The Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-1030

Faculty Senate
904-644-6876

AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
DODD HALL AUDITORIUM
April 16, 1997
3:45 p.m.

I.   Approval of the minutes of the March 19, 1997 meeting

II.   Approval of the agenda for the April 16, 1997 meeting

III. Election of the Faculty Senate President, M. Cowart
      Election of the Steering Committee, V. Richard

IV.   Report of the Steering Committee, J. Macmillan

V.   Reports of Standing Committees

      a. Computing & Information Resources Committee, P. Ray

      b. Undergraduate Policy Committee, G. Buzyna and M. Young

VI.   Unfinished Business

VII. New Business

      a. Report of the Ad Hoc Sustained Performance Evaluation
      Committee, J. Macmillan

X.   University Welfare

XI.   Announcements of Deans and other administrative officers

      a. Lawrence Abele, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

XII. Announcements of the President of the University

ANNOUNCEMENT

You are invited to attend the University Club "End-of-the-Year"
Wednesday Social (no charge) which will be held at the President's
Home from 5:00 - 7:00 p.m on April 16.

R971257   8/14/97

EDWARDS, STEVE
VP ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
WES   314   1480

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
April 16, 1997
Dodd Hall Auditorium
3:45 p.m.

Book

I.   Regular Session

The first regular session of the 1997-1998 Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, April 16, 1997, at 3:45 p.m. in Dodd Hall Auditorium. President Cowart convened the meeting.

The following members were absent. Alternates who were present are listed in parenthesis. J. Altholz, K. Bearor, J. Beckham, M. Bonn, D. Boroto, S. Bush-Baskette, K. Erndl (John Kelsay), M. Freeman, A. Gometz (Maria Chavez-Hernandez), N. Jumonville, D. Levi, S. Macnamara, B. Menchetti (Andrew Oseroff), T. Parsons, C. Piazza, V. Ping, M. Pohl, V. Richard, J. Sampson, B. Shellhamer, K. Tobin, B. Tuckman, E. Walker, D. Wong, R. Zwaan.

II.   Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of March 19, 1997 were approved as distributed.

III.   Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as distributed.

IV.   Election of the Faculty Senate President, M. Cowart

President Cowart opened the floor for nominations for Faculty Senate President. President Cowart was nominated and re-elected President of the Faculty Senate by a unanimous ballot.

Election of the Steering Committee, L. Fridell for V. Richards

Senator Fridell presented the ballot for election to the Steering Committee. A slate of nominees, received by mail ballot, was distributed to Senators. The slate included Jim Macmillan- College of Education, Fred Standley- College of Arts & Sciences, Timothy Matherly- College of Business, Robert Braswell- College of Engineering, Jane Clendinning- School of Music, Jean Graham-Jones- College of Arts & Sciences, Jeff Owens- College of Arts & Sciences, Perrin Wright- College of Arts & Sciences. There were no additional nominations from the floor of the Senate.

On the first ballot votes were: Macmillan- 37, Standley- 37, Matherly- 25, Braswell- 9, Clendinning- 23, Graham-Jones- 11, Owens- 18, Wright- 27. **Professors Macmillan and Standley were elected to two year terms.**

On the second ballot votes were: Matherly -31 and Wright- 41.
Professor Wright was elected to a two year term.

1

The membership and terms of the Steering Committee is as follows:

Robley Light, Arts & Sciences, 1998
Jim Macmillan, Education, 1999
Clifford Madsen, Music, 1998
Patricia Martin, Social Sciences, 1998
Fred Standley, Arts & Sciences, 1999
Perrin Wright, Arts & Sciences, 1999
Marilyn Young, Communications, 1998

The President of the Faculty Senate serves as chairperson of the Steering Committee.

