



THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
FEBRUARY 19, 2014
DODD HALL AUDITORIUM
3:35 P.M.

I. Regular Session

The regular session of the 2013-14 Faculty Senate was held on Wednesday, February 19, 2014. Faculty Senate President Gary Tyson presided.

The following members attended the Senate meeting:

J. Adams, T. Adams, J. Ahlquist, A. Askew, T. Atwood, A. Avina, H. Bass, B. Berg, B. Birmingham, R. Brower, M. Buchler, J. Carbonell, W. Carlson, E. Chicken, R. Coleman, J. Dawkins, R. Dumm, C. Edrington, K. Erndl, J. Fiorito, S. Fiorito, K. Fishburn, R. Gainsford, L. Garcia Roig, M. Gerend, J. Geringer, K. Goldsby, E. Goldsmith, J. Gomariz, M. Gross, K. Harper, C. Hofacker, C. Jackson, L. Jakubowski, M. Kapp, T. Keller, W. Landing, B. Lee, W. Leparulo, S. Lewis, S. Losh, T. Luke, C. Madsen, D. Maier-Katkin, R. Miles, D. Moore, R. Morris, M. Neal, J. Ohlin, O. Okoli, E. Peters, V. Richard Auzenne, N. Rogers, S. Rutledge, V. Salters, B. Schmidt, K. Schmitt, D. Slice, J. Sobanjo, J. Standley, N. Stein, L. Stepina, P. Sura, J. Telotte, S. Tripodi, J. Turner, G. Tyson, D. Von Glahn, E. Walker, S. Webber, W. Weissert.

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

I Alabugin, E. Aldrovandi, F. Berry, W. Deng, I Eberstein (**J. Taylor**), A. Gaiser, G. Galasko, R. Gonzalez-Rothi, T. Graban, J. Ilich-Ernst (**W. Denton**), S. Johnson, C. Kelley, Y. Kim, E. Klassen, S. Lenhert, M. Mascagni, T. McCaffrey (**C. Alexander**), R. McCullough, U. Meyer-Baese, W. Mio, S. Norrbin, J. Reynolds, J. Scholtz, O. Steinbock, B. Stults, F. Tolson, J. Tull, M. Uzendoski, O. Vafek, S. Witte.

II. Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of the January 22, 2014 meeting were approved as distributed.

III. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as distributed.

IV. Report of the Steering Committee, S. Fiorito

The Faculty Senate Steering Committee (FSSC) met two times since the last Faculty Senate meeting on January 22, 2014. Our January 29th meeting was cancelled due to the University closing for inclement weather. [Meeting dates: February 5th and 12th]

Dr. Gary Ostrander, the Vice President for Research visited with the FSSC to discuss the Policy on Authorship and Data Acquisition, Management, Sharing and Ownership. Dr.

Ostrander responded to questions we had about some of the wording and implications of the Policy, explaining the reasons for the policy and kindly answering our many questions. Dr. Ostrander indicated he would take our concerns to the Council of Research and Creativity (CRC).

Dr. Mathew Shaftel, Associate Dean for Liberal Studies, also visited with us on February 5th to talk about the online course approval process that is now in place for all course additions, changes and deletions. He has worked with Mary Eichin, Instructional Designer, with the Office of Distance Learning, and Melissa Crawford, Faculty Senate Coordinator, in the Office of Faculty Development and Advancement. Matthew discussed enrollment projections for Liberal Studies and E-Series courses. The FSSC asked to see feedback from department chairs after some of the Liberal Studies and E-Series courses have been approved and are up and running.

Our final guest at our February 5th meeting was Dr. Jennifer Koslow, Chair of the Undergraduate Policy Committee (UPC), who discussed with us the policy of when undergraduate students need to declare dual degrees. In addition, we discussed university standards for Undergraduate teaching assistants and our need to fill some open slots on the UPC.

