



The Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-1030

Faculty Senate
904-644-6876

AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Moore Auditorium
April 19, 1989
3:45 p.m.

- I. Approval of the minutes of the March 15, 1989 meeting
- II. Approval of the agenda for the April 19, 1989 meeting
- III. Election of the Senate President, L. Sandon
Election of the Steering Committee, T. Matherly
- IV. Report of the Steering Committee, M. Young
- V. Special Order

Presentation to First Elected Faculty Senate
President Wayne Minnick
- VI. Reports of Standing Committees
 - a. Elections Committee, T. Matherly
Confirmation of appointments to Senate Committees
 - b. Library Committee, M. Cowart
 - c. Graduate Policy Committee, J. Standley
 - d. Computing and Information Resources
Committee, T. Clark
- VII. Unfinished Business
- VIII. New Business
- IX. University Welfare
- X. Announcements of Deans and other administrative
officers
- XI. Announcements of the President of the University

ANNOUNCEMENT: The University Club will host the University Wednesday Social at the home of President and Mrs. Sliger immediately following the Senate meeting. First elected Faculty Senate President Wayne Minnick will be honored at the social. Everyone is invited! The University Club will collect \$1.50 to help defray their expenses.



The Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-1030

Faculty Senate
904-644-6876

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

Moore Auditorium

April 19, 1989

3:45 p.m.

I. Regular Session

The first regular session of the 1989-1990 Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, April 19, 1989 at 3:45 p.m. Senate President Leo Sandon presided.

The following members were absent. Their alternates who were present are listed in parenthesis. J. Altholz, M. Armer, H. Baker, D. Behrman, G. Buzyna, R. Dalton, G. DeVore, M. Evans (J. Turner), L. Gould, E. Haymes, D. Horward, R. Johnson, K. Kemper, W. Landing (B. Cushman-Roisin), D. Leslie (A. Tucker), B. Licht, J. Mitchell, J. Morse, P. Nelson, B. Newell, J. Piersol, J. Plescia, S. Rollin, K. Scott (L. Hafner), B. Shellahamer, O. Slagle, D. Sumners, P. Tait (B. Menchetti), D. Van Winkle (J. Owens), L. Weingarden (J. Eyestone). M. Young (T. King).

II. Approval of the Minutes of March 19, 1989

The minutes of March 19 were approved as circulated.

III. Approval of the agenda for April 19, 1989

The following changes are to be made in today's agenda. Section IV, the Steering Committee report will be given by Senator E. Mann; Section VI, reports of Standing Committees should be listed as a. Elections Committee, b. Library Committee, c. Computing and Information Resources, d. report on residency reclassification policies, e. remarks from

T. McCaleb, f. Graduate Policy Committee, g. Grievance Committee report. Senate President Sandon's motion to approve this amended agenda was seconded and approved.

IV. Election of the Senate President, L. Sandon

Senator Sandon opened the floor for nominations for Faculty Senate President. Leo Sandon was nominated. Nominations were closed. Senator Roeder moved that the record show that a unanimous ballot had been cast. This motion carried.

Election of the Steering Committee, T. Matherly

Senator Matherly turned the election of the Steering Committee over to Senator Laura Keller, a member of the Elections Committee. Senator Keller informed the Senate that there were four vacancies to filled; 3 vacancies for two-year terms and 1 vacancy to complete one-year of Senator Elizabeth Mann's term, as she is leaving the University.

The following names were nominated through written ballots: Marilyn Young, Marie Cowart, Timothy Matherly, Michael Armer, Fred Kreimer, Ed Mellon, Ruth Pestle; Martin Roeder, Anne Rowe and Perrin Wright. Ed Mellon thanked the Senate for nominating him, but asked that his name be withdrawn. Nominated from the floor was Fred Leysieffer. The nominations were closed.

On the first ballot, Marilyn Young received 49 votes, Marie Cowart 42, Timothy Matherly 22, Michael Armer 24, Fred Kreimer 17, Ruth Pestle 19, Martin Roeder 26, Anne Rowe 17, Perrin Wright 21 and Fred Leysieffer 33. Marilyn Young and Marie Cowart were elected for two-year terms on this first ballot. On the second ballot Timothy Matherly received 37 votes, Michael Armer 23, Martin Roeder 31 and Fred Leysieffer 44. Fred Leysieffer was elected for a two-year term and Timothy Matherly was elected to fulfill the one-year unexpired term of Elizabeth Mann.

