



The Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-1030

Faculty Senate R9B
904-644-6876

**AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Moore Auditorium
January 13, 1993
3:45 p.m.**

- I. Approval of the minutes of the December 2, 1992 meeting
 - II. Approval of the agenda for the January 13, 1993 meeting
 - III. Report of the Steering Committee, M. Young
 - IV. Special Order
 - a. Update on SACS, A. Mabe
 - V. Reports of Standing Committees
 - a. Curriculum Committee, T. Tilley
 - VI. New Business
 - VII. University Welfare
 - VIII. Announcements of Deans and other administrative officers
 - a. Undergraduate Update,
Elisabeth Muhlenfeld, Dean of Undergraduate Studies
 - b. Current Legislative Session,
Beverly Spencer, Vice President for University Relations
 - 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 Room (202 University Union) immediately following the Senate meeting. The University Club will collect \$2.00 to help defray their expenses. Everyone is invited to attend.

**THE NEXT SENATE MEETING WILL BE FEBRUARY 10,
1993 IN MOORE AUDITORIUM**



The Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-1030

Faculty Senate R9B
904-644-6876

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

Moore Auditorium

January 13, 1993

3:45 p.m.

I. Regular Session

The regular session of the 1992-1993 Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, January 13, 1993, at 3:45 p.m. Senate President Fred Leysieffer presided.

The following members were absent. Alternates who were present are listed in parentheses. M. Armer, M. Bonn, R. Chapple (W. Adolph), J. Clendinning, C. Cohan, A. Dzurik, I. Eberstein, T. Edwards (L. Grubbs), P. Elliott, G. Foster, J. Franceschina (G. Giles), L. Gould, E. Kaelin, J. Kerr (U. Ozanne), M. Licht, W. Lo, E. Love, B. Menchetti, D. Nast (A. Hollander), D. Powell, J. Sampson, P. Stowell, D. Sumners, J. Tanenbaum, P. Tate, G. Thompson, J. Torgesen, J. Tull, V. Williams, L. Wollan, M. Young.

II. Approval of the Minutes

The December 2 minutes were approved as distributed.

III. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved with the addition of a report from the Graduate Policy Committee.

IV. Report of the Steering Committee, M. Young

Professor Alan Mabe presented the Steering Committee report for Professor Young.

Since the last Senate meeting, the Steering Committee has met with President Lick and with Provost Glidden. The Steering Committee has also considered the following items.

***The Chancellor's comments regarding research and teaching.** The Steering Committee discussed the comments attributed to Chancellor Reed regarding the proper balance between teaching and research. We also discussed this matter with President Lick, expressing to the President our concern over the effect Reed's comments might have on faculty morale. Research is a vital element in the mission of a comprehensive university such as FSU and both research and teaching are integral to the statewide mission of this institution. A statement from President Lick will be presented later in today's meeting.

***Administrative raises.** The Steering Committee also expressed to the President concern over raises recently awarded to members of the administration. This is a particularly sensitive issue in light of the length of time since faculty and staff have received salary increments.

***Parental leave policy.** The Steering Committee is in the process of clarifying current policy on parental leave; we are also attempting to develop an outline of options available under this policy. This is a complex issue that must be dealt with in the confines of the FSU Constitution and the UFF-BOR Collective Bargaining Agreement while providing real benefit to qualifying faculty.

***The Seminole Logo.** The Steering Committee also discussed with President Lick the controversy over the use of the Seminole logo and mascot. The President assured us that the administration is taking this issue seriously and hopes to make refinements in our use of the symbols in ways that will enhance respect for Native American culture. The Steering Committee urged the President to stay in close contact with the Seminole Tribe of Florida, not only over this issue, but with respect to all matters affecting the tribe.

***Multicultural requirement.** At a meeting with the Steering Committee, Dean Muhlenfeld expressed concern over the shortage of courses that can be used to meet the multicultural requirement; this shortage is particularly acute in group y-Diversity in the American Experience. We would like to urge departments to submit courses for inclusion in the multicultural component. If the current shortage continues, we may ask the Undergraduate Policy Committee to consider allowing designated non-liberal studies courses to satisfy the multicultural requirement.

*** Enrollment trends.** Dean Muhlenfeld also discussed enrollment trends with the Steering Committee. She will present that information later in today's meeting.

***Faculty morale.** The Steering Committee expressed to the President its concern over the general level of faculty and staff morale in the face of projections about continued financial exigencies.

***Graduate Admissions appeals.** The Steering Committee discussed the GPC's recommendations for appeals of graduate admissions decisions. That recommendation will be presented to the Senate as part of the GPC report later in today's meeting.

Finally, the Steering Committee meets every Wednesday from 11:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. in the lounge of the Kuersteiner Music Building.

Senate President Leysieffer added the following announcement. In the next few weeks the Steering Committee will begin work on its annual task of appointing faculty members to 10 of its 12 standing committees. This process has worked well in the past in the sense that

we have many dedicated committee persons who take their responsibilities regarding their committee work seriously.

The appointment process, however, works in a way that, at least to a certain extent, favors membership on our committees to faculty known to members of the Steering Committee. There are obviously many talented faculty members whom we do not know or know of, who would be willing to participate in the committee process. If you are interested in serving on a particular committee, or know of faculty colleagues whom you think would be good committee members, please let me know or bring their names to the attention of a member of the Steering Committee. We cannot guarantee that your nominees will be selected for committee appointments but they will be considered. We would like to bring more people into the process and thereby give more faculty members a personal stake in the fine governance process we have here.

For your information members of the Steering Committee this year are Professors Alan Mabe, Cliff Madsen, Tim Matherly, Barbara Newell, Fred Standley, Perrin Wright and Marilyn Young.

**V. Special Order
Update on SACS, A. Mabe**

The SACS Steering Committee has been working on the format for the final report. The proposed format for Chapters 4, 5, and 6 has been circulated to the chairs of the subcommittees and revisions have been made in accord with their advice. The format for the section on institutional effectiveness will be addressed soon.

Almost all units have turned in their self-studies, and subcommittees 4, 5, and 6 are well along in preparing drafts of their chapters. Drafts of chapters 1 and 2 have been prepared. Chapter 3 will be prepared after 4, 5, and 6 are completed.

The SACS Steering Committee has commissioned several special studies. Among them are a. assessment of the needs for graduate education as we enter the 21st century (GPC), b. review of the current status of undergraduate education with special attention to the liberal studies program (UPC), c. level of research funded needed to be a top public university (Research Division), d. examination of the statewide mission of FSU (Faculty Senate Steering Committee).

Some preliminary results of the focus on the 21st century are now available. The ten universities most frequently cited for comparison are (in order) University of Michigan, University of Illinois, University of Texas, University of Wisconsin, Indiana University, University of North Carolina, University of California (Berkeley), Ohio State University, University of Minnesota. Eighteen programs reported being recently ranked within the top 5 or 10 nationally prominent programs in their discipline. Requests for additional faculty came from fifty-eight percent of departments, with a total of 231 additional positions requested overall.

VI. Reports of Standing Committees
a. Curriculum Committee, T. Tilley

The Curriculum Committee is a hard-working, well-prepared group which works together amicably and efficiently, so chairing the committee this year has been a delight. the committee is always willing to work with colleague to find ways to make things run more smoothly and to overcome problems. Today, I want to bring three topics to your attention.

First, normal operations: we review course proposals at every meeting and bounce back those where we have questions or find some confusion or problems. Another normal operation is the course purge. It is a bit late this year, but is now underway. Courses not taught since fall of 1988 are candidates for purge. A memo from the indefatigable Janis Sass will be forthcoming shortly to affected departments.