We also discussed strengthening academic ties among ACC universities by scheduling lectures by distinguished faculty members from universities whose teams travel to FSU for a game. This idea originated last year as the “Clemson Humanities Road Scholars” program: they invited a faculty member from each visiting ACC institution to give a lecture and to attend the game as a guest of the university. FSU's representative in that first series was our Senate colleague Dennis Moore, who gave a lecture on the Friday afternoon before the FSU-Clemson game and then attended the game in the President's Box at Death Valley. Our plan for this Fall is to develop, in cooperation with Westcott's Office of Faculty Recognition, a mini-series by inviting an award-winning scholar from each of 3 universities (Clemson, Notre Dame, and Virginia) to give a lecture here on the day before FSU hosts that university's football team. If this pilot mini-series is successful, we would expand it in future years to include more universities and more sports.

At our meeting with the Provost Stokes and Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement, Dr. McRorie on February 12th we discussed the status of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) and the SACS report. Both of which are in good shape. We also discussed the Torch Awards presentation and how the FSSC was very pleased with this Award presentation being elevated in status for the award winners.

Provost Stokes brought up the Dean's Evaluation, which will begin shortly as a second round since all the Deans have now been evaluated once. Provost Stokes asked for our input regarding the evaluation instrument and participants who provide feedback.

We also discussed the role of Honors at FSU and the possibility of an Honors College as one idea. The goal is to give more opportunities for students to interact with faculty on research and higher level academic opportunities. The administration is very interested in hearing ideas that will elevate our honors program.

This concludes the FSSC minutes. Thank you.

V. Reports of Standing Committees

- a. Undergraduate Policy Committee, Jen Koslow (See addendum 1.)
 1. University-wide Teaching Standards for Undergraduate TAs

Well than you, everybody. We spent our fall semester doing a QER, and we were able to begin to really think about what the two policies in front of you would be at our January meeting and then I went and spoke with the Faculty Senate Steering Committee and then we discussed them both again at the last meeting we had just a week ago.

So the Undergraduate Policy Committee has looked at the University-wide standards for undergraduate teaching assistants at Florida State University twice. What we discussed is that this is not a document that either advocates or says or denies – it's up to each department whether they want to use undergraduate teaching assistants. This does not make any statement either advocating or not advocating for that. But what we found is that there are many departments that use this. We do have many of them come to use and ask us questions about what undergraduates can or cannot do. And since it turned out that we didn't actually have anything on file – an actual policy – many of them have been looking at the graduate teaching assistant standards for guidance, and as you can guess some of those standards don't apply to undergraduates because, for instance, undergraduates can never be the instructor on record.

So, what we decided to do is to separate the two documents so that there won't be any confusion about what undergraduates can do as opposed to what graduate students can do. The responsibility for overseeing any undergraduate teaching assistant will rest with the department and there are a few minimum guidelines that we wanted to provide. One is we want to make sure that all the students who participate in this have received training in sexual harassment, the academic honor policy, and FERPA; that they receive supervision by the instructor on record and by the administrator in charge of departmental and/or program curriculum; that they—undergraduates—participate in planned and periodic evaluations; and that they have also demonstrated successful completion of the coursework equivalent. And you'll see that on page two there are a number of different additional requirements depending on whether it's a grading assistant, a proctor, a lab section assistant, etc. Since from what you first saw, there are a few minor changes. One is that if departments have questions about what codes to assign to undergraduate TAs it should go to the Human Resources Office. And Jennifer Buchanan just pointed out to me yet another typo I made. It's been a long couple of weeks. It should say: "Resources Office will verify the requirements for each classification and is the office to contact." Under that last section where it says these codes are only to be used for undergraduate students -- we've been waiting to get back information from HR about that literally within the hour before here. So I will be adding a footnote that puts the actual codes that HR would want you to assign for an undergraduate TA. I'm trying to think of what the other question was. Academic Honor Policy training is "provided" rather than "offered." We changed the language in the sexual harassment section so that it is all consistent rather than have one

“provided” and a couple “offer.” Everything is “provided.” I’m trying to think if there were any other changes.

Tyson: They received the second.

Koslow: Ok, they received the second. So there are a number of departments that are already doing this: computer science, chemistry, I believe biology maybe too. So if you have any questions about how undergraduate TAs are used by departments – I mean generally my understanding from these departments is it’s the [honors] undergraduates who are at the most advanced level to be in a leadership position amongst their peers. It’s not ever been described to me as a method to replace either a graduate student instructor or faculty member. It’s really meant within these departments to provide students a leadership position. And so for some departments this seems very relevant. For other departments, I doubt they would ever use an undergraduate teaching assistant. Questions?