Steering Committee members and their terms are:

Marie Cowart, Nursing, 1991
Fred Leysieffer, Arts and Sciences, 1991

Alan Mabe, Arts and Sciences, 1990
Clifford Madsen, Music, 1990
Timothy Matherly, Business, 1990
Leo Sandon, Arts and Sciences, 1990 - Chairman
Fred Standley, Arts and Sciences, 1990
Marilyn Young, Communication, 1991

V. Report of the Steering Committee, E. Mann

Among the items considered by the Steering Committee since the last Senate meeting are:

1. Leo Sandon reported on the inaugural meeting of the Joint Academic Advisory Council for the FAMU-FSU College of Engineering. The purpose of this committee is to enhance articulation between the two campuses.
2. Misconduct in Scholarship document. The Steering Committee decided to postpone consideration of this document until a later date once it was determined that the time frame for preparing a policy was longer than originally believed. It is now considered possible that some changes in current university practice may be all that is necessary to meet the requirements of the federal granting agencies. Alan Mabe and Marilyn Young will continue to work with the University attorneys, Penny Gilmer and Patty Draper to prepare a document for consideration by the Senate in the Fall.
3. Name Change for the College of Home Economics. The Steering Committee discussed the procedures followed in the request for a change of name and determined that requirements had been met. The College of Home Economics will now be the College of Human Sciences.
4. FSU Constitution. Fred Kreimer reported that plans to include the revised constitution in the Florida Administrative Code were moving forward.
5. Tuition Waivers. Leo Sandon reported on his conversations with Carl Blackwell and Chancellor Reed regarding the problem of tuition waivers for FSU teaching assistants. The BOR has not fully funded FSU's request for waivers and the Steering Committee discussed whether a reduction of full-time status

to 9 hours will alleviate the problem. FSU is the only institution in the system currently requiring 12 hours for full-time status.

6. PARS forms. A brief discussion of the new PARS form revealed that an inquiry was underway to assess the necessity for such a detailed and extensive document. Since that discussion, we have learned that the University will return to the old document. The Steering Committee believes that the PARS forms should be developed and administered through the Dean of the Faculties' office.

7. Senate Committees. Discussion was held regarding the problem of attendance at meetings of Senate Committees. Appointments were made to fill vacancies on these committees for the next academic year; these appointments will be considered later in this meeting.

8. Course Level Designators. Leo Sandon reported on the work of the Faculty Advisory Forum (FAF) in developing a proposed policy for resolving the course level designators controversy. The subcommittee, consisting of Marilyn Young (FSU), Richard Taylor (USF), Evelyn Davis (UWF, and George Morrison (FIU) reported to the FAF at its March meeting. The recommendations of that body would retain control of the curriculum in the hands of the faculty while addressing the needs of the cost study. The FAF forwarded the recommended policy to the Chancellor for his consideration. To date, no FSU course has been assigned a new level without the approval of the affected department.

9. University Bulletin. The Steering Committee expressed its strong, unanimous objection to the proposal that all courses be listed together, alphabetically by prefix, in the University Bulletin.

10. Conversion of out-of-state graduate students to in-state status. Leo Sandon appointed a committee consisting of Fred Leysieffer, Jayne Standley, and Don Robson to recommend a policy for evaluating conversion requests. That committee will present its interim report later in this meeting.

11. Full-time course load requirement for graduate teaching

assistants. The Steering Committee discussed the question of reducing the requirement for full-time status to 9 hours. The Graduate Policy Committee will report the results of its deliberations on this issue later in this meeting.

VI. Special Order

Presentation to first elected Faculty Senate President Wayne Minnick

Senate President Sandon presented Mr. Minnick with a plaque and offered the following remarks:

"Wayne Minnick served as Faculty Senate President in 1973-74 and again in 74-75. We recognize his work today, not just because he was the first Senate President under our present organization, though such a milestone in itself is worth noting.

More to the point is the context of governance crisis out of which our present system emerged and the crucial role Senator Minnick and several of his colleagues played in the engagement of that crisis. What we really mark in this presentation is Wayne Minnick's rhetorical skill, parliamentary expertise, and moral courage marshalled in the service of our faculty. He took his turn at bat and performed with excellence.

There is, finally, a representational aspect to this award. In recognizing Professor Wayne Minnick we honor all of those whose past service insured the preservation of, and increase in the level of faculty participation in the University's governance which we enjoy today."