V. Report of the Steering Committee, J. Macmillan

Since the Senate met on March 19, the Steering Committee has met weekly. On March 24, we met with President D'Alemberte, Provost Abele, and Vice President Spencer. We have also met with Ron Baxley, the Associate Chief of the FSU Police, to discuss safety on campus, and with Vice President Spencer, Frank Murphy, Dean of the Faculties Steve Edwards, Browning Brooks, and Sharon Thorsland to discuss future public relations efforts of the University. The following issues are of interest:

1. In the name of the Faculty Senate, the Steering Committee awarded the first "Torch Awards" at the Faculty Awards Ceremony on April 7. "Vires" torches were awarded to George Langford and Godfrey Smith; "Artes" was awarded to Professor Emeritus William Rogers; and "Mores" was awarded to Professor Emeritus Kitty Hoffman. The Steering Committee acted upon the recommendation of the Torch Awards Committee consisting of Professors Gregory Choppin, Jim Macmillan, Anne Rowe, Mary Beth Schall, and Bernard Sliger; and FSU Foundation President Jeffrey Robison and Board representative Frankie Strickland.

2. On behalf of the Senate, President Cowart has sent a certificate of appreciation to the 350 friends of the University who have given $100,000 or more to the FSU Foundation for academic programs this year. The list of names is attached as Addendum 1.

3. With the President and the Provost, we discussed issues related to the budget, the boosters, and various matters related to finance within the University. We are concerned that the academic mission of the University be kept in the foreground of all such decisions.

4. With the President, Provost and the officers of the Information Services divisions, we have discussed a plan to have the faculty be the focus of the University's publicity efforts during the next academic year. These discussions will be continuing, and suggestions are welcome.

5. A joint committee consisting of three Deans and three faculty members has been established to review the evaluation procedures for TIP, PEP, and other related processes. The Council of Deans Agenda Subcommittee recommended Deans Donald Foss, Dianne Montgomery, and Melvin Stith. The Senate Steering Committee recommended Professors Marie Cowart, Cliff Madsen, and Patricia Martin.

6. We have received and discussed reports from various standing and ad hoc committees. Some of these are to be presented later in this meeting.

2

7. We met with Associate Chief Ron Baxley of the FSU Police Department to consider matters of campus safety, particularly as they affect faculty members. Chief Drayton will be asked to speak to the Faculty Senate early in the Fall to discuss safety efforts.

8. We have been concerned with the criteria for awards to faculty- up to and including the Lawton Professorship; we will establish a committee to review the criteria for all such awards and report before the calls for nominations are sent out next year.

VI. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Computing & Information Resources Committee, P. Ray

Senator Ray discussed the two reports presented to and passed by CIRC during the month of March from the Subcommittee on Students and Computers and the Subcommittee on E-Mail Strategies. The reports are attached as Addendum 2.

b. Undergraduate Policy Committee, G. Buzyna and M. Young

The following courses were presented to and approved by the Faculty Senate:

Courses approved for Liberal Studies credit in the Social Sciences area:

PAD 3003 Public Administration in American Society

Courses approved for Multicultural credit:

LIT 4329y African-American Folklore
LIT 4385y Major Women Writers
AML 4604y The African-American Literary Tradition
AML 4290y Studies in Ethnic Literature
FOW 3590y Race and Gender in Literature

Senator Young presented the criteria and procedures for courses satisfying the Oral Communications Competence Requirement as information to the Faculty Senate. The information is attached as Addendum 3.

VII. Unfinished Business

There were no items of unfinished business.

VIII. New Business

a. Report of the Sustained Performance Evaluation Committee given by Senator Macmillan

There were three documents distributed to the Faculty Senate. The first document contained recommended procedures for carrying out sustained performance evaluations as mandated by the BOR-UFF agreement which were made by the Ad Hoc Sustained Performance Evaluation Committee. The second contained strikethrough and underline changes to the Sustaine Performance Evaluation Proposal suggested by the Council of Deans. And the third contained proposed amendments the SPE document recommended by the Steering Committee.

Senator Macmillan presented the following motion to the floor:

3

That the proposal for the Sustained Performance Evaluation Procedures be accepted with the recommended changes made by the Council of Deans' and the amendments proposed by the Steering Committee.

b. In addition to the proposed amendments made by the Steering Committee, the following two amendments to the SPE document were presented by Senator Fred Standley.

