



FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
NOVEMBER 18, 2015
DODD HALL AUDITORIUM
3:35 P.M.

I. Regular Session

The regular session of the 2015-16 Faculty Senate was held on Wednesday, November 18, 2015. Faculty Senate President Susan Fiorito presided.

The following members attended the Senate meeting:

J. Adams, T. Adams, S. Aggarwal, M. Akiba, A. Askew, H. Bass, K. Bearor, B. Berg, B. Birmingham, M. Blaber, J. Broome, M. Buchler, E. Chicken, A. Clarke, R. Coleman, B. Cox, M. Cui, A. Darabi, J. Dawkins, V. DeBrunner, P. Doan, J. Fadool, B. Fennema, J. Fiorito, S. Fiorito, H. Flynn, J. Geringer, K. Goldsby, T. Graban, M. Gross, K. Harper, E. Hilinski, K. Hires, K. Howard, L. Jakubowski, T. Keller, A. Kercheval, E. Kim, W. Landing, S. Losh, C. Madsen, C. Marzen, K. McGinnis, J. McNulty, M. Mesterton-Gibbons, D. Moore, O. Okoli, P. Osteen, I. Padavic, E. Peters, V. Richard Auzenne, N. Rogers, D. Rohlinger, K. Salata, J. Schwenkler, D. Slice, O. Steinbock, L. Stepina, U. Sypher, J. Telotte, G. Tyson, S. Valisa, Col. M. Vanwert, D. Von Glahn, E. Walker, C. Weissert, W. Weissert, K. Yang.

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

A. Abichou, E. Aldrovandi, E. Alvarez, C. Bolaños, K. Brummel-Smith, J. Clark (S. Slaveva-Griffin), J. Cogle, K. Erndl, A. Figueroa, J. Gabriel, R. Gainsford (W. Fredrickson), J. Hellweg, C. Hofacker, M. Horner, D. Humphrey, S. Johnson, J. Kesten, J. Larson, S. Lewis, T. Mariano, U. Meyer-Base, R. Morris, R. Rodenberg, P. Rutkovsky, V. Salters, J. Standley, M. Stewart, N. Stoltzfus, S. Stults, O. Vafek, D. Wilke, W. Wise, C. Wood, T. Zuehlke.

II. Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of the October 21, 2015 meeting were approved as distributed.

III. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as distributed.

IV. Report of the Steering Committee, Todd Adams

The Faculty Senate Steering Committee has met twice since our last Senate meeting. We meet with the VP for Finance and the Dean for Graduate Studies. We also participated in the Provost interviews. The Steering Committee had separate meetings with each of the candidates and submitted a report reviewing the strengths and weaknesses of the candidates.

That will be part of the process going forward. The search committee meet this afternoon and is going to meet with the President on Monday. We're not certain what the decision timeframe is beyond that, but that process is moving forward and coming to a conclusion. I want to remind everybody about the holiday party at the President's house on December 3rd from 5:30-7:30. That's with the Association of Retired Faculty and the Faculty Senate together. And a reminder that the December meeting of the Faculty Senate will be in the College of Medicine auditorium. It starts at 3:30 instead of 3:35. Three-thirty, College of Medicine auditorium. The first part of it will be President Thrasher's fall address to the University, and then we'll move into our regular Senate business.

V. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Graduate Policy Committee, Lee Stepina i. Residency Policy (see addendum 1)

First, the Residency Policy. Basically this is a policy that affects only doctoral students, and the purpose of the policy is to emphasize the importance of scholarly engagement in the community. Being on campus for twenty-four credit hours in twelve months is artificial and not necessarily an appropriate measure of engagement. The new policy challenges folks to articulate their vision of scholarly engagement and evaluate their students accordingly. Some of the universities that don't have residency requirements include North Carolina State, University of Washington, University of Maryland, University of North Florida, Arizona State, UCF, and USF. There was an issue that was raised last time we talked about this. This has been approved by the Steering Committee of the Faculty Senate. There is a concern that this policy might reduce enrollment in doctoral programs. The way things are now for FSU employees and State employees and other members of the local workforce may not see a doctorate as a viable option because they are constrained by the fulltime requirement. For some of the programs, Public Administration is one that comes to mind, most of their doctoral students are part-time. People in Social Work and Public Administration are currently designed to accommodate part-time students, but they are forced to enroll in twenty-four dissertation hours in twelve months. With the new policy, the issue is raised about online doctoral programs. Currently we do not have any online doctoral programs. I understand that there is a proposal for an online EdD that is in the pipeline. And the idea is to hit the market of workers who are employed but still wish to get a doctoral degree. So in recommendation one is to delete the residence statement in the graduate bulletin and replace that with recommendation 2 – the new statement on scholarly engagement where this explains what it is and in what cases it would be appropriate. Ok, number three is that if we are going to have students doing this university-wide, the GPC wants to monitor that and, as well, it might find its way into the QER with Tim Hogan. A committee of us is looking at how to streamline. What would have to happen is for the GPC program review report, one of the things that will go in the template is to assess what steps the program takes to facilitate and ensure students are active participants and immerse themselves in a global scholarly community. Number four, and this is something we talked at length to the Steering Committee about is distance learning. This is a change rather to graduate bulletin to the faculty handbook. What this requires – and some people when we talked about this last expressed concern about

creeping online programs. That a program is approved X number of years ago as a fulltime, on-campus program and then there are a few online courses that come in and then a few more, a few more, and the program is never re-reviewed to look at how those online offerings fit in. So what we've included here is a change to the faculty handbook that any new degree program that offers more than fifty percent of graduate credit hours using distance learning, and that program would be reviewed by the GPC anyway, and any existing graduate program that intends to increase its graduate credit hour using distance learning above the fifty percent threshold, must be approved by the GPC. In number five there is simply, under full-course load, to satisfy the residency requirement is simply eliminated. And finally recommendation six is that each department's annual review of doctoral students policy forms used should reflect the same language and clarifies intent of the review with the opportunity for scholarly engagement. This would take effect in fall of 2016. So questions?

Kercheval: Alec Kercheval, mathematics. So recommendation 2, the end seems like each unit of the doctoral program will figure out its own scholarly engagement requirement.

Stepina: Yes, that's correct.

Kercheval: Do you have in mind that there will be some guidance for that? Or does that require an approval by the graduate school?

Stepina: Well the guidance is provided by this language. And the thing is that depending on the program – if it's a science program it might be the opportunity to go work at a lab or someplace else. If it's in the humanities, it might be to spend a semester in Europe. It could be all different kinds of things, and our goal in GPC is to regulate to the minimum and give departments as much discretion as possible. So we are trying to find an umbrella committee that fits the wide variety of doctoral programs and doctoral students that we have at this university.