Mr Minnick thanked the Senate for its expression of gratitude. He stated that he felt a great deal of pride in being elected the first Senate President.

VII. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Elections Committee, T. Matherly

Senator Matherly thanked Senators Keller and Goldsmith for handling the Steering Committee elections so efficiently. The Senate confirmed the appointments to Senate committees

April 19, 1989

(addendum 1, 1a, 1b). There will be a run-off ballot for the election of members to the Professional Relations and Welfare and Grievance Committees.

b. Library Committee, M. Cowart

"Since the last Senate meeting the Senate Library Committee met twice. the committee has a recommendation for Senate consideration today. This recommendation relates to the adequacy of staff available for faculty and student academic use of the Library and was mailed to you with todays agenda." Senator Roeder moved the report and recommendations be accepted (addendum 2). His motion was approved. "The adopted recommendations will be forwarded to President Sliger for transmittal to the BOR staff."

c. Computing and Information Resources Committee, T. Clark

Senator Clark reported that the Computing and Information Resources Committee has met several times. The committee is divided into three sub-committees; telecommunications (chaired by Barry Sapolsky), administrative (chaired by William Shrode) and academic (chaired by Charles Tolbert). Each sub-committee is working with appropriate administrative personnel to address specific needs. Mr. Clark feels the overall Committee is proceeding as planned. Several meaningful observations have become very clear. 1) There is little faculty participation in the administrative process that develops computing resources. 2) The prevailing opinions are that the computing staff puts together plans and then ask for approval and/or comments from the faculty. The position of the faculty is that early participation in the planning process is required.

d. Report on Residency Reclassification Policies, F. Leysieffer

Senator Leysieffer's report is attached as addendum 3. After discussing the report, Senator Fred Standley moved to accept the report and recommendations and asked that the administration act to implement the recommendations immediately. Mr. Leysieffer reread the recommendations for clarity and the Senate approved Mr. Standley's motion.

e. Impact of Current and Proposed Faculty Senate policies on Graduate Assistant course loads, T. McCaleb

Before the Graduate Policy Committee makes its recommendations on reducing the number of hours for a graduate assistant course load, Mr. McCaleb gave a report (addendum 4) showing the financial impact. The Senate received and discussed the report.

f. Graduate Policy Committee, J. Standley

"The GPC recommends the following policy change occurring in the 1988-89 catalog p.74, paragraph 2:

Recipients of stipends from the University whether holders of fellowships or assistantships must be full time students register for at least 9 semester hours each term.

Also, p. 76 first paragraph, second column--substitute 9 hrs. for 12 hrs.

The 9 hr. requirement would be effective, Fall, 1989 and would apply to those with .25 or above assistantships.

After discussion and a motion to strike out the word "fellowships" from the wording which was approved, the amended motion was approved.

g. Grievance Committee, B. Braendlin

As the hour was getting late, Senator Braendlin submitted the following report to be included in the minutes.

"1. During the past year the Grievance Committee has resolved one grievance to the satisfaction of both parties. The details of the resolution are, of course, confidential.

2. Last summer a peer hearing panel was formed at the request of the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs as a fact-finding group for a proposed dismissal of a tenured faculty member, the University representatives and their lawyers, the panel was dissolved when the case was resolved

by outside arbitration.

3. Presently, I am discussing with a faculty member the first stage of the grievance procedure, that is, the process of trying to negotiate an informal resolution of the problem with the unit involved."

Senate President noted that dates for Senate meetings 1989-1990 would be September 13, October 11, November 8, December 6, 1989, January 17, February 14, March 14 and April 18, 1990. He also alerted the Senate to the possibility of a special May Faculty Senate meeting. Senators will be notified if and when this May meeting takes place.

Senate President Sandon thanked Senator Kreimer for his hard work on the FSU Constitution. He also thanked the Steering Committee and Parliamentarian Gregg Phifer for their support through his first year as Senate President.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Janis D. Sass". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the typed name and title.

Janis D. Sass
Secretary to the Faculty

ADDENDUM 1



The Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-1030

Faculty Senate
904-644-6876

New appointments to Senate committees to be confirmed on April 19, 1989.