#1. To rearrange the order of the subsections under II in the section titled "Procedures" as follows: one will become item three, two will remain the same, and three will become item one.

#2. That the following statement under II, number three, in the section titled "Procedures" ,which is proposed to be reordered as number one, read: "Any person whose annual evaluation have been satisfactory and without notices of "official concern" for that period shall be judged satisfactory in the SPE."

The floor was then opened for discussion for each amendment.

Amendment 1 was adopted by the Faculty Senate

Amendment 2 was adopted by the Faculty Senate

The recommendation made by the Ad Hoc Sustained Performance Committee as amended was adopted by the Faculty Senate. The adopted document is attached as Addendum 4.

IX. University Welfare

Senator Anderson-Lazier commented on the subject matter contained within President Cowart's letter to all tenured faculty. Senator Anderson-Lazier expressed her displeasure with the University President's and Provost's decision to overturn PEP Committee recommendations for faculty promotion and tenure. Senator Cowart expressed similar concern and remarked that this issue was a top priority on the the Steering Committee's agenda for the upcoming meeting with the University President.

X. Announcements of Deans and other administrative officers

a. Provost Larry Abele was not available for today's meeting.

XI. Announcements of the President of the University

President D'Alemberte was not available for today's meeting.

XII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Jennifer Albee
Assistant to the Secretary to the Faculty

4

List of One-Hundred-Thousand-Dollar-plus Donors
to the *Investment in Learning Campaign*
January 1, 1991 - March 30, 1997

Mrs. Jeanette B. Adler
W. F. Akers
E. C. Allen
Apple Computer
Arthur I. Appleton
Miss Edith-Marie Appleton
Appleton Cultural Center, Inc.
Arthur Anderson Company & Staff
Asolo Center for the Performing Arts
Associated Industries
AT&T-University Educational Donation Program
Elizabeth C. Atkinson
Dr. Thomas A. Backus
W. S. Badcock Corporation
Mark Bane
Larry D. Beltz
Bruce & Gene Benward
John W. Berry
Dr. C. Virginia Bert
Robert Louis Berto
Beverly California Corporation
Beverly Health & Rehabilitative Services
Frank Bilek
Blockbuster
Ruby Bowdoin Bloomfield
Bosworth Educational Trust
Robert C. Bowden
Mr. Rod M. Brim
Loris & Margaret Bristol
Mr. Charles A.Bruning
Dr. Francois Bucher
Burdines
Mrs. Mary A. Burns
Burroughs Wellcome Fund
James Caffrey
Malcolm R. Cairns
Centel Foundation

Dr. John E. & Mary L. Champion
CHARBETT, Inc.
Mr. Ralph L. Cook
Raymond & Stella Cottrell
Dr. James E. Croft
Thomas C. Cundy
DAVGAR, Inc.
Robert H. & Nancy Dedman, Sr.
Jeanette DeWitt Estate
Mrs. Hazel R. Dillmeier
Fred O. Drake
Jessie Ball DuPont Fund
Economic Development Administration
Nelle Loyless Edmunds
Mr. William H.Eisele
Frank Fain
Howell L. & M. Sharon Maxwell Ferguson
First Union Bank
First Union Corporation
First Union Foundation
Florida Bar Foundation
Florida Board of Regents Foundation (Collins Ctr.)
Florida Retail Federation
Fonvielle & Hinkle
Ford Foundation
Mr. John W. Frost
FSU Alumni Association
Tim & Holly Gannon
J. Paul Getty Trust
Mr. Ghazvini Family
Mr.Gerald Goldstein
Mr. Jack Winn Gramling
Arnold & Priscilla Greenfield
Mr. William D.Griffin
Gulfstream Park Racing Association
Melvine Hardee
Mr. Foster & Martha Harmon
Mrs. Mary M. Harris
Harris Foundation
Dr. Hadley H. Hasemeier