Telotte: John Telotte from Chemical Engineering. I had a question about recommendation four. Do we consider – The discussion was supposed to be about online education but we switched the language in terms of “distance education” and I think they are not exactly the same. That there are opportunities, at least in my area, for distance learning that are not online. [Inaudible talking] educational delivery system. Where you actually are – it's an active class. It's not an online class. It's all done with direct telecommunication. There is no other online component. I'm just wondering if we have to be worried about the distinction between online and distance because I believe there are situations where you might be able to get more than fifty percent of your coursework in that format. It's a lot closer to a standard class. You're talking, you can ask questions back and forth with the instructor, and the like.

Stepina: So you would suggest changing “distance” because –

Telotte]: I guess I question it because we started off talking about online and then all of a sudden we went into the terminology of distance. And again, I don't

know that they are exactly the same. I don't know if we need to worry about the language. Someone may know more.

Woman: So the language there in black. The first sentence and the last sentence in that paragraph is existing language. I think it's making the distinction between distance learning. And in this particular paragraph it's really talking about examples of online programs. And the concern as SACS has with online programs that you have all the resources available for students in the way we do in face-to-face programs. And so, in fact though, there was no distinction: what is an online program? Is it all the courses online? The decision here was to try to come up with we figured fifty percent. Because there is already a template and form for programs that want to transition from a face-to-face to an online to get approval from the GPC but it doesn't really say what the percentage of courses [inaudible].

Doan: Petra Doan, Urban and Regional Planning. Back to recommendation two, the second to last sentence. "The purpose of the scholarly engagement requirement is to ensure that doctoral students are active participants and immerse themselves in the global, scholarly community." That seems to be adding something to the residence requirement. Rather than that they should adhere, it sounds like it's adding that they should be engaging with the global community outside of it. So instead of a residence requirement, it feels like a global requirement, which I might be very supportive of, I just wanted to know if that was the intention.

Stepina: Well the intention is that students can do something to increase their awareness about what is going on elsewhere than here and immerse themselves in a different scholarly community that will expand their horizons, challenge their points of view-

Tyson: So the question there is it "should" or "could?"

Nancy: Well, "global" was actually. It's true that the word "global" today can mean international. [Inaudible]. Out of your individual program and become aware of what is even going on around this campus. That was, I think, the intent in using that word.

Stepina: So there's FSU and then there's the rest of the planet.

Buchler: Michael Buchler, College of Music. I have the same concern as Petra did. It's nuanced differently. If it's "ensures" and then followed by "complete spectrum of." So it sounds like we are requiring people to do all of these things, and that's a really broad requirement I think. So this allows them to...

Stepina: Scholarly engagement, clearly when they are in residence they are scholarly engaged. However what this is saying is that if they are going to engage in scholarly activities elsewhere that they are actively participating and they are heavily involved. They are not going to another lab to be a lab assistant and wash test tubes. So the idea is that if you have a student who is engaging in off-campus

scholarly engagement, that it's up to the department to ensure that student is not sitting on a beach somewhere unless they are in oceanography.

[Inaudible comment from man].

Stepina: That's why we left it – well you know, you're on the committee. We wanted to give the programs the freedom to do whatever the faculty see as appropriate.

Women: I thought I understood the intention but it seems like there are two different things this could mean. One is that we don't want graduate students who go somewhere else to get less engagement than they would get if they were here. So that seems like one thing it could mean. And then the other than that it could be trying to achieve is that they are engaged here even if they are somewhere else. I now cannot tell which is meant by this policy.

Stepina: What is intended by this policy is to address engagement off-campus. This is the basis of having the residency rule is that they are getting scholarly engaged while they are here in residence. We are in a position that we can make sure that is happening. But if they are going to be someplace else, there has to be some oversight and that's created by having the student evaluated based on what they've done and getting the approval of going someplace else. This is to be kept separate from the proposal that you will see not till next year concerning leave of absence for graduate students. So this is not that, you know, you need a mental health semester off or whatever.

Woman: I guess the whole idea with the doctoral level of education is to ensure that students are engaged in the scholarly community. The point being that to be on campus is an artificial way of measuring that, so if the idea is that the scholarly engagement [inaudible]. It could occur by them being somewhere else if they are in a scholarly community there. [Inaudible]. The real point is following scholarly engagement wherever it may occur. And the students aren't just isolated working independently [inaudible].

New woman: And I think that's important. I'm just not sure it's necessarily conveyed that way in this recommendation. That's my concern. I thought it meant something else initially and now reading it and discussing it, I'm not sure it's conveyed clearly in this recommendation.

Stepina: I think that the first sentence basically specifies our concern that graduates students get scholarly engagement but it may occur in a number of different ways. In terms of scholarly engagement, doctoral students can interact with faculty which includes enrolling in courses – that covers people who are here – attend seminars, symposia, or conferences, engage in collaborative study. So it's an umbrella that includes both on campus – enrolling in classes – and off campus.

Von Glahn: Denise Von Glahn, College of Music. I'm interested in you clarifying between recommendation one which meets the residency requirement, but in paragraph two, line three, it talks about twenty-four credit semester hours. How

that might talk about recommendation two and scholarly engagement. Are you looking at a maximum number of hours that could be used for any one of these contexts? [Inaudible].

Stepina: This is to leave open that they would be engaged in activities where they wouldn't be enrolled as a student.

Woman: But they would get credit for them?

Stepina: No, they would not. If a student takes a semester off and gets approved to go study in Paris then they would still be required to take all the classes for their degree that are specified in the program. So it's not an exchange. It's "in addition to."

Woman: The twenty-four hour dissertation requirement, that stays. That's not changing. All this is saying is that you don't necessarily have to sandwich twenty-four hours in one year. [Inaudible].

Stepina: Ok. Ready to vote?

[Man from college of Music]: [-] from the College of Music. Do we need the three words "complete spectrum of"? I would feel better if – This seems to me like something we can't possibly communicate or ensure. In the first sentence [inaudible], if we simply deleted "the complete spectrum of."

Cox: If I might also ask - Brad Cox from Education – could we just cut the whole first sentence? In all honesty, it starts the confusion because it's talking about the resources here on campus and later you're talking about global. You already have a purpose statement, you already have a goals statement, you already have a here's what you need statement. If first one seems superfluous, let's cut it.

[Inaudible talking]

Stepina: I guess as you say that, number two specifies what is involved. The goal is to prepare students as scholars. So I would be ok with getting rid of that first sentence. I mean, it's superfluous. Whoever said academics aren't wordy.

[Inaudible talking]

Fiorito: So we don't at this minute have a motion on the floor to accept this. Right? We're just talking while Lee is presenting this. So I think we can make this change, and then we'll make a motion on the changed policy. Is that ok with everybody? So we'll take out the first sentence. Now do I hear a motion to accept the policy?

[Inaudible comment from man].

Stepina: I don't think that's necessary because here it specifies what the goal is.

Man: [Inaudible]. What I'm saying is that the point was that students should benefit from the spectrum of what's available and not specifically – and I agree with this idea that students should immerse themselves. [Inaudible].

Stepina: That they are active participants and immerse themselves in the scholarly community here and elsewhere.

Woman: Before we go to any other sentences, don't we have to vote on the motion about the first sentence?