*denotes new appointments

UNDERGRADUATE POLICY COMMITTEE (3-year terms)

Carol Darling, 1990	William Jones, 1991	*Donna Crowley, 1992
Martin Roeder, 1990	Karen Laughlin, 1991	*Joe Icerman, 1992
Robert Smith, 1990	Charles Tolbert, 1991	*James Gapinski, 1992
	Perrin Wright, 1991	*Jim MacMillan, 1992

GRADUATE POLICY COMMITTEE (3-year terms)

Delos DeTar, 1990	Lawrence Abele, 1991	*Karen Berkley, 1992
Adam Hirsch, 1990	Eugene Cjajkoski, 1991	*Stephen Celec, 1992
Stephen Klees, 1990	William Haas, 1991	*Richard Greaves, 1992
Elaine, McManus, 1990	Allen Imershein, 1991	*Natholyn Harris, 1992
Dianne Montgomery, 1990	A. Krothapalli, 1991	*George Judy, 1992
Patricia Rose, 1990	David Rasmussen, 1991	*David Leslie, 1992
Phyllis Van Orden, 1990	Jayne Standley, 1991	*Eric Walker, 1992
	Robert Zmud, 1991	

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE (3-year terms)

Melissa Hardy, 1990	David Ammerman, 1991	*Pam Coats, 1992
David Levenson, 1990	Fred Leysieffer, 1991	*George Dawson, 1992
Marilyn Young, 1990	Mary Shannahan, 1991	*Bentley Shellahamer, 1992

ELECTIONS COMMITTEE (1-year term)

*Doris Clack, 1990
*Michael Launer, 1990
*Kathy Scott, 1990

STUDENT ACADEMIC RELATIONS (2-year terms)

John Kelsay, 1990
Herbert Taylor, 1990
*Katherine Anderson, 1991
*Timothy Matherly, 1991
*Maxine Montgomery, 1991

BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE (2-year terms)

*Carol Darling, 1990
Leo Sandon, 1990
Fred Standley, 1990
*Alan Mabe, 1991
*Clifford Madsen, 1991
*Robert Marshall, 1991
*Patricia Martin, 1991

COMMITTEE ON MEMORIALS & COURTESIES (1-year term)

*Jesse Lovano-Kerr, 1990
*Elizabeth Piccard, 1990
*Joseph White, 1990

HONORS PROGRAM POLICY COMMITTEE (3-year terms)

Sanford Safron, 1990
Douglass Seaton, 1991
Walter Tschinkel, 1991
*Penny Gilmer, 1992
*Graham Kinloch, 1992
*William Lhamon, 1992
*Philippa Levine, 1992

addendum1a

COMPUTING AND INFORMATION RESOURCES COMMITTEE

1988 - 1990

CAROL DARLING, HUMAN SCIENCES
DIANNE GREGORY, MUSIC
GEORGE MARSAGLIA, ARTS & SCIENCES
DAVID POWELL, LAW
PAUL RUTKOVSKY, VISUAL ARTS & DANCE
WILLIAM SHRODE, BUSINESS
CHARLES TOLBERT, SOCIAL SCIENCES

1988 - 1991

TED BAKER, ARTS & SCIENCES
TOM CLARK, BUSINESS
DAVID EDELSON, ENGINEERING
GEORGE HEPNER, SOCIAL SCIENCES
SANDE MILTON, EDUCATION
PETER RAY, ARTS & SCIENCES
DON ROBSON, ARTS & SCIENCES
BARRY SAPOLSKY, COMMUNICATION

1989 - 1992

MAE-LOUISE BAKER, THEATRE
BARBARA COTTRELL, NURSING
ELISABETH LOGAN, LIBRARY & INFORMATION STUDIES
ALAN MABE, ARTS & SCIENCES
CAROLYN STEELE, SOCIAL WORK
WALT WAGER, EDUCATION
GORDON WALDO, CRIMINOLOGY

addendum 1b

LIBRARY COMMITTEE

1988 - 1990

JOHN DEPEW, LIBRARY & INFORMATION STUDIES
THOMAS HOFFER, COMMUNICATION
CHRIS HUNTER, ARTS & SCIENCES
MICHAEL KENNELLEY, BUSINESS
JOHN TELLOTTE, ENGINEERING
JOHN WAGGAMAN, EDUCATION
MORT WINSBERG, SOCIAL SCIENCES
LAUREN WOLLAN, CRIMINOLOGY

1988 - 1991

MARIE COWART, NURSING
RUSSELL DALTON, SOCIAL SCIENCES
DANIEL EISENBERG, ARTS & SCIENCES
E. I. FRIEDMANN, ARTS & SCIENCES
MARILYN GOMBOSI, MUSIC
SHIMON GOTTSCHALK, SOCIAL WORK
PATRICIA ROSE, VISUAL ARTS & DANCE