Tyson: So this came up from the UPC so it doesn’t need a motion, so let’s have a discussion period before we go to the vote on this policy.

Man: I have a question about the definition of undergraduate TA including the people who do volunteer work. We’ve got a number of our professional student organizations and our honor societies that have help sessions for our students. It seems like their work would fall under this and that I could not recommend that my students go to this unless all those people went through the appropriate training.

Koslow: If you were to recommend that students use another student for help then you are in some ways are taking responsibility for that tutoring session. And if anything were to happen at that tutoring session, if you had recommended it, you are taking responsibility. If students want to hold their own tutoring session, that’s a different story. But if in any way an instructor is authorizing or anything like that than in a sense you are --- than that student who is running that session should be aware of conflicts. If they are ever in a position where they see no conflict of interest or anything else. But it is a matter of if you tell students to go to something than you are taking responsibility in a sense.

Previous man: I am making them aware of this opportunity.

Koslow: Well, the students can make themselves aware of the opportunity. If it’s student run, it’s one thing. If it’s a faculty member who says, “I’m going to set up a help session and this student is going to run it” then you are in a sense supervising that undergraduate. So it’s a fine—

Previous man: But our honor society runs such a program all the time. And I’m happy to tell my students, “Hey this is a great- you can get some assistance here.”

Koslow: Do they take it for credit?

Questioner: No. Separate help sessions that they run on different subjects.

Koslow: Than that's different. These are all people who are employed through the University in one sort or another or getting academic credit for it.

Previous man: It says "volunteer" in the—

Koslow: Right, so there is some – like the FIGs – they're volunteers but they also get credit. So it has to cover them as well because in a sense they are supervising their peers. Does that make sense? So if someone is getting university credit—

Previous man: These guys aren't getting any credit. The people I'm thinking of.

Koslow: Then it's an ad hoc; this doesn't apply. This only applies where someone is either being hired or receives credit. So if situations where students are volunteers and they're getting credit. Does that make sense?

Tyson: So Jen can I cut in for a second? This is ultimately going to be the Senate's policy, so if you feel the need for clarifying language, propose it; we can put it in there. If it's something we have to delay until March, we'll do it even though we do not want to do too much of that. This is exactly what I want. I want a discussion of, in this case, the clarity of the policy or maybe whether this is policy that the Senate wants to endorse.

Koslow: But it is very much meant to—Oh, sorry, Jennifer.

Buchanan: Can I ask a question? Is it voluntary tutorial? Is that voluntary for the student going to get the help or is that meaning the volunteer? I'm wondering if it's just a semantics issue.

Koslow: Right. It's the person who is giving the help not the students who go to get the help.

New man: So the question is: does it say right now an undergraduate teaching assistant is an undergraduate enrolled at FSU who is either being paid by FSU or is receiving credit in an instructional role. Does it say that here? I can't see it.

Another man: It says university sponsored and/or sanctioned.

Tyson: If you can give your name when you speak.

Birmingham: Bridgett Birmingham from University Libraries. We have volunteer tutors who are not being paid or given credit. They are trained as are all the other students. They do go through all of this but they are not given credit for that.

Koslow: But they're university sponsored, right?

Birmingham: Right.

Koslow: That's the issue. Are they working in a capacity that is university sponsored? I would advocate that if they are working in a capacity where they are university sponsored, they should be aware of sexual harassment, FERPA, and all that other stuff.

Birmingham: I was just saying we have people who don't get either of those things.

Okoli: Okenwa Okoli, industrial engineering. When you say "university sponsored" that means all university organizations? For instance, manufacturing society. So if the students decide to have a session do all those things. Does it hold the University responsible for them based on that?

Koslow: If they harass somebody and they were university-sponsored then I would suspect – I'm not a lawyer – but my common sense would tell me that yes, the University probably is responsible in some way. If it's a University sponsored activity, then the University is responsible.

Okoli: Could we get some clarification on that? I'm not a lawyer.