Fiorito: We have a second? No one has presented a motion yet, so are we- Ok, we have. Thank you.

Man: I motion that we strike the first sentence from the recommendation.

Fiorito: Do we hear a second on the motion striking the first sentence? Bridget? Ok. So we hear a second. Is there discussion? Sudhir do you want to have a discussion about this? Are we ok with that?

Aggarwal(?): I just think this is a little milder than what [inaudible] was after. If we don't have this, then I see the problem as the purpose to make sure students are actually participating and immersing themselves in the global scholarly community. So if that first one – that just says they are supposed to benefit from this emphasis – it would make it clearer, I think.

DeBrunner: Victor DeBrunner, Chemical Engineering. I like the sentence because it tells you the intent and then goes on to specify. I'm not sure it really matters. I'm not sure why we are all going into gyrations about it.

Fiorito: So you are speaking to keep the sentence? Ok, so we have a motion that has been seconded. Yes, sir?

Osteen: Philip Osteen, Social Work. Does it make a difference [inaudible] to just drop the word "complete." That was the main problem, right?

Fiorito: "Benefit from and contribute to the spectrum of"

[Inaudible talking]

Man: [Inaudible]. The spectrum is complete. There is a certain unnecessary modifier [inaudible].

Stepina: So that is what the vote is about.

Fiorito: So we have a motion to delete the first sentence. We have a second. We had discussion. Let's go ahead and vote on this and if we need to readdress it we can do that. So striking the first sentence is the motion that we have. We had a second. We had some discussion. Let's have a vote.

The motion passed.

Jack Fiorito: Jack Fiorito, College of Business. I move that we strike the word “global” from the third to last line.

Several voices: Second.

Fiorito: Ok. “Global” from the third to last line.

Man: It would also address this concern if we struck “and immerse themselves” right before that. Then it would get rid of any ambiguity.

Other man: “Are active participants in the scholarly community.”

First man: Exactly.

Fiorito: Do I hear a motion? Dennis, yes?

Slice: Slice, Scientific Computing. Can I ask a question? The statement as to why there is a scholarly engagement requirement, is that stated anywhere else?

Fiorito: Stated anywhere else?

Slice: We just struck a line explaining what this other stuff is about. Is it explained anywhere else?

Stepina: In the old residency policy, it didn’t explain why we had a residency policy.

[Inaudible talking].

Man: [Inaudible]. The way that sounds right now that includes everybody enrolled in classes whether they are engaged or not. What I would suggest is that if you can make it more specific: enrolled in courses in addition to their program of study.

Stepina: In addition to their program of study?

Man: If they are in other courses in addition to what they are already enrolled in. You said if they are in Paris that is an additional course [Inaudible].

[Inaudible talking].

Fiorito: Ok. At this point I think its best – I don’t really want to do this – I think it’s best to take it back to the Graduate Policy Committee. The Graduate Policy Committee has this. We’re changing it significantly. I hope you heard the concerns. It’s not going to go into effect until fall of 2016. We’re not going to work here and change every single word. I think the committee needs to take it back. We need to look at it again. All of us need to make sure that Graduate Policy Committee is sure about this. Hopefully some of them that are here can relay the changes that need to be made.

Stepina: I should note that the Graduate Policy Committee has been working on this since very early this year.

Fiorito: I know. I know. But if the faculty senate does not approve it then it does not get approved. That's it.

Man: Susan, you care making a motion to recommit. You have to either ask for unanimous consent or add a motion to recommit.

Fiorito: Can I just table this?

Several voices: No.

Fiorito: Ok, so we need to make a motion to recommit?

Man: No, you can ask for unanimous consent.

Fiorito: Ok. Yes.

Losh: Two things. The first is, when we are considering all this – Susan Losh, Ed. Psych – I'm looking at that last line and thinking of our program. We are re-doing our program requirements. So I would like everyone to consider that the more generic we have this, the easier we will be in our colleges. Then I will be glad to make a formal motion to recommit this decision to the Graduate Policy Committee.

Walker: Eric Walker from English. I'm opposed to sending this back. It's very simple, and I think we should vote. I think it's a great idea. I think the old, twenty-four-hour residency requirement was an old, one-size-fits-all that just didn't work in particular units. The simplicity of this is that individual units define what scholarly engagement is. There is nothing prescriptive. Those are just suggestions. Each individual unit will define what it needs to do for scholarly engagement. If you want to say "nothing," say "nothing." So the simplicity is let's get rid of the one-size-fits-all twenty-four-hour residency requirement that doesn't work and replace it with each unit defines what scholarly engagement is. I'm ready to vote on that. I think it's a great idea. That's my peace.

Fiorito: Ok. So. Bridget?

Birmingham: I'm confused at what motion we have on the floor. What's the motion?

Man: This is a recommendation from a Standing Committee and a recommendation from a Standing Committee that needs to be moved. That comes to the floor. It needs a vote. The main motion is on the floor.

Jack Fiorito: There's also a motion to strike "global" from the third to last line. That needs to be dealt with first.

Fiorito: Ok. So if we are moving to that: there is a motion to strike “global” and “immerse themselves.” [Inaudible talking]. Those are separate. Just to strike “global.” Do I hear any opposition to that? Ok, so we need to vote.

The motion passed.

Fiorito: Ok, we are striking “global.” Now to strike “and immerse themselves.” We need a motion. Ok, so moved to second.

The motion passed.

Fiorito: Ok, do we have a motion to accept this policy as amended? Ok, let’s vote on it. Discussion on the policy as amended?

Tyson: [Inaudible]. I’m in favor of this, but the only thing I would like to see not here is who enforces this? If there is an exception or it needs policing, is it the department? Is it the graduate college? Who enforces exceptions on an individual basis? So let’s say a department decides that they have some requirement and for some reason there is some student who needs to change that slightly, does the department then waive that requirement or do they have to go to the Graduate School? I don’t know.

Woman: I think it’s really up to the department. [Inaudible]. It should also be addressed in your annual review process.

Tyson: So then there are two issues. The one is that the department may want to change their policies but they may have an individual students who is trying to graduate and needs to be exempted.

Woman: There is no way for the registrar to currently correct [Inaudible talking].

Tyson: So the assumption right now is that the department would be able to handle this. If that’s in the minutes of the meeting then I am very happy with that.

Fiorito: And I think professors monitor their student’s progress. That’s with any policy. You have to monitor what your masters and doctoral students are doing. That’s our responsibility as major professors to do that and follow the policy. Ok, let’s have a vote on this amended policy.

The motion passed.

ii. GTS for Postdocs (see addendum 2)

Right now if you have a postdoc and you want that postdoc to teach your graduate class you have to go to Janet and get a courtesy appointment for that person. Arts and Sciences asked the GPC to look at that policy and ideally streamline it. This is the streamline approach. You can see what’s changed. Academics was turned into criteria and procedures for GTS appointments. Here

are the guidelines. It talks about what it will include. It mentions that post-doctorate scholars are eligible to be nominated. Ok, so that's all.