1989 - 1992

EUGENE CROOK, ARTS & SCIENCES
JOHN DEGEN, THEATRE
JODEE DORSEY, HUMAN SCIENCES
JAMES HOFFMAN, BUSINESS
MAXINE JONES, ARTS & SCIENCES
JIM MACMILLAN, EDUCATION
ORIN SLAGLE, LAW



The Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-1030

Faculty Senate
904-644-6876

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 6, 1989

TO: Faculty Senators

FROM: *Marie* Marie Cowart, Chairman
Senate Library Committee

SUBJECT: **Recommendation from the Faculty Senate
Library Committee**

The University Library, like other departments on campus, is currently undergoing a period of high staff turnover, attributable in part to increased promotional and reassignment opportunities on campus. At the end of the 1987/1988 fiscal year overall, 39% of USPS employees in the University Library had been in their positions for less than one year.

If one excluded from that overall percentage the Library Technical Assistant level, 48% of the secretarial and clerical staff have been in their positions less than one year. For some clerical positions, it is not unusual to fill the position two or three times during one year. Turnover in night and weekend positions is particularly high.

This turnover, resulting in the continual training of new staff members, makes it more difficult to provide adequate service to the University community using library resources. The University Library is responsible for providing service to faculty and students for more than 100 hours per week at four different locations on campus. In order to increase the retention of trained, qualified staff members, new incentives for current staff positions are needed. The attached addendum includes six possibilities for accomplishing a reduction in turnover.

Attachment

1. Provide special salary adjustments and compensation for staff required to work nights, weekends, and holidays. Almost none of the USPS employees in the library work a traditional Monday through Friday, 8 to 5 schedule.
2. Provide salary adjustments for staff members with supervisory responsibilities or shift supervisor assignments in order to create incentive to take on supervisory responsibilities. Current regulations provide no additional benefits or compensation for these duties. Most people prefer not to take on responsibility unless they can earn a higher rate of pay.
3. Provide the flexibility to grant salary increases and increases in pay grade as counter offers to employees who are offered a promotional opportunity elsewhere when it is mutually agreeable and beneficial to the library. This would be done only for a staff member with a good performance record and valuable training.
4. Modify the career ladders so there would be additional opportunities for staff interested in remaining in the library. At the top of the career path, add a Library Technical Assistant (LTA) III to the current LTA I and II classifications. At the low end of the career path, provide something between current clerical positions (i.e. Clerk Specialist) and Library Technical Assistant I so employees interested in promotion who are not qualified for an LTA I position would not have to leave the library for a promotion.
5. Revise the procedure for the allocation of merit raises and increase the flexibility of this process so there would be additional incentives for good work. Current practice discriminates against the many good employees who may not receive "Exceeds Performance Standards" raises. Since all staff essentially receive the same minimal raise each year what incentive is there for good performance?
6. Return to an evaluation system with four or five categories instead of three. The current system allows for "Exceeds Performance Standards," "Achieves Performance Standards," and "Below Performance Standards." Since there is a legislative mandate to minimize the number of "Exceeds Performance Standards" ratings awarded, most employees receive a rating of "Achieves Performance Standards." There is no way to distinguish between the marginal employee who is very close to receiving a "Below performance Standards" rating and the above average employee who does not quite reach "Exceeds Performance Standards." The many good, dependable employees who are the backbone of the library go unrewarded year after year and receive only the most minimal annual raise.

Report

Ad Hoc Faculty Senate Committee on Residency Reclassification Policies

April 14, 1989

This is a report from the Ad Hoc Committee to examine policies governing the reclassification to Florida residency for tuition purposes.

The committee members are Mr. Max Carraway, Prof. Fred Leysieffer (Chair), Prof. Donald Robson and Prof. Jayne Standley.

The committee was given a fact-finding charge to determine, insofar as possible, the policies relating to the reclassification from out-of-state status to in-state status for students both here at Florida State University and at the University of Florida. It was also asked for recommendations that bear on the University's policies and procedures for residency reclassification.

For Florida State University to remain competitive in attracting top quality graduate students, it is essential that provision be made to exempt them from the prohibitive costs of out-of-state tuition. Many universities accomplish this through the use of tuition waivers or by considering graduate assistants as automatically eligible for in-state tuition. Currently, the University faces a crisis in underfunding of out-of-state tuition waivers. In this sense the residency status issue is part of a larger problem, and one of extreme concern for department chairs whose graduate programs are in serious jeopardy, unless relief is found.

