal. *(See addendums 3 & 4)*

X. **University Welfare**

a. **United Faculty of Florida, Florida State University Chapter, Matthew Lata**

- UFF is monitoring the legislature.
- A union-busting bill has been introduced. The bill includes yearly expirations for union cards, among other items.
- UFF has several upcoming events, all surrounding activism.
- The Florida Education Association (FEA) is planning a major action on January 13, 2020. FEA is trying to engage more with higher education to represent higher education FEA members.

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

No announcements were given.

XII. **Announcements by President Thrasher**

No announcements were given by President Thrasher.

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Dr. Kristine Harper
Faculty Senate President
Using Power BI Dashboards to Examine Race/Ethnicity Related Disparities in 4-year Graduation Rates

Smriti A. Ingrole, Ph.D.
James M. Hunt, Ph.D.

4-year Graduation Rates at FSU

- White: 73.50%
- Black: 64.30%
- Asian: 70.00%
- Hispanic: 70.20%

Approx. 10%
Purpose

- Dive deep into the data and examine patterns via Power BI
- Develop a predictive model (logistic & multinomial regression) to identify the significant predictors of graduation in 4 years
- Using the identified significant predictors, develop a probability calculator that provides students' probability of graduating in 4 years

Observed Patterns and Descriptives

- Link to Power BI report:

https://app.powerbi.com/view?r=eyJrIjoiYzQ2NjU2NTYtMmE3ZC00MmY1LTk3ZTAtN2JmMDkyZGZmZGQ1IiwidCI6ImEzNjQ1MGViLWRiMDYtNDJhNy04ZDFiLTAyNjcxOWY3MDFIImIiLCMiOjF9
Significant Predictors

Graduation in 4 years
- Gender (+Male)
- Residency (-OOS)
- D/F/W counts (-)
- Avg Registered hours (+)
- AP/IB credits (+)
- Dual credits (+)
- Race/Ethnicity (-two or more, -other)
- ACT (-)
- Male X Pell (-)
- Began in Summer (+)

Still Enrolled at 4 years
- Gender (+Male)
- D/F/W counts (+)
- Avg registered hours (-)
- AP/IB credits (-)
- Dual credits (-)
- Race/Ethnicity (+other)
- Began in summer(-)

Drop/Stop/Transfer Within 4 years
- Gender (+Male)
- Residency (+OOS)
- D/F/W counts (+)
- Avg registered hours (-)
- AP/IB credits (-)
- Dual credits (-)
- Race/Ethnicity (+Hispanic, -black, +other, +two or more)
- ACT (+)
- Male X Pell (+)
- Began in summer(-)

Probability Calculator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>0.212</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out of State</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-0.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School GPA</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.3666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-0.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Admit</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFW Count</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Registered Hours per Term</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male X Pell</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-0.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP/IB credits</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Enrollment Credits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converged ACT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.553</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Odds          0.409671
Predicted Probability of Graduation in 4 29.06%
Key Findings

Non-Actionable

• Male students (particularly males who receive a Pell Grant)
• Accelerated credits (AP/IB and Dual Enrollment)

Actionable

• DFWs (particularly in gateway courses)
• Term course loads (encouraging 15-hours in fall and spring)

Questions?

The half of knowledge is to know where to find knowledge
Logistic Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>0.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>2.198</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>1.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-0.155</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>3.063</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>0.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more</td>
<td>-0.433</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>8.737</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>0.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-0.923</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>7.546</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>0.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>-0.355</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>10.931</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>0.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School GPA</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>1.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell</td>
<td>-0.962</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-0.351</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>18.766</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Semester Summer</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>21.292</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFW Count</td>
<td>-0.276</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>665.516</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Registered Hours</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>102.821</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male X Pell</td>
<td>-0.403</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>7.792</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>0.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP/IB Credits</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>59.767</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Enrollment Credits</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>27.044</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT (Concorded)</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>5.406</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>0.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.553</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>14.425</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agenda

- Why does timely completion matter?
- Disparities in timely completion
- Predictors from literature
- Purpose of the FSU project
- Power BI demo
- Regression results & probability calculator
- Conclusion and Discussion
Importance of a College Degree

- Beneficial not only to the individual but society as well (Ma, Pender, & Welch, 2016).
- Increase in economic returns of having a college degree (Autor, 2014; Avery & Turner, 2012).

Disparities in Graduation Rates

- Race and ethnicity related disparities in graduation rates (National Student Clearing House, 2019)

State of Florida

- Asian: 78.30%
- White: 63.09%
- Hispanic: 50.86%
- Black: 42.06%
Model Fit

![ROC Curve]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUC</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>95% C.I.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.782</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.768</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagonal segments are produced by ties.