James A. Helinger
Mr. Cantey Higdon
Louis & Mart Hill
Kitty & Harold Hoffman
Mr. J. Wayne Hogan
Mrs. Lucilla Housewright
Dr. Wiley Housewright
Mr. Reid B. Hughes
Louise I. Humphrey
John Hunnicutt
JM Family Enterprises, Inc.
Winona Joers Estate
Willie Lee Johnson Estate
Severiano & Josephine Jorge
W. M. Keck Foundation
Kellogg Foundation
Mattie Kelly
Mr. Robert G. Kerrigan
Robert L. & Tedy Parker King
Marie & Edward Kingsbury
James E. & Mary F. Kirk
George W. Krausmann
Mr. George R. Langford
Mr. E. Robert Langley
Mr. Robert L. Larson
Mrs Nancy E. Lenny
Margaret K. & Fred S. Lewis
License Tag Buyers
Lincoln College Education & Research Fund
Mr. Joseph A. Lindsay
Caroline Lombardo
Manatee County Seminole Boosters
Lucille Markey Trust
Marriott Foundation
Mr. Michael T. Martin
Penelope E. Mason Estate
Fred L. May Trust
Curtis Mayes
Colonel C. D. McAllister
Gladys P. McCormick

MCI Communications
MCI Telecommunications
McIntosh Foundation
Mrs. Frances C. McIntyre
McKenzie Tank Lines
Mr. W. Guy McKenzie, Jr.
James L. McKeown
Joyce Mertz-Gilmore Foundation
Metropolitan Life
Reva Daniels Metzinger
Mr. DeVoe L.Moore
Coyle E. Moore Family
Moore Family Trust
James M. Moran Family
Morrison, Inc.
Mr. William Russell Mote
Mote Scientific Foundation
Naples/Ft. Myers Kennel Club/Louise Hecht
NationsBank
Nautilus Foundation, Inc.
Mr. Carl L. Owenby
Panama City Campus, Friends of
Leonard Pepper
Claude & Mildred Pepper Foundation
Mr. Thomas F. Petway
Mary Margaret Pfeiffer
John H. Phipps
Mina Jo Powell
Herbert C. Rand
Mr. Ted Rodrique
Ruden, Barnett, et al, P.A.
Sarasota Ballet of Florida, Inc.
Mr. Leon J. Schmehl
Joseph M. Schor
Schor Foundation
Selby Foundation
Betty G. Shelfer
Mr. Godfrey Smith
C. David Smith
The Smith Family

Block Smith/AJAX Construction
Howard & Norma Smoyer
Society of Manufacturing Engineers
Southern Scholarship Foundation
Mr. Harry G. Spirides/Resort Inns, Inc.
Sprint/United Telephone of Florida
State of Florida
Dr. Gus A. Stavros
SunBanks
Sybase, Inc.
Synovus Financial Corporation
Haywood Taylor
Thinking Machines, Inc.
Mrs. Marcia Deeb Thornberry
Miss Maxie Lou Thorpe
Ms. Pearl Tyner
Dr. Don A. Veller
Mr. Albert O. Waldon
Bess Ward Estate
Mr. Royal D. Watts
Norman Weisbord Trust
Mrs. Lucyle Werkmeister
Westinghouse Hanford Company
Williams Family Foundation
Dr. Jean D. Wilson
Dr. Ada Belle Winthrop-King
Woods Hole Oceanigraphic Institute
Young, Van Assenderp, et al

Addendum 2

FSU FACULTY SENATE
COMPUTING AND INFORMATION RESOURCES COMMITTEE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON E-MAIL STRATEGIES

March 16, 1997

AY 1996–97 Report

I. MEMBERSHIP

The CIRC subcommittee on e-mail strategies met on February 18 to discuss a campus-wide strategy. The committee consisted of Bob Clark, Chair (College of Education), Brenda Cappuccio (Modern Languages), Larry Conrad (Administrative Information Systems), Tom Cornille (Family and Child Sciences), Darryl Jung (Philosophy), David Kuncicky (Electrical Engineering), and Peter Ray (Meteorology).

II. BACKGROUND

The Computing and Information Resources Committee (CIRC) Electronic Mail Subcommittee, in conjunction with the Campus Computing Standards and Electronic Mail Task Force, has assessed the weaknesses of the present electronic mail (e-mail) environment at FSU. identified a general set of characteristics of an e-mail environment for the university, taken a cursory look at the products available in the marketplace, and arrived at a strategy and set of standards to recommend for the university community.

A. Current E-mail Issues

We have identified five primary issues:

1) Lack of an up-to-date, comprehensive, and integrated directory for e-mail addresses;

2) Difficulty in exchanging other than text documents between academic and administrative e-mail users;

3) Occasional sluggish e-mail delivery;

4) E-mail system reliability problems; and

5) The need for comprehensive student access to e-mail.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Characteristics

We identified the following desirable characteristics for an acceptable e-mail strategy:

- Be easy-to-use;

- Perform well (be responsive);

- Have an attractive user interface (be intuitive);

- Provide a broad set of functions (be robust);

- Support multi-media documents;

- Provide the full ability to interchange e-mail;

- Allow users to maintain their own directory entries (be self-maintained);

- Provide a single directory image for lookup (one-stop shopping for directory entries);

- Provide synchronized local and remote access regardless of location;

- Support privacy (encryption);

- Maintain the integrity of e-mail (be secure);

- Provide fault-tolerant delivery of e-mail (be reliable); and

- Provide authentication of e-mail authorship.

B. Strategy

We believe the most successful strategy for the university will be to implement an environment that will support web-based e-mail. By web-based e-mail, we mean e-mail that uses popular workstation web browser software (e.g., Netscape) that conforms to the HTML (Hypertext Markup Language, the standard for web documents) standard.

C. Standards

An acceptable e-mail strategy needs to comply with the FSU campus computing standards. In addition, the following e-mail standards need to be incorporated:

- POP3 format — This is a dynamic field. Products will change, but both Eudora and Netscape currently provide adequate support;

- MIME document interchange — easy exchange of multi-media documents;

- SMTP support — exchange of e-mail on the Internet;

- Netscape e-mail for students — supported on PC (Windows), Macintosh, and UNIX platforms;

- Eudora-Pro e-mail for faculty/staff — supported on PC (Windows) and Macintosh platforms; and

- X.500 directory — one location for faculty, staff, and student information.

D. Implementation

We also make the following specific recommendations:

- Migrate the administrative e-mail environment to Eudora-Pro and eliminate use of `cc:Mail` — this will make administrative e-mail users compatible with most faculty and student e-mail users;

- Encourage other units who are not presently using Eudora-Pro to convert to it;

- Establish a central server for student e-mail accounts to allow students to access their e-mail from any location on or off campus (for instance in computer labs);

- Deploy a generalized e-mail address in the format ⟨*first name*⟩.⟨*last name*⟩@fsu.edu (e.g., `william.smith@fsu.edu`);

- Provide support for multiple nicknames maintained by the end user (e.g., `bill.smith@fsu.edu`);

- Provide a mechanism for resolving equivalent names;

- Implement an integrated set of directory services which will provide each person the ability to maintain her/his own directory entries;

- Complete the establishment of an e-mail account for every FSU student and encourage the use of e-mail as a key communications vehicle with students (e.g., homework assignments/submittals, delivery of grades, and financial aid notification);

IV. IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The impact of this proposed strategy and set of standards/recommendations includes the following:

Conversion: Eudora-Pro will need to be installed on roughly 1100 administrative PC's. It will also need to installed on some number of other systems and these users trained in the use of Eudora-Pro. There is no incremental cost for the software as FSU already has a site-license for Eudora-Pro.

Training: Additional training classes will be needed on Eudora-Pro. We expect it will take approximately 6 months to complete the transition.

Servers: Academic Computing and Network Services (ACNS) will provide the server at no additional cost for the administrative e-mail customers who will be shifting to Eudora-Pro.

Help Desk support: Help Desk support needed for faculty/staff should be less because of the more consistent e-mail environment on campus. Help Desk support for students will increase due to the ubiquitous deployment of student e-mail; however, ACNS has already staffed up for this workload.

3

⟨*first name*⟩.⟨*last name*⟩@fsu.edu: A mechanism exists to support this, but it would need to be fully deployed and documented.

Central e-mail server for students: ACNS already provides this ability on their Garnet cluster configuration.

E-mail addresses and nicknames: The new Human Resources Management System (HRMS) already provides a facility for recording/changing a person's e-mail address and nickname. At present, these must be maintained by departmental staff, so a mechanism would need to be created to allow faculty/staff to update these directly. Administrative Information Systems (AIS) is developing a database in the Data Warehouse which will contain student data including a student's e-mail address as provided by ACNS. A nickname mechanism for students would need to be created as would a mechanism to allow a student to update her/his e-mail address and nickname directly.

Resolving duplicate names: A mechanism would need to be created to resolve duplicate names in the campus e-mail directory.

Student e-mail: ACNS is well on its way to establishing an e-mail account for all FSU students. Once this is achieved, mechanisms would need to be established that would allow the programmatic creation of e-mail notices for students (e.g., grades and financial aid notices).

FSU FACULTY SENATE
COMPUTING AND INFORMATION RESOURCES COMMITTEE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON STUDENTS AND COMPUTERS

adopted by CIRC, 26 March 1997

AY 1996–97 Report

I. MEMBERSHIP

The Sub-committee consisted of Bruce Stiftel, Chair (Urban and Regional Planning), Carl Baker (ACNS), Pamela Coats (Finance), George Dawson (Science Education), Tonya Harris (Nursing), Ed Hilinski (Chemistry), Gary Kleck (Criminology and Criminal Justice), and Joe Lannuti (Office of Research).

II. BACKGROUND

The Faculty Senate Computing and Information Resources (CIRC) Subcommittee on Students and Computers was charged with examination of issues pertaining to a potential requirement that all FSU students, or some subsets of FSU students, be required to purchase personal computers. The genesis of this charge appears to have been the belief, among some CIRC members, that if FSU's education is to stay current in the coming years, our students must have better access to computing resources. The sub-committee met three times during the winter of 1996–1997, establishing five inter-related facets of the charge:

1) Should students be required to purchase a "home" computer?

2) Establishment of Performance Standards for suggested computer systems.

3) Should some financial aid provisions be made to assist students in home computer purchase?

4) In what ways should the university facilitate student purchase of home computers?

5) Are on-campus, public access computer facilities adequate? and, if not, what changes would be desirable?

During our discussions, we solicited input from staff of ACNS, the FSU Libraries, Campus Computer Store, and the Offices of Admissions and of Financial Aid.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Student Computer Purchase

The Sub-committee rejected the proposal that all FSU students be required to purchase a home computer. We propose instead that all new FSU students (freshman, transfers, new graduate students) be strongly recommended to purchase a home computer.

1

Our reasoning is that while computers have become vital to learning in all fields of academic endeavor, and will become more so, on-campus public-access computer facilities will never provide the access necessary to enable students to make in-depth use at the necessary level. At the same time, a requirement of computer purchase would disadvantage the institution in recruitment, and would have financial consequences that might be severe in specific cases. It is noteworthy that the Sub-committee was aware of no comprehensive university that currently maintains a policy of required computer purchase by all students.

B. Performance Standards

We developed the notion of "Performance Standards" to be used in characterizing the equipment that would be suggested as appropriate to students. Specifically, we recommend that ACNS develop and publicize recommendations concerning the applications that a home computer be capable of running (e.g., Word $x.x$, Corel Word Perfect $y.y$, or equivalent; Netscape 3.0 or equivalent; Eudora Pro 3.0 or equivalent; etc.). These performance standards would be developed in consultation with colleges, schools and departments, and would be supplemented with suggestions about configurations that are capable of meeting them (e.g., Pentium 133 MHZ; 1.5 Gbyte HDD; 16 Mb RAM; 8X CD-ROM; etc.). Such recommendations should be identified as particular to categories of areas of study (i.e., undergraduate arts and letters, graduate engineering, etc.)

Our intent is to make it easier for entering students, especially computer novices, to know how to purchase a system that will be appropriate to their studies.

C. Financial Assistance

The Sub-committee could find no clear desirable method of providing financial assistance to students for the purpose of computer purchase and therefore has no recommendation in this area.