Second, committee tendencies: in my three years on the committee I have noticed three tendencies that you might find of interest. (A) The committee does a lot of correction of sloppy course proposals, e.g., sample syllabi missing evaluation procedures or totally absent. We also notice wonderful gaffs in proposals and supporting documents. One said "This is not a quality course." Another recent proposal presented a course dealing with "ephemera." Happily, these were clarified. (B) The committee tends occasionally to ask departments to run course proposals by other departments to check for duplication or overlap. Duplication is rarely a problem. Faculty also generally recognize that just because a course includes arithmetic or statistics or computers or behavior models ethical theories doesn't mean they should be listed as math courses or the statistics courses or computer science courses or psychology courses or philosophy courses. If every course that used SPSS, for example, had to be taught as a statistics course, our faculty and curricula would be rather different. (C) The committee tends to disapprove course which look like personal professional development workshops or which are designed to teach the use of specific computer programs, e.g. WordPerfect. I would generalize this by saying that the curriculum committee tends to find that, however valuable some skills are, they do not seem to be part of a *curriculum* of studies; they may be pre curricular (like typing) or extracurricular (like job hunting).

Third, a project: We are beginning to review the use of "Special Topics" courses. Most of these are taught on a one-time or irregular basis or are used as a rubric under which faculty can develop new courses. These are not reviewed by the committee, although faculty are required to submit a syllabus "for the record" through Mrs. Sass to the registrar. If a course becomes a regular offering, rather than a special topic, it should go through the regular course approval process. We are trying to see if a formal policy needs to be developed to ensure that regular courses are not taught as constantly repeated

special topics and that they do go through the normal review and approval process.

If I or we can be of any help to you, please let us know. Thank you.

b. Graduate Policy Committee, J. Standley

Professor Standley presented a report (addendum I) to the Senate. The report was accepted. The Senate discussed item #2 of the report (addendum II). Professor Standley's motion that addendum II be approved was seconded and approved by the Senate.

VII. University Welfare

Professor Jack Waggaman reported that due to an upgrading of computer equipment at NWRDC the LUIS system will be completely shut down in the libraries January 16 and 17.

Professor Ralph Dougherty reminded faculty the needs of higher education will again be addressed by the Legislature.

**VIII. Announcements of Deans and other administrative officers
a. Dean of Undergraduate Studies, E. Muhlenfeld**

Dean Muhlenfeld re-emphasized the importance of submitting syllabi for Special Topics courses. The office of the Registrar frequently receives requests for information about course content for topics courses taught in the past.

In speaking about the multicultural course requirement for liberal studies Dean Muhlenfeld expressed satisfaction with what this component has done for us as an institution in putting multicultural issues before us. This has had a positive effect. She expressed her disappointment with the progress toward providing courses to satisfy this requirement. There are still too few courses designated as multicultural courses available for students. One partial solution to this problem may be found by allowing courses not approved for liberal studies credit, but which have sufficient multicultural content to count for satisfaction of the multicultural requirement.

Dean Muhlenfeld briefed the Senate about the enrollment shortfall at the lower division level. The University is not meeting its planned enrollment projections for 1000 and 2000 level courses and might be faced with having to return up to \$800,000 to the SUS. There is a possible additional shortfall of \$1,800,000 in loss of incidental revenue, funds not collected in tuition, especially out of state tuition.

The reasons for this shortfall are complex. In 1987-88 FSU set about to decrease the size of the its freshmen class. This was done by increasing standards for admission. This resulted in enrolling more students with prior dual enrollment records and who came with advanced placement credits. This in turn resulted in less students taking 1000 and 2000 level courses. A further action of the University limited the enrollment of students without an AA degree. Previously

Statement to Florida State University Faculty Senate

January 13, 1993

Last month Chancellor Charles Reed spoke to the New England Association of Colleges and Schools. In the speech and in subsequent interviews with the media, the Chancellor made some remarks on the relative importance of teaching and research which caused many to become very concerned about his commitment to research in the State University System.

I felt that the Chancellor was misunderstood and urged him to clarify his position. He agreed and issued a statement which was released publicly in the December 14 issue of *State*, and is attached to my statement for distribution this afternoon. The earlier comments and the clarification statement have generated a healthy dialogue across the State of Florida, and I believe it is in order for me to express in a formal statement my personal commitment to research.