Students Graduating in 4 Years

- Pre-college Academic Performance
- Social/Economic Background
- Institutional Factors
- First-year Academic Performance

Graduation
Addendum 2

Honors Program Policy Committee – Proposal to Extend Final Evaluation

The Honors Program Policy Committee proposes that the Faculty Senate extend the final evaluation of the Honors Experience Program (HEP) to Fall 2022. Since the first cohort of HEP students entered FSU in Fall 2018, extending the Pilot Program until Fall 2022 will allow us to capture a full four years’ worth of program data from current HEP students, thereby allowing the Faculty Senate to make a more fully informed decision about the success of this program.
Addendum 3

Background for Constitutional Changes (2017-2019)

By Joe Calhoun, Constitutional Review Committee

The Constitution Review Committee (CRC) decided to address the changes in three phases. Phase 1 was the “technical changes,” which addressed wording that was simply incorrect or outdated. For example, Board of Regents was changed to Board of Trustees. Generally speaking, these changes were not controversial and easy to identify.

Phase 2 was the “substantive changes,” which addressed issues such as crediting of time toward tenure. While these changes were not necessarily controversial, they required a more thorough discussion on the Senate floor. In total, twelve changes were approved.

Phase 3 was the most difficult and controversial. It addresses three principle questions: (1) who is allowed to vote for senators, (2) who is counted in the apportionment of senators across colleges, and (3) who is eligible to serve as a senator. The answer to (1) is generally left to the voting units. The answers to (2) and (3) are intimately tied together.

Currently, specialized faculty (i.e. non tenure track) are not included in apportionment nor are they eligible to serve as a senator. That means two colleges, Motion Picture Arts (i.e. Film School) and Applied Sciences (i.e. Panama City Campus) do not have any representation in the Senate. Regarding apportionment, specialized faculty currently comprise about 40% of the FSU faculty. It is important to note that specialized faculty are a diverse group. They include lines such as teaching, research, research support, and librarian. Librarians, while part of this group, were ‘grandfathered in’ because they were guaranteed a seat under the preceding iteration of the FSU Constitution. Their status would not be affected by the success or failure of the Phase 3 proposal.

The goal of Phase 3 was to allow specialized faculty some representation without dramatically shifting the balance of apportionment or representation. The Committee didn’t want to substantially change the relative number of senators among the colleges.

Adding 25 specialized faculty senators seemed like the “right” number in the following sense. It allows for at least one specialized faculty from each college/school/unit and allows for a couple of units to have up to three new specialized faculty senators. The variation is determined by the size of the unit. For example, the College of Arts and Sciences would receive 3 specialized faculty senators because it is the largest college. 20 new specialized faculty senators would be the minimum number to allow at least one specialized faculty senator from each college/school/unit.

During discussions among the CRC and the Senate floor, two opposing views emerged. One view is that specialized faculty should remain excluded from the Senate. That is, keep the apportionment and eligibility as it is currently written in the constitution. Another view is that specialized faculty should be included as general faculty. That is, make no distinction between tenured, tenure-earning, and specialized faculty. Apportionment and eligibility would not be split between the two groups of faculty. Phase 3 proposes a middle-ground approach.

After several iterations among the CRC and one modification on the Senate floor, the current Phase 3 proposal was rejected in March, 2019. 31 Senators voted yes, 30 voted no (passage requires a two-thirds yes vote). The Phase 3 Amendment is being re-introduced as New Business.
Proposal for the New Composition of the FSU Faculty Senate:
Including Specialized Faculty, as amended November 20, 2019

Specialized Faculty Membership in the Faculty Senate

1 – There shall be a maximum of twenty-five (25) senators representing Specialized Faculty [phased in over two years; i.e., 13 in year one and 12 in year two]

2 – Representation in the Faculty Senate by the FSUS (Lab School) shall be discontinued following completion of the current Senator’s term. The FSU Libraries will retain their elected representative; this representative shall be counted as one of the 25 Specialized Faculty representatives.

3 – Except for the University Libraries and National High Magnetic Field Lab, Specialized Faculty who are not housed within one of the colleges and schools shall not be eligible for membership in the Faculty Senate.

4 – Specialized Faculty members of the Senate shall have full voting privileges and shall be eligible to serve on all standing and \textit{ad hoc} Senate committees

5 – Each college or school with at least one Specialized Faculty shall be entitled to representation in the Faculty Senate according to the following formula:

\[
\frac{\text{number of Specialized Faculty senators}}{\text{number of eligible Specialized Faculty in college or school}}
\]

25 total number of eligible Specialized Faculty in the university
6 – When an academic unit qualifies for Senators representing their Specialized Faculty, those new Senators will be additive to the current number of General Faculty Senators in that unit

7 – Specialized Faculty members elected to the Senate are not eligible to serve as the President of the Faculty Senate

8 – Specialized Faculty members elected to the Senate are eligible to serve on the Faculty Senate Steering Committee {see below}

**Membership in the Faculty Senate Steering Committee**

1 – The eligible Specialized Faculty (in the aggregate) shall be deemed an “academic unit” for the purpose of distributing Steering Committee membership in any given academic year among at least 4 academic units

2 – No more than two (2) members of the Senate who represent the Specialized Faculty can serve on the Steering Committee at any given time

3 – Members of the Senate who represent the Specialized Faculty are not eligible to serve as the Chair or the Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee