



The Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-1030

Faculty Senate
904-644-6876

AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Moore Auditorium
December 7, 1988
3:45 p.m.

- I. Approval of the minutes of the November 16, 1988 Senate meeting
- II. Approval of the agenda for the December 7, 1988 Senate meeting
- III. Report of the Steering Committee, M. Young
- IV. Reports of Standing Committees
 - a. Graduate Policy Committee, J. Standley
 - b. Undergraduate Policy Committee, P. Wright
- V. Unfinished Business
 - a. The relation of academic penalties under the Honor Code to the Forgiveness Policy, P. Wright
- VI. New Business
 - a. Proposal for amendment to Bylaws to change parliamentary authority from Robert's to Sturgis, G. Phifer
- VII. University Welfare
- VIII. Announcements of Deans and other administrative officers
 - a. Report on retention, admissions, etc., E. Muhlenfeld
- IX. Announcements of the President of the University

ANNOUNCEMENT: The College of Law and the University Club will host the University Club Wednesday Social in the Garnet and Gold University Room, 202A Union, immediately following the Senate meeting. The University Club will collect \$1.50 to help defray their expenses. Everyone is invited!

THE NEXT SENATE MEETING WILL BE HELD ON JANUARY 18 IN MOORE AUDITORIUM



The Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-1030

Faculty Senate
904-644-6876

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Moore Auditorium
December 7, 1988
3:45 p.m.

I. Regular Session

The regular session of the 1988-1989 Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, December 7, 1988 at 3:45 in Moore Auditorium. Senate President Leo Sandon presided.

The following members were absent. Their alternates who were present are listed in parenthesis. J. Altholz (D. Montgomery), M. Armer, C. Avery, M.L. Baker, A. Brown, J. Bryant, G. Buzyna, E. Cancalon, G. Choppin, R. Conn, G. DeVore, L. Epstein, J. Fenstermaker (D. Kirby), C. Hahn, G. Heald, R. Heck, J. Keller, C. Keuchel, J. Kodras, W. Landing (B. Cushman-Roisin), G. Leahy, B. Licht, J. Lovano-Kerr, R. Marshall, J. Mitchell, J. Morse, P. Nelson, J. Patterson, P. Ray, A. Rowe, K. Scott (L. Hafner), J. Simmons, F. Standley, P. Strait, J. Telotte, J. Turner (G. Barton), W. Veal, J. Wyatt.

II. Approval of the minutes of the November 16, 1988 meeting

The minutes were approved as distributed.

III. Approval of the agenda for the December 7, 1988 meeting.

The agenda was approved as distributed. President Sliger will not be at today's meeting.

IV. Report of the Steering Committee, M. Young

"Despite the brief time that has passed since the last Senate meeting, the Steering Committee has considered the following items:

1. Clarification of the status of the course level designators project. This continuing thorn in our sides has consumed an inordinate amount of faculty time, particularly mine and that of Senate President Leo Sandon. Professor Sandon has been the emissary between the Curriculum Committee, the Steering Committee, and the BOR on this issue and has spent a great deal of time in addition to his normal duties speaking with Chancellor Reed and representatives of the Board of Regents. At the recent Faculty Action Forum meeting in Orlando, Prof. Sandon presented BOR representatives with a proposal for resolving the dispute; this proposal,

- developed by Marilyn Young, chairman of the FSU Curriculum Committee, essentially called for acceptance by all parties of the status quo including those changes in level which have already been approved by the faculties of the individual universities. No immediate objection was made to the provisions of this proposal, but we have not received a definitive answer from Board staff.
2. FSU Constitution. Efforts to update the version of the Constitution published in the Florida Administrative Code are moving forward and we anticipate no difficulties at this time.
 3. The Student Life Committee. The report of this committee is nearing completion; we discussed the content of the statement of FSU history and the date on the official seal of the University as contained in the Student Handbook.
 4. Legislative Weekend. Professor Sandon and others reported on their activities and discussions during Legislative Weekend, held the weekend of the FSU-UF football game. The general feeling was that these discussions, particularly those with newer members of the legislature, were fruitful and ended on a positive note.
 5. Alumni Association. The committee discussed the desire of the Alumni Association for increased cooperation between that association and the faculty and administration of the University. Ken van Assenderp spoke to this concern in his address to the Faculty Senate at our last meeting.
 6. Undergraduate Policy Committee. The committee discussed disposition of UPC'S vote on the use of the forgiveness policy to remove an academic "F". The Steering Committee decided to have UPC bring this issue to the full Senate.
 7. Appointments of University Presidents. We discussed the impact of the new law regarding presidential search committees on the selection processes at UNF and UCF. Regents's chairperson Joan Ruffier was able to involve faculty in the selection of the members of the search committee for the vacancy at the University of Central Florida.
 8. Dual Enrollment Courses taken by high school students. We met with Dean Muhlenfeld to discuss the impact of proposed legislation on the university's authority over acceptance of dual-enrollment courses taken at a community college. Currently, the University accepts these courses for transfer credit only if equivalent courses are taught here; language in the pending legislation appears to require the University to accept all courses offered for dual-enrollment credit.

9. Drug-free Workplace. The Steering Committee reviewed the governor's initial draft policy for a drug-free workplace and made recommendations to Marilyn Young, who is representing UFF on the governor's task force.

10. The members of the Steering Committee attended a social held by the Student Senate to promote cooperation between the SGA and university governance.

11. Items of Faculty Welfare. At the last meeting, Martin Roeder asked that we look into the whereabouts of the portraits of Robert Lawton and George Bogusch, which had been hanging in the Fine Arts Building. We have found the portraits in storage; they were removed by the School of Theatre in order to display work by theatre students.

12. The Steering Committee will be holding a half-day workshop on December 13 to discuss issues for the Spring Semester.

V. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Graduate Policy Committee, J. Standley

Ms. Standley's motion to approve attachment I was seconded. The floor was open for discussion.

Mr. Roeder's motion to strike "and one copy to the department" in line 3 was seconded and approved. Mr. Kromhout's motion to restore "All" in line 7 (deleting the newly proposed Only) was seconded and discussed with no action being taken.

Mr. Roeder's motion to replace may with "shall" in line 15 was seconded and approved.

There was considerable discussion involving editorial changes and Mr. McWilliams moved to refer the issue back to committee. This motion was seconded and approved.

b. Undergraduate Policy Committee, P. Wright

Mr. Wright's motion to delete REL 3142 from Area IV of Liberal Studies was seconded and approved.

Mr. Wright informed the Senate that English had reorganized their Shakespeare courses and requested that ENL 3332 be replaced with ENL 3330 for Liberal Studies credit. Motion was seconded and approved.

Mr. Wright presented four courses from Modern Languages for Liberal Studies credit in Area VI. The courses had been reviewed and accepted by the Area VI Liberal Studies committee and the UPC. After discussion a motion to allow these courses for Liberal Studies credit in Area VI failed by a vote of 28 to 25. (FIL 3520, Italian Cinema; FIL 3521, French Cinema; FIL 3522, German Cinema; FIL 3523, Hispanic Film)

VI. Unfinished Business

- a. The relation of academic penalties under the Honor Code to the Forgiveness Policy, P. Wright

"Several years ago Faculty Senate and Student Senate jointly ratified a new Honor Code. The code was the product of four years of development and considerable labor on the part of the ad hoc committee appointed to draft it. One of the sticking points in Faculty Senate was whether a faculty member could administer an academic penalty to a student who cheated. The Faculty Senate was firm on this point and the provision was made part of the code. The faculty member can issue such a grade. If the student agrees to the penalty, the faculty member and the student are required to put the agreement in writing and forward a copy to the Judicial Officer. If the student does not agree, the student has the right of appeal to the Honor Court; if the appeal is sustained by the Honor Court, the grade penalty will be overturned. It seemed clear to all at the time of ratification that the appeal to the Honor Court was the only route by which an academic penalty could be overturned.

It has recently come to the attention of Faculty Senate that there is no prohibition in the Honor Code against the student's retaking the course under the forgiveness policy and having the grade removed from GPA. The matter was referred to the Undergraduate Policy Committee with a request to consider amending the forgiveness policy to prevent this occurrence. The committee split with a 4-4 vote, and no recommendation was made. One member suggested that we should let sleeping dogs lie; another person suggested that the dog was not sleeping. The question is still circulating, and I have volunteered to raise it again here as a matter of unfinished business, and I emphasize that I am not acting on behalf of the UPC.

My perspective on the matter has, I believe, improved with time. I think that what we need is a clarification of the original intent of both Senates when the code was ratified. If the intent was that such grades should be forgivable then it would be inappropriate and even improper for the Faculty Senate to attempt to change the Honor Code unilaterally by tampering with the forgiveness policy.

My own sentiment is that such grades were never intended to be forgivable. You may have other ideas. Without any recommendation except that you take some positive action toward resolution, I leave the matter to your best judgment".

Mr. Madsen moved that forgiveness not be allowed when applied to Honor Code violations. This motion was seconded and the floor was open for discussion. Mr. Mabe stated that this issue

was not discussed in the ad hoc Honor Code committee. The Honor Code committee could not set up new forgiveness policies.

Mr. Roeder moved a substitute motion (seconded) to abolish the forgiveness policy. There was discussion on this issue, including consulting with the Student Senate.

After a lengthy discussion, Mr. Roeder moved (seconded) to refer the issue of forgiveness for academic penalties and the entire forgiveness policy issue to the Steering Committee, with a recommendation that they establish an ad hoc committee to address these concerns. The motion passed with a vote of 38-25 and is referred to the Steering Committee.

VII. New Business

- a. Proposal for amendment to Bylaws to change parliamentary authority from Robert's to Sturgis, G. Phifer

Mr. Phifer presented attachment 2 as a first reading. A vote on this issue will be taken at the January 18 Senate meeting.

VIII. University Welfare

There were no items of University welfare today.

- IX. Announcements of Deans and other administrative officers
a. Report on retention, admissions, etc., E. Muhlenfeld

Dean Muhlenfeld presented attachment 3 to the Senate.

- X. Announcements of the President of the University

On behalf of President Sliger, Provost Turnbull wished everyone a happy holiday break. He also commented on the clearing of our athletic department from the recent NCAA investigation. Because of the leadership and aggressiveness of our faculty our coaches are watching students records and providing a positive recruiting tool.

- XI. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.



Janis D. Sass
Secretary to the Faculty

December 7,

TO BE PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY SENATE ON ~~NOVEMBER 16,~~ 1988

GPC Suggested Revisions to 1988-89 Bulletin, p. 81
October 31, 1988

Wording Deleted = ~~Strikethrough~~
Wording Added = *Italics*

EXAMINATION IN DEFENSE OF DISSERTATION

The defense of dissertation will be oral. Responsibility for suggesting the time, designating the place, and presiding at the examination rests with the major professor. The examination must be completed at least two weeks prior to the date on which the degree is to be conferred.

Academic courtesy requires that a preliminary draft of the dissertation be submitted to each member of the supervisory committee ~~and one copy to the department~~ at least four weeks before the date of the oral examination. The supervisory committee, the chairperson of the major department, and such other members of the faculty as may be appointed by the academic dean, will conduct the examination. ~~All~~ *Only* members of the graduate faculty are invited to attend the oral exam and participate in the questioning. *Only members of the committee may vote in determining the outcome of the exam.* At least two weeks prior to the date of the examination, the major professor will present an announcement of the dissertation title and the date and place of the examination to the Office of Graduate Studies. *The major professor may schedule a formal presentation of the dissertation to which students and public are invited, but this shall be a function separate from the oral examination.*

(The remainder of the section is unchanged.)

Note: It is the intent of the GPC that these provisions allow for open and public presentation of the dissertation work with questions from the audience for clarification if desired. It is further intended that evaluation of the candidate ~~not~~ be open to the public. The wording above is not intended to preclude these two events happening contiguously, but allows the major professor to ask the public to leave prior to the official beginning of the oral defense.

Refer back to committee - approved



The Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-4021

College of Communication

Florida State University Faculty Senate
Recommendation from the Senate Parliamentarian, Gregg Phifer

Fall 1988

Amendment proposed to the Senate Bylaws, Section D. Procedure.

Present Reading: Section 1. All meetings of the Senate shall be conducted in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order, newly revised, except as otherwise provided in the Constitution or in these Bylaws.

Proposed change in the parliamentary authority:

Section 1. All meetings of the Senate shall be conducted in accordance with the third (1988) edition of Sturgis Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure, except as otherwise provided in the Constitution or in these Bylaws.

Rationale:

Robert's Rules of Order provides the best available nineteenth-century parliamentary manual. Even the Newly Revised edition of 1970 (or the reprinting of 1981) is completely and intentionally compatible with the original Robert privately printed in 1876. Despite its flaws--and they are many--RONR is an excellent reference work for the professional parliamentarian. For everybody else its rules are too complex and its language too antiquated for easy use.

We now have an excellent alternative, a third (1988) edition of Sturgis Standard Code first published by McGraw-Hill in 1950 (second edition in 1966). The third edition represents a complete revision and modernization of the Standard Code by a committee of the American Institute of Parliamentarians. This revision embodies many (not all) of the changes I have been writing about in Parliamentary Journal for the past two decades. In my judgment, it is a substantial improvement over anything else now available.

Unlike Robert, which attempts to answer far more questions than most of us will ever ask, Sturgis is designed for organizations like ours. The language is that of the 20th century, not the 19th. And the Code offers procedures appropriate for organizations like our Senate and not the U.S. House of Representatives--the model chosen by Robert. New and far simpler treatments of the motions to reconsider and to table are themselves worth the price of the book. Except for the handful of true believers who still worship the Sacred General Robert, I can see no good reason for failing to adopt Sturgis as our parliamentary authority.

Try it; you'll like it!

Gregg Phifer
Professor of Communication
Instructor SPC 3410, Parliamentary Law

PROBATION, DISMISSAL AND REINSTATEMENT

Combined Summer 87-Spring 88

<u>Division</u>	<u>Probation</u>	<u>Dismissal</u>	<u>Reinstatement</u>	<u>% Dismissals Reinstated</u>
Arts and Sciences	377	293	133	45.4%
Business	423	206	32	15.5%
Communications	43	21	9	42.9%
Criminology	106	56	21	37.5%
Education	98	53	15	28.3%
Engineering	108	101	57	56.4%
Home Economics	45	25	10	40.0%
Library Science	16	4	1	25.0%
Music	27	23	6	26.1%
Nursing	10	2	0	--
Social Science	323	416	196	47.1%
Social Work	31	15	7	46.7%
Theatre	8	8	2	25.0%
Visual Arts	38	24	5	20.8%
Undergraduate Studies	534 (24.4% of Total)	578 (31.7%)	140 (22%)	24.2%
TOTAL	2187	1825	634	34.7%
Total Warning (Lower Division Students)				1795