I believe that research is a necessary element in higher education at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. A true university must value, conduct, foster, and defend research because what we think we know must always be defined, expanded and interpreted by what we are discovering. At a university, research is inseparable from teaching. Indeed, it is often the best and most valued way we teach. We teach students to do research by doing research with them. Some of these students become, in their turn, teacher/researchers; and the qualities we helped instill and develop enable them to become good teachers and good researchers because they are the same qualities of industry, diligence, precision and integrity.

I believe that research is a necessary element of human advancement. We could not begin to sustain our present world population without the discoveries made during this century. The quality of life enjoyed by many of us is the direct result of advances made in the last few decades – most of which began as university research projects or by-products of those projects.

Further, I believe that research must be encouraged and supported even when it has no apparent utility beyond answering the questions of the researcher. Our real task at a university is learning. If teaching is nothing more than doing something to students and the students are passive, then we have failed. We succeed only when the students learn – become active – do something for themselves. This is true for higher learning at the undergraduate as well as the graduate level. Research is an essential element of the environment in which such learning can take place and the ideal condition is one in which the professor and the student share the excitement of discovery.

Finally, I believe that research is at the essence of academic freedom. Inquiry and the reporting of one's findings are what our freedom in the academy is all about. To deny these rights is to court oppression; to fail to defend and support them is to be on the wrong side in the ancient struggle against ignorance and prejudice.

Dale W. Lick, 1/11/93

Reed: There's room for both teaching, research tenure tracks

A STATEMENT FROM DR. CHARLES B. REED TO THE STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM:

Recently I gave a speech in Boston to the New England Association of Colleges and Schools, a regional educational accrediting group, in which I discussed the reward structure of universities, and how such structures could be used to effect institutional change.

I made three suggestions:

- First, I discussed the possibility of an alternative tenure track. This could be implemented at Florida's new 10th university, now in the planning stages. Those seeking tenure along this pathway would plan to emphasize teaching, just as those pursuing tenure by way of the more traditional route would continue to emphasize research. Both tracks, however, would continue to include all three of the traditional criteria for tenure: teaching, research and public service.

- Second, I urged that presidents pay closer attention to the patterns in which rewards such as tenure are awarded or withheld. I suggested that a symbolic alarm bell should go off in the president's office if a college or department consistently withholds tenure from women or members of minority groups. I expressed concern both for basic justice and for the avoidance of costly lawsuits.

- Third, I suggested the addition of a new academic rank — senior professor — above that of full professor. Such a new rank could provide a reward or goal to which full professors with tenure might aspire. This would be a formal academic rank, emblematic of particular accomplishments, separate and distinct from distinguished professorships or holders of endowed chairs. Holders of professorships or chairs would be

eligible for senior professor status, as would all full professors.

Some who have heard or read accounts of this speech agree with it. Others do not. Its critics, while perhaps engaging in a degree of overreaction, are motivated by their totally legitimate enthusiasm for protecting the function of university research. Strong reaction, particularly from faculty at a research university, is understandable. For the past three years, they have been asked to teach more and more, with no pay increase, due to budget cuts.

Make no mistake: I support research of all kinds, in every discipline. It is my experience that the best instructors tend to be active in research. The enthusiasm that drives them to conduct research — and which such work inspires — is a major element of their success in the classroom. Further, the research they publish is of direct benefit, importance and relevance to the people of Florida and the United States.

Indeed, research is fundamental to the role of the institutions comprising the State University System of Florida. One (admittedly inadequate) measure of my support for research is the growth in funding for research contracts and grants since 1985, when I became chancellor. In 1985-86, the SUS received \$225.9 million in such research funds; last year, it took in \$626.3 million. Individual faculty members and departments deserve the credit for this major increase; but I suggest that such an increase also serves as a symbol of a highly conducive climate for the pursuit of research goals.

I hope this places my modest proposal for an additional, alternative tenure pathway in some perspective. I intend to pursue such an idea at the new university. As I said in my Boston speech, our choice is not whether to change, but rather whether we wish to become agents of change, or objects of change subject to the whims of external forces. If the ensuing discussion results in a deeper public understanding of the central role research plays throughout the life of universities, both the public and the universities will benefit.