At the outset it was clear to the committee that this has become an emotionally charged issue on our campus and that there were major conflicting perceptions held concerning policies in force both here and at U of F. This report deals with a number of those perceptions. It is difficult, in a limited time period to separate perception from fact, however. There are many instances where a more thorough investigation would be needed to elicit more information. The situation regarding reclassification policies is a dynamic one, with changes anticipated even now. Finally, as a last introductory remark, it should be clear to all concerned that the University **must** operate within the applicable Florida statutes.

Policies at Florida State University:

Perception: FSU has been interpreting the law governing the reclassification to Florida residency too narrowly and/or operating too bureaucratically.

Conclusion: The committee has had difficulty in determining what has happened in the past and has not attempted to sort out past history. There is considerable anecdotal evidence to indicate that students have left the Registrar's office with the impression that they need own property to be classified as residents, or that the documentation required was extensive. While this perception may well be true, this committee has tried to concentrate on current policies, a course of action it considered would be more constructive.

Perception: A change of residency status is almost impossible

Conclusion: This is certainly a widely-held view in most parts of the University. It was fostered by early reports that students were encountering a requirement to own property in Florida before qualifying. It was fostered further at a variety of levels of administration by officials who said we could expect a major tightening up of residency requirements. In fact, a change in residency status is not impossible, nor should it be particularly difficult to achieve if all concerned understand the process and cooperate in working through it.

Perception: There is confusion as to what is needed to obtain residency.

Conclusion: This is true. The process is not well-understood. This issue needs to be addressed. Some efforts have already been made through a workshop with departmental representatives. The committee recommendations address this issue.

Perception: One only needs one document to establish residency. FSU is making the process too difficult and interpreting the law too narrowly.

Conclusion: In fact, as per consultation with attorney William Gladwin, one needs more than one document:

- a. A declaration of domicile pursuant to Section 222.17 Florida Statutes.
- b. Evidence of having been in Florida for at least 12 months. Here a rent receipt is satisfactory. Other evidence could include a Florida driver's license, or voter registration if they indicate a residency of at least 12 months.
- c. Evidence that the student is independent from his or her parents for tax purposes. A notarized statement from a graduate student will usually be accepted, as would be a notarized statement from the student's parents.
- d. Some evidence that the student is residing in Florida not just to attend the University. Here a rent receipt is **not** satisfactory. Evidence could consist of a voter registration, auto tag, or membership in a non-university, Florida organization. (For example, membership in the Florida Chapter of the American Statistical Association would satisfy this criterion.) There are a variety of other ways one can substantiate this intent. For example, if one has a letter from a prospective employer in Florida, this would show intent. It is not necessary to own property in Florida, although this would also be accepted.

The University **must not be in possession** of information that would contradict a student's assertion of remaining as a Florida resident. The university cannot question the intent of a student who claims residency, but must be able to document its determination.

Perception: McKnight scholars are treated differently from the graduate student population in general.

Conclusion: This is true. McKnight scholars are considered to be recruited to Florida universities for the purpose, not only of studying here, but of teaching here after earning their degrees. This is taken as their intent to continue as Florida residents.

Perception: The personnel in the Registrar's office are not helpful to students seeking change of residency status, and are occasionally rude. Students leave the office discouraged, with the feeling that a conversion is impossible.

Conclusion: The committee has not found a way to verify this directly. To do so carefully would require interviewing a random sample of students who have either gone through the process or have inquired about the process. However, this perception is so widely held that it cannot be ignored. The committee recommendations address this issue. The issue of rudeness was particularly difficult to address, since the Registrar had not received **specific** complaints for him to act on. The committee received reports that U of F may be more user friendly to its students, to the extent that their registrar's office stocked the Declaration of Domicile forms.

Perception: The administration and overall university community are perceived as being insufficiently aware of how the residency reclassification policy has impacted differentially upon departments.

Conclusion: This appears to be true. As noted earlier, the policy on residency reclassifications is part of a larger problem, coupled with a shortage in out-of-state tuition waivers. The University has a wide variety of programs. Student populations in those programs differ from one to another. In particular, there is a non-uniform distribution of out-of-state students in university departments and of the proportion of graduate students in the departments receiving assistance. Departments with only one or two out-of-state students would be relatively unaffected by an inflexible policy on residency reclassifications. Departments with a large proportion of out-of-state students, most of whom are on assistance, face devastation under both a restrictive policy on conversions and a shortage of waivers. There are many departments who simply **do not have** the resources to make up shortfalls in tuition waivers, and whose graduate programs will be severely curtailed unless relief is found.

Perception: The Registrar is uninformed about the problem's impact upon graduate programs.

Conclusion: This is certainly not the case anymore. A more accurate perception might be that there was little guidance, initially, from higher administration. Until the problem erupted at the departmental level as a crisis, little was done to solve it. Officials seemed to assume that residency conversions would be virtually impossible, when, in fact, legal opinion indicates otherwise. It was through the initiative of several desperate department chairmen that this issue received the attention it has now.

Policies at the University of Florida:

Perception: Department chairs at U of F do not seem to have a problem with waivers or with residency conversion.

Conclusion: That perception appears to be true. Data to support this conclusion have not been gathered except in an anecdotal fashion through personal

telephone calls by FSU chairs to their counterparts at the U of F. However, a look at the procedures used by U of F to deal with students shows that department chairs do not get directly involved in the residency process. Waivers are awarded centrally by the graduate school. In this sense department chairs are not directly involved in the waiver allocation process. The U of F uses an additional administrative device to convert graduate assistants to in-state residency status. Through this device and through regular student residency conversions, the University appears to have accommodated its graduate assistants.

Perception: The U of F is classifying some of its graduate students as state employees, thereby qualifying them for in-state residence status.

Conclusion: This appears to be true. The argument appears to be based upon a court decision made during the time the graduate student union was being formed at the U of F, which made the university feel it could consider its graduate students as state employees. Consequently, after a graduate assistant has been in that position for 6 months, he or she is considered as having finished a probationary period and is then eligible for a change in status. This procedure has not yet been subjected to examination by auditors. However, an audit report is due on or about April 15 of the U of F procedures. The legality of this procedure is not clear to the committee. State law confers residency status to full time employees. Graduate assistants are usually appointed at a maximum of one-half time.

Perception: The U of F is more lenient in converting student to in-state residency status than is FSU.

Conclusion: If by lenient one means reclassifying students as employees, the U of F seems to be more innovative or "lenient." For students not so classified the situation is not clear to the committee and the perception was left undecided. To resolve this issue this factually would require the committee to have more investigative authority than it has. Individual student records would have to be examined for students both converted and denied at both institutions before a clearer picture would be forthcoming. The committee did not pursue this issue further since its importance was overshadowed by more important issues, mainly that of an examination of FSU policies. In the process of not resolving this issue, the committee noted the following:

- a. We did not determine specific criteria for a student to obtain residency at the U of F.
- b. A superficial consideration of the numbers of students converted to in-state status in the spring of 1988 shows that 60 were converted at FSU compared with 143 at U of F. There is, however, a lot information that is not known. FSU claims to have made a lot of conversions during the fall 1987 semester, before new audit procedures went into effect. Did U of F do the same or was there a backlog there that had to be processed in the Spring of 1988? How many of the 143 conversions were made on the basis of the employee interpretation procedure described above?
- c. Discussions between university officials indicated that U of F officials claimed that they were operating within the law and being as careful as FSU officials were. However, it is hard to imagine how those conversations could have gone otherwise.

d. One FSU department chair phoned the UF registrar's office posing as a potential graduate student, asking about conversion to Florida residency. His perception was very clear that there was no difficulty to be anticipated.

Conclusions and Recommendations:

Recommendation 1: The Registrar must be vigilant in briefing his front office staff to present a user friendly atmosphere for residency conversions to take place. His current policy is that no students are to be denied reclassification without first having an interview with him. Students eligible for in-state residency must not leave the office discouraged, but should leave with a plan of action to effect the change of residency.

Recommendation 2: The checklist for establishing documentation to support the intent to reside in Florida should be redone, to list documents in a more ascending order of "difficulty to obtain." Currently the most difficult possible documents are listed first (e.g. property ownership) leading students to conclude incorrectly that there is no hope for conversion.

Recommendation 3: The requirements for residency reclassification must be clear to all concerned. There should be no confusion about what type of documentation is required to establish residency. To effect this, a legal opinion from the University Attorney's office should be obtained, detailing which specific documents would be legally sufficient for the documentation of Florida residency. (No such document currently appears to exist.) Steps should be taken each year to remind departments of the steps necessary to achieve residency, possibly by repeating the briefing sessions held in March of this year.