It appears to us that the only significant source of such assistance would be through the requirement of purchase, coincident increase in the "published cost of education" at FSU, and the resulting potential for larger financial aid awards to individual students by the Office of Financial Aid. The best information available to us suggests, however, that such a strategy would have the detrimental effects of reducing the fraction of students who can get financial aid awards at all, making FSU seem more expensive to potential students, and making it more difficult for international students to obtain visas for entry into the country.

D. Facilitating Student Purchases

The Sub-committee recommends that ACNS begin a program of outreach to the vendor community in Tallahassee designed to familiarize vendors with the campus's recommended configurations and the computing needs of FSU students. It is our impression that student purchases can be made easier and more cost effective if local vendors were to create packages designed to match the campus's recommended configurations, and that such action by vendors would be relatively easy to induce.

2

The Sub-committee endorses the Campus Computer Store's new program of expanding its product line into DOS/Windows technology and encourages the Store to expand aggressively in this direction. We also support the Store's interests in making arrangements for payroll deduction options for computer purchase.

E. On-Campus, Public-Access Facilities

The Sub-committee strongly supports efforts by ACNS, the FSU Libraries, and various Colleges and Schools to enhance student access facilities on campus. We recognized that substantial public-access facilities are necessary, both to serve students who do not have home computers and to serve the on-campus needs of students who do have home computers; and that these facilities are costly and troubling to maintain. It appears to us that existing centrally-maintained facilities fall short of meeting the full needs of all of our students, but that this shortfall is ameliorated by Internet-access facilities maintained by the FSU Libraries and by discipline-specific laboratories maintained by colleges, schools and departments. In addition, planned improvements include increases in centrally-maintained facilities, information kiosks, "docking stations" for laptops, and more dial-in ports. The Sub-committee strongly supports implementation of these improvements.

The Sub-committee recommends that the University endeavor to equip a larger fraction of its classrooms with computer display equipment, network computer connections, and multi-media (voice/data/video) capabilities. We imagine that current limitations in such access deters faculty from including computer-based activities in courses.

CRITERIA FOR COURSES SATISFYING THE ORAL COMMUNICATION COMPETENCE REQUIREMENT

Scope

Competence in oral communication is indicated by demonstrating the ability to clearly transmit ideas and information orally in a way that is appropriate to the topic, purpose, and audience. It also involves demonstrating the ability to discuss ideas clearly with others, to hear and respond to questions, and to assess critical response appropriately. Competence in oral communication cannot be accomplished through a single speaking experience, but requires multiple occasions spread out through the course of the term. These experiences may be discrete and independent or cumulative, culminating in a final presentation. The specific type of oral skill (for example formal lecture/presentation or interviewing) may vary from discipline to discipline, though a minimal level of oral competence is required. Courses satisfying the oral communication competence requirement must enable the student to develop the requisite skills through application of theoretical concepts and analytical structures basic to successful oral communication. Thus, instruction in the theory and practice of oral communication must be an intrinsic part of the course, encompassing course objectives as well as activities and readings.

Specific criteria

While the precise method of instruction and examination is the prerogative of the instructor, approved courses must contain the following elements:

1. The course must provide instruction and the student must demonstrate competence in the following:
   a. generation of an original oral message which clearly presents ideas and/or information;
   b. making effective use of both vocal and physical delivery in the presentation;
   c. adapting the presentation to the particular audience; and,
   d. being receptive to questions and/or criticism.

2. Among the course requirements there must be provision for the student to demonstrate the ability to perform according to the above criteria using standard American English. The course syllabus must contain a statement that satisfactory completion of the oral competence examination portion of the course is required to receive a grade of C- or higher in the course.

3. Faculty assigned to teach the course must be certified by their department as having the experience and/or training to evaluate oral communication competence as defined herein.