Koslow: Yeah, I'm not a lawyer

Fishburne: Kenan Fishburn, Interior Design. It seems like what's happening here is we are trying to decide on what an undergraduate TA is which is an actual University title, correct? It's going to be used as a title for students doing certain things. Is that correct?

Koslow: It's never been defined before, but different departments have used the term.

Fishburne: My point is that you have to be very careful in defining it because it's a title. It confers something onto a student that does not just volunteer. It's very important that we all agree what this means. Really, academically as well as liability-wise.

Koslow: I mean I think just like with the graduate student assistants, there are a number of different ways that describe that. The five most common ways we saw that were reported to us as ways in which undergraduates filled these roles were: grading assistant, proctor, lab section assistant, recitation/discussion section assistant, and class tutor. So those are the five roles that we saw that were reported to us as ways in which undergraduates are functioning in some capacity as a teaching assistant. So in that way it's kind of modeled after the graduate student assistant having different gradations.

Ahlquist: I'm Jon Ahlquist, Earth, Ocean, and Atmospheric Science. I have a question about something I'm involved with [inaudible]. The students who take this class record weathercasts like they are in a TV studio. The way they do that—I've got, I don't know precisely the number, but let's say 10-20 senior undergraduate who've been through the course before. They produce a half-hour-a-day television show that airs live [inaudible] and after they are done with their half-hour show then the students who are taking the class get in and use the same graphics that were prepared for the show. None of the students who are on the show are signed up for any credit; none of them are paid anything but they're helping the students do the assignments for the class. They have no grading responsibility in that. Each day they've got a team leader. I should say that. The question is: do just the team leaders need to go through this formal training? Does every person involved in the show have to go through this training?

Koslow: Are the team leaders receiving a grade and/or credit for being team leaders?

Ahlquist: No one is getting any credit or payment. It's all volunteer.

Koslow: It would be like if you're in a class and you divided your class and some people are little section leaders in the class but you're still the instructor and you haven't given anyone...

Ahlquist: Many of these students that are team leaders have been through the class and they are not in the class any longer. And they are building up their profession with a side activity.

Koslow: Right but they have no formal role. See, this is really meant for a formal role where there is a tutor who is assigned to a class by the instructor, where there is a grading assistant assigned to the class by the instructor and/or the department. It's not for informal roles; it's for formal, University-sanctioned activities.

Ahlquist: The students taking my class, in order to do their assignments, they have to participate. It's the only way they can do it. They equipment is just too technical for them to do it on their own. [Inaudible; talking over one another].

Koslow: It doesn't apply. They're not in a formal role.

Tyson: So let me butt in for just a second. I love having the discussion. I'm wondering whether this discussion is going to be input to the committee to go back and think about it or what you're kind of pointing to now, can we tweak it so that it is going to be acceptable to a majority of the faculty here. I just want to get a feel from most of you, which direction do you think we are headed? Do you think this needs to go back for some refinement or do you think this needs to be tweaked, or I guess a third option are you happy with it the way it is? Let's do a show of hands. How many of you think this should probably go back to the UPC for some refinement?

Koslow: Ok. We need directions on that because I can tell you right now, every department has a different definition of what an undergraduate teaching assistant is. So sending us back to add in more tweaks or more --. We as a committee tried to make this as loose a document as possible so that every department could sort of define for themselves where in that gradation they were doing stuff. So if you want to make a very strict definition, we need more guidance on what that would look like.

Man: [inaudible] I wonder if you might could enumerate some examples. At least say: some examples of people [-] in this class are... And that might avoid having to offer a blanket description to cover everything.

Tyson: So let me address that with kind of a broader point. The purpose, I think, of faculty governance at the University level is to set a set of standards that are not specific to discipline. Right? You can do that at the college level or even at the unit level if necessary. It's to figure out, in this case, what's the minimum set of standards required for somebody to serve in a role. We may have to rigorously define the set of roles, and then say if you're outside of that you should have your own policy. I'm hesitant to give the example because that becomes a, "You guys should do it this way; you guys think about it this way." And really, I think, governance works best when the University level only considers things that are applicable across the entire University and then leaves room for the other units to do what they need to do to specialize.