The motion passed.

VI. Old Business, Susan Fiorito

a. Liberal Studies Bylaws Change (see addendum 3)

Now we have something that is not controversial at all. At the last meeting Annette presented the bylaws change for the Liberal Studies change. Annette talked about it last time. You've seen this. This is a bylaws change so it was presented and discussed on October 21st. We are ready for a vote on the bylaws change in your packet.

The motion passed.

b. Library Committee Bylaws Change (see addendum 4)

The second bylaws change was for the library committee. Again, we presented and discussed this at the October 21st meeting. You received it by email. Let's have a vote.

The motion passed.

VII. Special Order: Kim Barber, University Registrar

I just wanted to brief you in on some actions we are taking with undergraduate students, looking at students who have high hours. So students who have either started here and have racked up a significant amount of hours at the University or students that transferred into us with what you might consider a reasonable or not reasonable number of hours, but nevertheless find themselves with 180, 200, 250 hours and no degree in hand. This body passed about six years ago a policy that said if a student has meet all the degree requirements, the University reserves the right to award that degree to that student, and we are actually doing that. We've done that in the past at the undergraduate and graduate level, but they've typically been one-off students. And we've now really started taking a look at these students who have been racking up the high hours, trying to figure out what is going on with them. You know, the cost to them – they are running out of financial aid. They are exhausting that. They are running up a lot of debt. A lot of them are finding themselves with 235 hours and deciding that Engineering is their life's passion five majors after the fact. So we are really trying to help them along and say, "You know what, five degrees is probably not as good as a bachelor's and a master's degree and a doctorate degree, so maybe you need to focus those academic efforts and be more productive." So we are helping them along their way. The academic deans have been reviewing lists of students. They review students at 140 to 179 hours. My office took students that had 180 or more hours. And what we are doing is putting them on the graduation list and saying, "Go forth, little fledglings, fly from the nest. We will help you. We will bring you back. We will work with you to readmit you as a second degree student if you really need that second bachelor's degree." Really encourage them to go to graduate school because you get different financial aid packages. You can use your bright futures towards that. Lots of different things that they can do that a lot of them don't realize are options for them. It's really facilitating very focused, directive discussions between

them and their advisors. There is a formal appeals process that this body approved. We've had three students this semester formally appeal to be removed off the graduation list. Two of them had more than 180 hours. One of them had 143 hours and needed two courses to finish pre-med requirements. So we're going to award his degree in his case. We've waived the application fee. I've already admitted him as a non-degree student. I've already registered him for the two classes. So those students that can present an academic case for the desire to remain, it is reviewed by a committee, and if that committee agrees with the academic merit of their case, we let them continue on. In certain cases, we as a committee may choose to disagree with the student's academic pursuits, in which case we offer them alternatives which are really more in line with where they need to go. And in many cases it really is: "You need to look at graduate school. We will work with you as an institution to get you into that." So I just wanted to let you know. You might hear rumblings from either students, advisors, parents, you never know, that, "Oh my God, their kicking my child out of school." No, we are not. We are helping them along because a lot of these students are very very good students, and they really can do more than just rack up five bachelor's degrees. They really are candidates for graduate school whether it's here or somewhere else. Or looking at alternatives for what they want to do – other experiences in the global world. So there's a lot of options for students out there, so we are helping them become aware of what some of those are. So I just wanted to brief you on all that, if there are any questions I'll be happy to answer them. Thank you.

VIII. Special Order: Ken Johnson, University Technology Administration

I was here a couple of meetings ago just to tell you about our initiative to move to a new email service. Those efforts have been underway for the last couple of months. We've migrated probably close to four thousand accounts now. I suspect most of you in this room, if not at least some of you, have already moved to the new environment. It's been a positive experience. Of course that's coming from me. You may have something else to say and I encourage you to do so if you have not had a positive experience. But one thing I just wanted to reinforce is the need for people to print out the information we send them especially as it relates to mobile devices because that's the number one problem. People do have to reconfigure their phones, iPads, and other tablets to connect to the new service. So we're going to continue this effort over the next couple of months. We'll be taking some time off around the holiday break so we won't be moving anybody. We're trying to work with department heads and IT professionals within the various units. If you have any questions or concerns, just contact our service desk or me directly. And then I'll just mention some other good news. Within the next couple of weeks we'll be launching a new version of our myFSU Mobile app. This is a very popular app. It gets downloaded about 500 times a week on average by our community. That being the general public, students, their parents, employees, etc. So this new app will be available in the app store within the next couple of weeks. It's going to provide us with the foundation we need to enhance the overall university mobile experience. Things like logging in to OMNI and approving timesheets, submitting time, a lot of those other very common functions we do in OMNI will be available with a mobile experience through the mobile app. So that's not coming for two weeks. I'm just laying the foundation. So what we are going to do is provide the same information we're currently providing but you'll notice some good user experience there too. Any questions?

Tyson: Just out of curiosity, did we do that development in-house?

Johnson: No, we're utilizing a company called Mobil Labs. Their product. It is just too hard to sustain in-house, especially with the kind of integration we are looking for. And I know – you and I have talked about this over the years – we're certainly interested in that, and incidentally this application, however, will give us the ability to incorporate in-house developed apps. So for academic units that are developing apps that have a university-wide interest, they will be able to make those apps available through our app. You can contact me and we can talk about that further. The previous version did not have that flexibility. So we are thinking about that at the very least. Alright, any other questions?

IX. New Business

There were no items of new business.

X. University Welfare

a. Dennis Moore, Road Scholars

Several of you responded to the message I circulated last week on behalf of the Faculty Senate's Road Scholars Committee, asking for recommendations of scholars at these three specific ACC institutions whom we might consider inviting for our spring 2016 mini-series: UNV, Virginia Tech, and Notre Dame. Thanks for your responses! We now have a total of 12 recommendations, only one of which is a scholar for Virginia Tech. So here's the way our committee is proceeding: we'll go ahead and begin figuring out whom to invite from Chapel Hill, for mid-February, and from Notre Dame, for the last week of spring-semester classes. For Virginia Tech, we welcome any additional recommendations you might send me – by next Monday evening, please – suggest a dynamic, knowledgeable scholar from Virginia Tech whom our committee might invite to give a talk, here, for a general audience. Again, thanks.

b. Tony Archer, Website

Good afternoon. My name is Tony Archer, and I'm the director of Creative Services for Florida State University. I'm also an adjunct instructor of design within the College of Visual Art, Theatre, and Dance. I work with Browning Brooks who is our Assistant Vice President for University Communications. Under her direction we've been developing an update to fsu.edu, and I just wanted to share that with you today and point out a few functions of that site. This will just take a minute. I have it well hidden. We have been working with as I said Browning Brooks. Browning has also been working with the President and the President's Cabinet on this project. I wanted to come to you today to show you some of the updates to the site and to tell you exactly why we made those. One of the biggest issues we needed to address with fsu.edu is its mobile responsiveness. Our current site is not responsive. As of this year Google has started penalizing those sites that are not mobile-friendly and dropping them lower in the rankings. For example, University of Florida's site is mobile friendly. Ours is not. If someone typed in "Florida university," we would come up in the search results under the University of Florida. If they type in "Florida State University" we'll still pop up, but for those kind of vague analogues searchers, we're going to start eventually dropping lower and lower. So as you can see with this particular site, as you would move from desktop to iPad to mobile device, the site

will become responsive with those various sizes. So that was one issue we needed to address. Also our current site utilizes Flash, which does give some mobile devices a little bit of a problem. You'll notice this site, there is nothing moving. We are staying static with this but maintaining the wealth of faculty research, student stories, university happenings. That kind of stuff. Those will still be front and center on the website. We've stripped nothing off. We've kind of just added a little to it. If we scroll down a little bit we see that we added a preeminence section to the University website. As one of only two preeminent universities in the state of Florida, we feel it's very important to share that with people. We've introduced some features that are not currently on the fsu.edu website including an "apply now" button for undergraduates and graduates. We also utilized a lot of Google analytics when deciding what kind of content to add to the site. We certainly looked at, "What are people coming here to do?" Things like the cost of attendance, getting their transcripts. That's why people are coming to fsu.edu, not seeing it, and then entering it in the search bar. So we try to address that in the user experience. We also have – I wouldn't say necessarily marking – on the home page but we certainly have a lovely recruitment video that perspective students if they wanted to could watch there. We also have a live academic calendar feeding into the current site, pulling from calendar.fsu.edu. So things like exam weeks, when the University is closed, first day of classes will self-populate there. The initiatives for the University – the billion dollar fundraising campaign has a presence, the Know More Sexual Violence Campaign, and a new feature which is Florida State's economic impact. Again, lots of our legislatures and other people outside the University community, need to be made aware of Florida State University's economic impact. And then like you would find on our current site, we do have the quick links or key links there, listed out but grouped a little by proximity of how they fall. That site map is also right here on what we call the global navigation. So the site has just been updated a little bit for today's modern iPhone times. And again we just wanted to share that with you. This is just the current draft of the website. We are working with all sorts of groups to make sure it is very well vetted before we launch before the New Year. We hope to come back in 2016 with a lovely, new fsu.edu website. We've also been working with colleges within the University to get their sites mobile-friendly as well. So I just wanted to share this with you. If you have any questions, comments, or concerns, my email address is "a" –as in Anthony- "archer.fsu.edu." I would be happy to answer those for you and thank you for letting me come chat with you today.

c. Jack Fiorito, UFF

I'm Jack Fiorito, senator for the College of Business and Vice President of the United Faculty of Florida, FSU chapter. If you'll bear with me; I am new at this. I wanted to announce our chapter president, Matthew Lata, announced today that Jeff Wright, Director of Public Policy for the FEA will be our featured speaker at a luncheon on December 9th. The meeting starts at 11:30. Jeff will be speaking at 12. This will be at the Student Services building. Room 203. Jeff has appeared before keeping us updated on what is going on in the state legislature. This year his remarks are titled, "The Idiots who Run the State of Florida." That might not be the official title; it's a working title. It should be a good presentation. Jeff always is very entertaining. He's an FSU alum. He loves to come and talk to the faculty so if you can make that, please do. It's free for UFF members and \$12 for others. Other than that – more off the top of my head. I wrote myself some notes on that. We'll be

meeting with the president I think next month for another consultation. We expect to start bargaining maybe as soon as February 1st. Probably not quite that soon. But we'll be doing a poll soon, later this month or early next month, asking about your bargaining priorities. Please respond. We like to hear what people are thinking. That really helps provide guides for our bargaining team, of which I'm also a member by the way. Please watch for announcements of our forthcoming poll and please participate if you get the chance. Any questions?

XI. Announcements by Deans and Other Administrative Officers

a. Karen Laughlin, Dean, Undergraduate Studies

Thank you, Susan. Susan has been attending lately – and I'm so glad – meetings of the Enrollment Management Committee, which has been in existence for a long time but may not be on all your radars. But this is a group of people from Undergraduate Studies, Student Affairs, Finance and Administration, Financial Aid, and we meet every couple of weeks to talk about both student recruitment and retention issues. I think it's been an incredible collaboration with a lot of open discussion and sharing, vetting various kinds of concerns, and helping us move ahead with our initiatives for retention and student success and bringing the best students to Florida State. There are a couple of things I wanted to talk about today. One of the issues that we talked about at some length at this last meeting – that I bet will not surprise any of you – is that we appear to be dealing with another level of parental involvement. Have any of you encountered this in your departments? I can't imagine that you haven't. This came up partly because each fall for many years now Alice Wright, the Director of Retention who works in Undergraduate Studies, sends out what we call the "Dear Parents" letter. It's to the parents of freshmen to help them with their transition – to say, "You know, this is the time of the semester when it's getting to be crunch time, time to send a care package. Here's some resources if your student is in touch with you and is having issues." Well the responses we got this time were just off the charts. And the demands we got from parents this time were, we felt, almost alarming. We talk about helicopter parents. I think we are at the Kamikaze stage at this point. And I will tell you many of these parents are calling – and this is nothing on you, believe me, – to say, "Aren't you going to call that professor who was mean to Sussi and tell him or her that how dare they do that?" I think these are parents who are used to being very involved in their high school student's lives and now are expecting the same kind of interaction and behavior at the college level. Our standard response is, "No way!" but we say it nicely. We say, "This is college. We want you to understand that we expect your student to be taking responsibility for his or her education." But I know, Alice told me just recently that she had a long conversation with a parent. She explained that there is no way we should be talking with faculty or that mom should be talking to faculty. That student should be talking to you. But the next thing she did after she hung up the phone was call the professor. We wanted to just put this on your radar to let you know we are doing what we can on our end to try to address these concerns. But related to that is the kind of parallel issue of the fact that we are finding students in this batch are increasingly less resilient to the point that it has really got us worried. I think you have probably seen this too. I don't know how much this has been made public but we've had a number of student deaths this semester – more than we've had in many semesters. Several of them have been suicides. It's just a tough time for students with

this sort of generation and this level of parental involvement. So I really just wanted you to be aware of this and perhaps encourage you to take the same line that we are taking, which is that if you get a call from a parent, just ask them to have their student talk to you. Because of course we know also we never believe at face value anything a parent tells us about how mean and bad you've been to their students. I assure you of that. I'll never forget when I took my daughter to kindergarten, and the teacher said to me, "I want to make a deal with you. I will not believe everything she tells me about what is going on at home if you promise not to believe everything she tells you about what is going on at school." I made that pact and I continue to live by that principle. Anyway, just wanted to bring this to your attention. If you have any comments or thoughts or you want to fire any thoughts our way in Undergraduate Studies, please do. Is this resonating with you? I'm seeing at least a few nodes? Not so much? Good. I'm hoping it's less than you might think or that we are feeling. But I do know that we just seem to have students who seem to be more fragile and more vulnerable because perhaps the fact that mom and dad have been running their lives so closely, especially their academic lives.

There is a related issue that you may be more aware of that is that we have seen a significant change in registration behavior among students over the last couple of years that continues to have us concerned. This is that the students are waiting longer and longer to register for classes. Used to be that your window opened and you were on the phone or your computer waiting to do whatever you were doing that second, grabbing up all those great classes. Many of you I know are reaching out to Undergraduate Studies and the Demand Analysis group to say, "My class isn't filling. What's going on? I'm really worried about enrollment." Well there are 4,000 students out there who have still not registered for spring classes. I think what happened is that when we went to the new system, we had an open ended you-can-register-at-any-time. When then decided that was very difficult from the standpoint of demand analysis and schedule planning, so we went back to a cut-off. So this semester, registration closes on the 4th of December and will not re-open until drop/add because of that short window when the semester starts again, and any student who does not register by December 4th is going to be assessed a late fee. So if you are doing any student advising or outreach, please help us. We are doing everything we can to get that message out to students. But I know this might be causing you headaches because you are looking, thinking what is wrong with my enrollment patterns. We are finding this is a real concern. I had a long talk with the Advising First advisors about this, and there are a couple issue they brought up that I want to put on your radar. Two in particular. One is the way departments are using reserved capacity. Many departments now are reserving most if not all the seats in a class for students in their major. Now in some cases there is a really good reason to do that but not very many. Because what this means then is that a student in another major who needs that class – maybe as a milestone or to explore your major or to progress in some way – can't get that class until drop/add. So they are waiting until drop/add for that perfect schedule – because that's who these kids are – so we are putting roadblocks up which I am not sure are always really necessary. So we will be looking at this along with the Registrar's Office, trying to convene people who are building schedules to try to talk about this issue. And I would encourage you in your departments to really take a look at how you are managing what's called reserved capacity now that puts caps on your classes. Really ask yourself if you need to save every seat in every class. Frankly, if you want my opinion, we have no business

saving seats in liberal studies classes only for our majors. Those classes are for students to explore different degree programs. I'm not here to tell you how to manage this. I am just here to tell you that it is causing problems for students and is contributing to this late registration behavior. The other thing that is contributing and causing issues are classes that are not offered at standard class meeting times. Again, I've been a faculty member for many, many years. I understand these issues. But I have to tell you that every time you teach at a time that does not start and end at the regular meeting times, you make it harder for students to take that class and fill their schedule with other classes. So I would just make a plea. Sometimes it's a matter of fifteen minutes – starting earlier or later than the standard time. And it wreaks havoc with room utilization and it wreaks havoc with students' schedules. So we will be looking more at some of these issues and putting this information out to the deans and departments to help you with this.

The last thing that is a little lighter note, maybe. We are all aware of students who bring service animals on campus. And this is absolutely something we must and should allow. I don't think people have any issues with this, but we just learned at this meeting that there is a new policy through the Federal Housing Authority that now allows students – I've forgotten. Does anyone remember the exact name? Comfort animals. That's right. So there's this whole range of pets that we must allow, but we only have to allow it in housing. So if your student is bringing their, I don't know what, pony or their rabbit – you do not have to allow that critter in your classroom. They are only allowed in [Inaudible talking]. Well that's the lighter note anyway. Any questions or comments?

Woman: I wonder if students are feeling restrained by the fact that we have a schedule that often doesn't work. The students cannot get from one class to another class on campus in fifteen minutes. They just can't do it. I have many students who are walking in late and leaving early because they just can't do it.

Laughlin: Right. Right. It's challenging of course because every department is building their schedule based on the needs of that department and the faculty in that department. It's difficult to coordinate that. I don't know if you are suggesting that we look at allowing more time between classes.

Woman: That is exactly what I'm suggesting. [Inaudible] a system where there is twenty minutes between classes instead of fifteen. Because students just can't do it anymore. And that may be restraining some of these registration issues.

Laughlin: That may be an issue too. We can certainly look at that. [Inaudible talking]. The other issue that I've heard is that in some cases students are finding that the classes that they need for their major are all offered at the same time. So we are trying to analyze that as well to make sure it's not impossible for a student to take the courses they need because they are all at two o'clock on Tuesday and Thursday. So that too is something that we need to keep thinking about. It's a balancing act, I understand, to give you the opportunities to do your research, the time you need, but we also need to get this 40,000 students through their curricula and out the door in a good timely manner with a rich educational experience.

XII. Announcements by Interim Provost McRorie

Hi, I'm going to be really, really quick. Two things. The State Board of Governors has asked that all the state institutions look at a common learning system, like Blackboard. I think they've identified three of those. We are going to need some faculty members from each university in the State system to take a look at all three and see how they work and if they like them or not. I need twenty people from Florida State. So if you are interested in being one of those folks, email me and let me know that is something you'd like. And if I don't get twenty volunteers, I'll ask Susan to help me. Secondly, you may have seen the big article in today's Democrat about coding as opposed to foreign language courses for high school kids. One of our senators in the State, Senator Jeremy Ring who is down South, Margate I think, has a bill – it doesn't have a companion bill in the House yet but it's supposed to have one coming – that would make computer coding taken for two years the equivalent of taking a foreign language for two years in high school. As the article pointed out this morning, as the bill is written now in its initial draft form, it would require every high school to offer coding and would require every student who wanted to get a Bright Futures Scholarship to take two years of coding. So, I had heard about this before. Joe Glover, who is the provost at UF, and I spoke with Senator Ring this morning and pointed out some problems with that. He has said he understands and will take the “must” and the “shall” out of all the wording and make it something that students may do but are not required to do. There's a long road to go on that bill, and I don't know if it's actually going to come to fruition or not. But I wanted you to know that if you read that thing this morning and thought, “Oh, this is horrible,” I agree with you, but I think Joe and I have managed to inoculate the senator appropriately. Any questions?

Woman: Does the senator also plan to fund this?

McRorie: Oh, of course not. Of course not. Actually Tod and I had the chance to have a conversation about this the other day. Where are we going to find people who know how to code who want to teach high school? Just doesn't make any sense. Anyway. We're still in Florida. Thank you all.

XIII. Announcements by President Thrasher

President Thrasher was not in attendance.

XIV. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:53 p.m.



Melissa Crawford
Faculty Senate Coordinator

Recommendations Were Approved by the GPC on 2-16-15. Rec # 4 Approved on 3-30-15. Rec # 4 was Revised and Approved on 11-2-15. Revised and Approved by Faculty Senate 11-18-15.

Residence Policy Revision

Recommendations:

1. Delete "Residence" statement in Graduate Bulletin 2014-2015, p.73
2. Replace with new statement on Scholarly Engagement in Graduate Bulletin
3. Revise Template for GPC Program Review Reports, to include consideration of student scholarly engagement during program reviews conducted every seven years. *Note: this activity is to be completed by the faculty/staff to the GPC and does not require vote of Faculty Senate. Provided for information purposes only.*
4. Revise Faculty Handbook, Section 7: Teaching and Student/Faculty Interactions, Distance Learning - to include statement requiring GPC approval for expansion or development of online /distance learning programs.
5. Remove statement in Graduate Bulletin 2014-2015, p. 80, relating to "residence requirement."
6. Revise and Insert language into each College/Department's Annual Review of Doctoral Students Policy and/or forms assuring the versions are aligned to reflect the same language and to clarify/communicate intent of the annual review.
7. Changes to take effect Fall 2016

See below for information on each recommendation:

Recommendation 1: Delete "Residence" statement in Graduate Bulletin 2014-2015, p.73

Residence (Graduate Bulletin 2014-2015, p. 73)

~~The intent of the residency requirement is to ensure that doctoral students contribute to and benefit from the complete spectrum of educational, professional, and enrichment opportunities provided on the campus of a comprehensive university. When establishing residency the student should interact with faculty and peers by regularly attending courses, conferences, or seminars, and utilize the library and laboratory facilities provided for graduate education.~~

~~After having finished thirty semester hours of graduate work or being awarded the master's degree, the student must be continuously enrolled on Florida State University Tallahassee campus for a minimum of twenty four graduate semester hours of credit in any period of twelve consecutive months. In cooperative degree programs involving two or more universities, residence requirements may differ from the foregoing only with the approval of the graduate policy committee and the Dean of The Graduate School. Students in such programs should check residence requirements with their departmental chairs or program leaders.~~

~~The College of Education and the Art Education program in the College of Visual Arts, Theatre, and Dance permit EdD students, if they so desire, to complete their residency requirement by registering for thirty credits during a consecutive sixteen-month period. The Doctor of Nursing Practice program in the College of Nursing permits DNP students, if they so desire, to complete their residency requirement by registering for twenty four credits during a consecutive sixteen-month period.~~

Recommendations Were Approved by the GPC on 2-16-15. Rec # 4 Approved on 3-30-15. Rec # 4 was Revised and Approved on 11-2-15. Revised and Approved by Faculty Senate 11-18-15.

Recommendation 2: Replace with new statement on Scholarly Engagement in Graduate Bulletin

Scholarly Engagement

To meet the Scholarly Engagement requirement, doctoral students should interact with faculty and peers in ways that may include enrolling in courses; attending seminars, symposia, and conferences; engaging in collaborative study and research beyond the university campus; and utilizing the library, laboratories, and other facilities provided by the university. The goal is to prepare students to be scholars who can independently acquire, evaluate, and extend knowledge, as well as develop themselves as effective communicators and disseminators of knowledge. The purpose of the Scholarly Engagement requirement is to ensure that doctoral students are active participants in the scholarly community. Each academic unit with a doctoral program should include a program specific statement in its Graduate Handbook describing how its students can meet the Scholarly Engagement requirement.

Recommendation 3: Revise Template for GPC Program Review Reports to include consideration of student scholarly engagement. *Note: this activity to be completed by staff to GPC and does not require vote of Faculty Senate. Provided for information purposes only.*

TEMPLATE FOR GPC PROGRAM REVIEW REPORTS

- 1. HISTORY AND CONTEXT OF DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM:** Provide a brief history of the department and its component academic programs and describe the main events by which it has arrived at its present status. Include here an overview of the size and scope of the department, plus any current contextual factors that significantly affect its operations and should be kept in mind.

- 2. STUDENT BODY: ENROLLMENT, RETENTION, AND GRADUATION (at all graduate levels)**
For each graduate degree provide data on the number of students admitted each year, the number enrolled and the number graduating. Give the GRE scores and GPAs of newly admitted students (average and range). Discuss and comment on the following:
 1. Are there flows and trends in the data? Is the program growing or shrinking? Do the GRE/GPA data suggest changes in the quality of students entering the program?
 2. How does the program recruit students? Is there a recruiting plan?
 3. Is retention a problem? If so, what factors are causing students to leave the program?
 4. Annual Graduate Student evaluation: does the program have an effective evaluation procedure in place? Comment on the quality of a representative number of graduate student evaluations.
 5. Is the program's ethnic and gender diversity consistent with the field? Are the program faculty addressing this issue?
 6. What steps does the program take to facilitate/ensure that students are active participants and immerse themselves in the global scholarly community, e.g., attend seminars, symposia and conferences, engage in collaborative study and research beyond the university campus, engage in interprofessional scholarly endeavors, etc.

(Remainder of report template not included as no recommended changes made)

Recommendations Were Approved by the GPC on 2-16-15. Rec # 4 Approved on 3-30-15. Rec # 4 was Revised and Approved on 11-2-15. Revised and Approved by Faculty Senate 11-18-15.

Recommendation 4: Revise Faculty Handbook, Section 7: Teaching and Student/Faculty Interactions, Distance Learning - to include statement requiring GPC approval for expansion or development of online /distance learning programs.

**Faculty Handbook, Section 7: Teaching and Student/Faculty Interactions
Distance Learning**

Florida State University offers a wide array of courses through distance learning, some of which are part of entire degree programs available online. *Any new graduate degree program that will offer more than 50% of its graduate credit hours using distance learning, and any existing graduate degree program that intends to increase its graduate credit hours using distance learning above the 50% threshold, must be approved by the Graduate Policy Committee.* Instructors developing or teaching distance learning courses can find resources at: <http://distance.fsu.edu/>.

Recommendation 5: Remove statement in Graduate Bulletin 2014-2015, p. 80, relating to “residence requirement.”

Full-time Student Course Load (Graduate Bulletin, p. 80)

Recipients of stipends from the University, whether holders of fellowships or assistantships, must be full-time students as defined below. Non-degree students are not required to obtain underload permission.

The University reserves the right to determine full-time status based on course and/or research load, and stage of degree completion.

The standard full-time load for graduate students is twelve credit hours per semester, unless the student is receiving a university assistantship or fellowship. Some departments may permit such students to enroll on a part-time basis. A student who wishes to register for fewer than twelve credit hours per semester must have written approval from his/her academic dean prior to registration. For thesis-seeking master’s students, after completion of the required coursework and six credit hours of thesis, master’s students must be enrolled for a minimum of three credit hours per semester (of which at least two must be thesis hours) until completion of the degree. Doctoral students, after completion of the preliminary exam and twenty-four credit hours of dissertation, must be enrolled for a minimum of three credit hours per semester (of which at least two must be dissertation hours) until completion of the degree.

For graduate students receiving a university or externally-funded fellowship, twelve credit hours per semester constitutes a full-time load. A student who wishes to register for fewer than twelve credit hours per semester must have written approval from his/her academic dean prior to registration.

For graduate assistantship holders on a quarter-time or greater appointment, nine credit hours per semester is defined as a full-time load. Academic deans may grant exceptions to this policy for teaching assistants in those departments which conform to national course load policies in their disciplines.

To receive financial aid, all graduate students must be enrolled for at least six credit hours per semester.

~~To satisfy the Residence requirement, all doctoral students must be enrolled for twenty four credit hours during any single period of twelve consecutive months.~~

Recommendations Were Approved by the GPC on 2-16-15. Rec # 4 Approved on 3-30-15. Rec # 4 was Revised and Approved on 11-2-15. Revised and Approved by Faculty Senate 11-18-15.

The number of credit hours which a graduate student may carry without special permission is fifteen. A heavier load may be permitted by the student's academic dean.

Graduate-level courses may be modified downward in credit for a student by the student's academic dean.

Included in the calculation of student load are credit hours of graduate credit other than formal coursework, e.g., credit hours in thesis or dissertation, in directed individual study, in supervised research, and in supervised teaching.

For federal immigration reporting requirements, international (F-1 or J-1) students meet the full course of study requirement with enrollment of a minimum of nine credit hours in the fall and spring semesters, prior to completion of coursework. Departments may require additional enrollment, depending on department policy. After completion of required coursework, the standard university policy applies. An F-1 or J-1 student who wishes to reduce enrollment below the required levels must request permission, in advance, from an adviser at the Center for Global Engagement. For more information, visit <http://cge.fsu.edu>.

Recommendation 6: Revise and Insert language into each College/Department's Annual Review of Doctoral Students Policy and/or forms assuring the versions are aligned to reflect the same language and to clarify/communicate intent of the annual review.

Example: *The intent of the annual review is to assure that each student has the opportunity for scholarly engagement and continues to make timely progression toward completion of the degree program.*

Recommendation 7:

Residence policy change to take effect Fall 2016.

Approved by GPC on 10-19-15

Graduate Teaching Status: Appointment

Appointment to Graduate Teaching Status (GTS) is required for members of the specialized and non-tenure-earning faculty (NTTF) to teach graduate courses. Graduate Teaching Status (GTS) does not accord eligibility to serve, co-chair, or chair master's and doctoral committees nor to perform other functions of graduate education without further appointment (see below). GTS may be awarded for multiple academic degree programs with the approval of the appropriate department, college, and the Dean of the Graduate School. A faculty member with Graduate Teaching Status may be the instructor of record for 5000, 6000, and 7000-level courses.

Subject to consideration of special circumstances, minimum qualifications are: (1) completion of the doctorate or its equivalent and/or (2) proven expertise in the teaching area.

Under special circumstances qualified persons who are not regular members of the FSU faculty may be hired into a compensated "Visiting in Lieu of" or non-compensated "Courtesy"-qualifying faculty position and appointed to GTS on a temporary basis (up to three years) with the approval of the dean of the college and the Dean of the Graduate School. Temporary graduate teaching status is course-specific and expires at the end of the appointment period. Renewals may be requested by the academic unit. Postdoctoral Scholars (9189) are eligible to be nominated for GTS for the duration of their postdoctoral appointment. Persons holding appointments as adjunct faculty-instructors or Post Doctoral Research Associates (9189) are not eligible for GTS. Exceptions to this policy may be made by requesting Courtesy Faculty status in an appropriate classification code as well as GTS for such persons through the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement and the Dean of The Graduate School. For example, an FSU employee meeting the required criteria for appointment to GTS, but who is appointed as an A & P Program Director would need to be approved for status as a courtesy faculty member and subsequently approved for GTS in order to teach a graduate course.

Academic units will determine criteria and procedures for GTS appointments, according to guidelines in the Faculty Handbook and subject to approval of the dean of the college or school. The criteria will be subject to the approval of the Dean of The Graduate School with the advice and consent of the Graduate Policy Committee. Names of new GTS appointees will be sent to the Dean of The Graduate School for confirmation with the advice and consent of the Graduate Policy Committee.

Normal policy forbids graduate students from teaching graduate courses. Exceptions can be requested as follows:

Colleges where a master's-level professional degree is the normal terminal degree may request approval from the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement through the Dean of The Graduate School for doctoral students to teach in a practice-oriented master's-level course in a specific semester under the supervision of a regular tenured or tenure-earning faculty member with graduate faculty status. The request for approval shall include (a) justification for the request, (b) details of the course, (c) full CV of the student in question, and (d) details of the supervision

Commented [MNH1]: Note that this includes FSU employees who are not members of the regular faculty and persons external to FSU who are hired to teach a graduate course. Normally all of these folks are paid, but occasionally the person is not paid extra and hence Courtesy is appropriate.

Liberal Studies Coordinating and Policy Committee

The Liberal Studies Coordinating and Policy Committee shall promote liberal education and provide oversight for the liberal studies program curriculum. ~~Its concerns will include the intellectual climate on campus, the institutional concept of liberal learning, and student and faculty perceptions thereof. It will seek to improve the visibility of the academic achievement of students and of academic honor societies. The committee will work through other standing committees and administrative groups to bring about desirable change in both curriculum and public relations. It will not duplicate the functions of other standing committees. It may make recommendations to those committees as well as to the Senate and will undertake a coordinating role.~~

The Committee shall consist of seven-nine faculty members, appointed by the Steering Committee, who shall serve for staggered twothree-year ~~staggered~~ terms, including one representative each from the Undergraduate Policy, ~~Graduate Policy~~, Honors Program Policy and University Curriculum Committees. The Dean of Undergraduate Studies and Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs or their designee shall serve as ex-officio members. The Committee may invite to its meetings representatives of administrative offices and others with responsibility for implementing policies that have direct bearing on the Liberal Studies program. The Steering Committee shall appoint the chair annually from among the faculty representatives.

Commented [CM1]: COMMENT FROM ANNETTE SCHWABE: Karen and I would like to delete this. Though it might have been appropriate for establishing a division of labor between committees and to tout the program in the early phases, it does not seem necessary now. Nor is it in keeping with descriptions of other Faculty Senate standing committee.

Proposed version of Faculty Senate Library Committee bylaws

- approved January 2015 by the library committee
- submitted for Faculty Senate consideration October 2015 and vote in November 2015

The Library Committee shall consider University-wide policies on general library operations. Members of this Committee shall be appointed by the Steering Committee, with the advice and consent of the Senate, for staggered three-year terms. Each college shall have one representative; the Colleges of Education, Business, and Social Sciences and Public Policy shall each have one additional representative; and the College of Arts and Sciences shall have four additional representatives. The Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, or his or her designee, the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement, or his or her designee, the Dean of University Libraries, and the directors of the ~~Claude Pepper Library, the College of Music Allen Music Library, the College of Law Research Center, the College of Medicine Maguire Medical Library, the Harold Goldstein Library, and the Dirac Science Library, and the head of Scholars Commons.~~ shall be non-voting ex-officio members; and membership shall include a graduate student and an undergraduate student from different colleges appointed for a one-year term by the President of Student Government. The Committee shall annually elect its chairperson from the faculty representatives. The Committee will make its recommendations to the Steering Committee which will transmit the recommendations to the Senate for action.

Commented [RA1]: Not independent and no director...cut from the bylaws

Commented [CM2]: Change also to add Gloria Colvin, head of scholars commons and all library liaisons to departments