4. Courses in the oral performance of literature will not satisfy this requirement.

Procedures

To have a course evaluated for oral communication competence credit, submit to the Undergraduate Policy Committee two (2) copies of the following materials: 1) the OCC request form; 2) A statement indicating how the criteria for competence in oral communication are met by the submitted course; and 3) A complete syllabus including assignments and activities. *Note: new courses and courses which have been substantially modified in order to satisfy the OCC requirement should be submitted simultaneously to the UPC and to the University Curriculum Committee.*

REQUEST TO APPROVE A COURSE FOR THE ORAL COMMUNICATION COMPETENCE REQUIREMENT

Date:_____

Course number and title:_____

_____

Department or unit proposing the course:_____

Faculty Contact:_____Telephone number:_____

Address:_____E-mail:_____

How many students can be enrolled in this course over a 12-month period at the current level of resources?_____

How many times per academic year is the course offered (indicate number of sections per semester)? Fall_____; Spring_____; Summer_____

What faculty will teach these courses?_____

_____

The policy passed by the Faculty Senate on December 4, 1996 requires that the department chairperson or unit director certify that faculty teaching these courses have the experience and/or training to evaluate oral communication competence. The department chairperson's signature on this form constitutes that certification.

I hereby certify that the above named faculty have the experience and/or training to evaluate oral communication competence.

_____   _____
Department Chairperson or Unit Director   **Date**

Submit to the Undergraduate Policy Committee two (2) copies of:
1) This request form;

2) A statement indicating how the criteria for competence in oral communication are met;

3) A complete syllabus including assignments and activities.

Note: new courses and courses which have been substantially modified in order to satisfy the OCC requirement should be submitted simultaneously to the UPC and to the University Curriculum Committee.

SUSTAINED PERFORMANCE EVALUATION (SPE)
PROPOSAL

ELIGIBLE FACULTY: Every faculty member who has been in rank for at least seven years since being promoted or since achieving tenure shall be reviewed every seven years.

Untenured faculty members, adjunct instructors, research associates, and other non-tenure earning members of the professional staff are not eligible for evaluation in this process.

PROCEDURES:

I.   Each department (or school, where there are no departments) shall elect an evaluation committee (which may be an existing committee) that will, in concert with the Department Chair or Dean (where there are no departments), review the annual evaluations of any tenured faculty member of the department who has been in rank as an associate or full professor for seven or more years after the last promotion or after receiving tenure. The annual evaluations shall include all material included in the evaluation file for the faculty member.

II.   The departmental committee will recommend to the Dean one of the following for each person considered under the SPE. The person evaluated shall be given the opportunity to append a concise response to the evaluation before it is sent to the next level.

    1.   Any person whose annual evaluations have been satisfactory and without notices of "official concern" for that period shall be judged satisfactory in the SPE.

    2.   A person whose record includes a pattern of "official concern" in any area of assignment during those years and who has not shown improvement may be required by the committee to develop a professional improvement plan in consultation with the supervisor. Annual reviews by the departmental evaluation committee may be required as part of the professional improvement plan.

3.   A person whose record includes a pattern of "unsatisfactory" ratings in any area of assignment during these years and who has not met previous requirements for improvement shall develop a professional improvement plan in concert with his/her supervisor. The professional improvement plan shall include specific performance targets and a time period for achieving the targets. Annual reviews by the departmental evaluation committee shall be required. In the event that the faculty member and his/her supervisor cannot agree upon the elements to be included in the performance improvement plan, the faculty member may appeal to the Dean or the Vice President for Academic Affairs in the case of schools without departments.

III.   The President of the University (or a designated representative) shall consider each recommended professional improvement plan. The President or representative shall give final approval for each professional improvement plan. Specific resources identified in an approved professional improvement plan shall be provided by the University.

IV.   After the professional improvement plan has been improved, the faculty member's supervisor shall meet periodically with him or her to review progress toward meeting the performance targets. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to attain the performance targets specified in the professional development plan. Progress shall be reviewed by the evaluation committee and reported to the dean on an annual basis until such time as the faculty member has achieved the performance targets. If the faculty member does not meet the performance targets in the specified time period, the supervisor shall initiate appropriate action.

V.   These procedures shall take effect in the Spring Semester, 1997-1998. At that time, all eligible faculty shall be reviewed.