Woman: It seems to me that the issue is the word "voluntary." I don't know if it's University-sanctioned policy or not, when I tell somebody there's an upper classman who's willing to provide some assistance. So that's the place, in my mind, where the committee could provide some guidance.

Koslow: I'm wondering if--. So the example we had in our heads when we were trying to come up with the language was FIGs. So freshman interest groups, they take the course for credit, so they are technically volunteering to take on a leadership, instructional role. So that's where we came up with "voluntary" -- not as in students organizing help sessions. It's where they are receiving credit but they are not receiving money. If that was in the document, like formal credit and/or monetary compensation?

Several voices: Yes.

Man: All those terms that are under pressure in that last sentence of the first paragraph. "Full," "volunteer." Work on that last sentence and I think we are good.

Koslow: Well it's two places, right? It's the standards -- "these standards are meant to cover the formal use of undergraduate teaching assistance whether paid or working in a"

Man: Could be credit-earning

Koslow: Credit-earning. Is “formal capacity” the right language?

Man: No. That wouldn’t apply to FIGs. Because they aren’t really quite voluntary; they are getting credit for it.

Tyson: You’re getting compensated for it. Your compensation is in the form of credit hours. So I think “compensation” is the key.

Koslow: But where would that go?

Tyson: If you don’t want to do it now, the committee can take it back. If you really would rather get it done right now-

Koslow: I think we’d rather get it done. It scares me that there are so many departments out there without a formal policy that I’d rather take the five minutes to figure out how to make the wording work now than go another month without a formal policy at this University.

Man: Whether they’re compensated or not, when we say here’s a study group, we’re implying that we know they are trustworthy.

Koslow: I think for the purposes of this document, what one person finds trustworthy might not be another person’s definition of trustworthy. Right, but that’s apparently not clear to everybody. I like your way of thinking but that’s not clear to all of the departments.

Birmingham: Bridgett Birmingham, University Libraries. I guess I’m not sure, without having it in front of me, how this relates to the HR policy already about volunteers or what paperwork you have to fill out.

Koslow: There’s no minimum standards. So we have some departments that do a lot of training and we have other departments that do no training. So again, this is just supposed to be the minimum set standards so all departments know they are supposed to do a minimum set of training for students who are in these types of positions.

Tyson: And there may very well be different policies to come. This is not a hierarchy. It’s a shared governance structure. There are some independent policies that exist here as well. We don’t have to solve all problems. We just have to express what the faculty feels should be done in these situations.

Okoli: Okenwa Okoli, industrial engineering. If we go that route, should we do away with the name TA?

Koslow: Most of the departments are using that terminology, so that’s not what the UPC is imposing; that’s how it’s been described. I don’t think it’s going to halt what people are doing across campus but hopefully it will get them coherence about the minimum that they have to do if they are going to have an undergraduate assist them in a teaching capacity.

Landing: Bill Landing, EOAS. It sounds like it's the volunteer issue that's the problem. There are all kinds of groups that do this. There's an undergraduate chemistry—there's a chemistry fraternity that does help sessions. This is all over the university, so if you specify in the bottom of the first paragraph paid or credit-earning capacity and take out voluntary wherever you see it, you cover the people who are getting credit or who are getting paid and all the volunteer activities that we've heard all these examples of are not included. And if that's acceptable, you've solved the problem. The volunteer problem is a separate problem.

Alexander: Clint Alexander with the ROTC department. This is the kinds of stuff that the army, air force, ROTC, seniors, juniors, sophomores, freshmen – every one of our people are involved in this. I think maybe what's the purpose of the policy might answer some of the question because if it's to prevent sexual harassment and adhere to strict academic honor policy and the FERPA standards, it seems like we should just give every student this at orientation and student's rights and responsibilities, you know just doing a hazing phase last year, they get this anyway. So it seems like every student should adhere to this. So what's the purpose of having the policy? If this happens tonight – a student sexually harasses a kid in one of our counselling sessions tonight, having the policy wouldn't change if that happened or not.

Koslow: Well unfortunately it kind of does. For departments that use these students that have not trained them in the issues of sexual harassment and FERPA, etc. And that's where this grew out of – a case of conflict of interest. Unfortunately it does-

Alexander: [inaudible] make me sign an academic honor code policy, make me sign that I won't sexually harass anybody, make me sign that I won't violate FERPA – done deal. 41,000 covered.