Recommendation 4: Academic departments should counsel those students who seek Florida residency prior to their visit to the Registrar's office. Each student seeking Florida residency should be encouraged to complete a Declaration of Domicile immediately upon arrival in Tallahassee, to become a registered voter, and to get a driver's license. This should take place during the registration week of the student's first semester on campus, if not sooner, so that the student can become eligible for conversion 12 months later. Departments should **strongly encourage** their students to **follow through** with the necessary procedures.

Recommendation 5: A mechanism should be established to clear up confusion when a student perceives he or she cannot obtain residency. It may well be that residency status is not possible. However, if only a minor technicality remains for a student to obtain residency, that should be known. Whenever a student returns to a department reporting that residency is not possible, the chairperson or representative should follow up using the (unspecified) mechanism.

Recommendation 6: There should be feedback from departments to the Registrar when problems are perceived. The Registrar, although learning of allegations of rudeness, has not received any specific, individual complaints. Given these circumstances, he cannot act.

Recommendation 7: The University should be alert to opportunities to support a change in procedures for making residency easier to obtain. Two immediate possibilities are:

a. In the event that the University of Florida is not cited in its audit report for the manner in which it classifies students, Florida State University should adopt the same procedure. (Note that the fact that there is a student union at U of F should have no bearing on FSU, which should be able to use a companion equity argument to establish the same policy here.)

b. The efforts to enlarge on the arrangement made for McKnight Scholars to include the class of graduate assistants should be pursued vigorously. This policy, if adopted would allow graduate assistants to become residents by arguing that their recruitment here is not only for the purpose of being students, but also to serve the state through their research and teaching contributions.

There may be other options to consider. As they appear they should be investigated vigorously.

Recommendation 8: The university administration is urged to adopt a more immediate problem analysis and resolution mode of operation which would lead toward an emphasis on crisis prevention rather than the present undesirable emphasis on crisis resolution. Interdepartmental communication also appears to be direly in need of improvement.

In an emotion charged atmosphere, no report, however factual will, be satisfactory to everyone. It is the feeling of this committee that residency reclassification is not as difficult as it has been perceived to be. It is the hope of the members of this committee that the effects of the harsh rhetoric will fade and that all concerned will work together in an atmosphere of goodwill.

Respectfully submitted:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'F. Leysieffer', written over a horizontal line.

Fred Leysieffer, Committee Chair

This is a postscript to the preceding report.

It was indicated in the introduction to this report, that the circumstances surrounding the reclassification of out-of-state students to in-state are dynamic. It can now be reported that, due to the promulgation of a legal opinion from the University Attorney's office, the steps suggested in recommendation 7b are being implemented. Graduate assistants on appointments of at least one-quarter time will be able to establish their residency with a declaration of domicile, a notarized statement showing their financial independence, and evidence of having resided in the state for at least 12 months. Graduate assistants have been recruited to Florida for purposes beyond their being students, as is evidenced by the contributions they make to the state through their teaching and research.

**ESTIMATED FINANCIAL IMPACT OF CURRENT AND PROPOSED FACULTY
SENATE POLICIES ON MINIMUM COURSE LOADS FOR GRADUATE ASSISTANTS
FOR ACADEMIC AND FISCAL YEAR 1989-90**

Each of the following estimates assumes that (a) the number of graduate assistant appointments with waivers in 1989-90 is equal to the number of appointments with waivers in 1988-89 and (b) the Legislature fully funds the Board of Regents request for increased matriculation and out-of-state fee waiver authority for 1989-90.

If the current policy of 12 hours fall and spring and 9 hours summer subject to existing exceptions is maintained:

Matriculation (In-State) Fee Waiver Surplus (Deficit)	(43,831)
Out-of-State Graduate Fee Waiver Surplus (Deficit)	(601,668)
Out-of-State Undergraduate Fee Waiver Surplus (Deficit)	(26,599)
Total University Surplus (Deficit)	(672,098)
Reduction in University Enrollment-Based Funding	0

If the proposed policy of 9 hours per term (fall, spring and summer) is adopted:

Matriculation (In-State) Fee Waiver Surplus (Deficit)	301,727
Out-of-State Graduate Fee Waiver Surplus (Deficit)	(154,440)
Out-of-State Undergraduate Fee Waiver Surplus (Deficit)	(26,599)
Total University Surplus (Deficit)	(181,039)
Reduction in University Enrollment-Based Funding	(659,726)