Koslow: I agree that every student should know what those are.

Tyson: I'm glad our military is so efficient.

Koslow: That is where the issue grew out of – a violation. That's when it became apparent that these are students all over the University and there's no policy to guide it and they are being used in various capacities and they aren't getting training in sexual harassment, FERPA, and the like. So that's where it came from.

Walker: Eric Walker, English. I'd like to set Professor Landing's proposed revision of the final sentence of the first paragraph –

Koslow: And then can I make a friendly amendment to that to also then change it in the second paragraph where it says “details and policies that apply to” to then change it to from the voluntary to credit-earning [-].

Several voices: Yes

Tyson: So given that Eric has seconded it we need to first vote on the amendment to this before we get back to the discussion, however, that means we are in the discussion of the amendment and if it applies to the amendment feel free to continue this discussion.

Koslow: Try and find other places where it says “voluntary.”

Man: Call the question on the amendment.

Tyson: We’ve got to—We’ve ready for discussion on the amendment first. Everybody know what the amendment is here?

Woman: Can you restate it?

Koslow: In that first paragraph let’s change that last line so it says, “These standards are meant to cover the formal use of undergraduate teaching assistants whether paid or in a credit-earning capacity in course instruction.” And then in the second paragraph, the last line would say, “The companion policy, University-wide Standards for Graduate Teaching Assistants at Florida State University, details the policies that apply to credit-earning and paid use of graduate students.” Well I guess the question is do we need that line where it says, “The term undergraduate TA used in this document should be understood to apply to all University-sponsored or sanctioned extra help sessions, tutoring, and voluntary-” Is that making things too confusing and we should just pull that out?

Many voices: Yes.

Tyson: Right. That was the proposed amendment. So the removal of that entire sentence. Any discussion? All in favor of amending the document to have those changes say, “Aye.”

All: Aye.

Tyson: All those opposed, like sign. Ok, so we are not there yet but now we have an amended document. Continue the discussion of the merits of this now amended document. Any other questions?

Ahlquist: Jon Ahlquist, Earth, Ocean, and Atmospheric Science. Very general comment that I would like to see all of these places where they are required to have sexual harassment training for it to just be harassment training. There are so many different ways to harass people, why make a difference? [talking over].

Tyson: I think we’ll take that as a friendly amendment. It certainly is just more encompassing.

Woman: I do believe that it’s protected by federal law. And that’s why it says “sexual harassment.”

Buchanan: That’s why. It’s required.

Tyson: But if we did “harassment” would that satisfy? You’d have to add explicitly “sexual harassment?” Ok, so that’s the answer. The federal government wants us to have “sexual harassment.”

Man: Based on the amendment that we discussed is there now no longer a definition of undergraduate TA [inaudible]?

Koslow: No. There is. Uh...

Tyson: Oh that one sentence is the one definition we had?

Koslow: “Should be understood to apply to formal-”

Tyson: “-to the formal use of undergraduate teaching assistants whether paid or unpaid.” So no, there is not. So we go with the conventional use of the term, I guess. So the answer is no, and I’m not sure that isn’t the right thing to do.

Koslow: I mean that is—“the formal use of undergraduate teaching assistants whether paid or unpaid in a credit-earning capacity” – is the description

Tyson: It doesn’t define undergraduate teaching assistants but I don’t know we need to [-]. Ok, other questions?

Alexander: Clint Alexander, ROTC. When this is finalized and we all do it and approve is there a “no later than” that [-]. When do all of these people get certified for like next academic year? Is it prior to the start of the school year or sort of a “within 90 days of assuming the position as the tutor?”

Tyson: I would say policy cannot retroactively apply to the semester, so I would say this begins in the summer semester.

Koslow: The next bulletin. So when it goes into bulletin then it becomes...

Tyson: So just make sure that’s in the notes. I think if we believe in the policy we should implement it. Unless we can’t disseminate the policy. When’s the next...?

Several voices: Fall

Tyson: Yah, I guess we should start it in the fall then. Alright, let’s start it in the fall.

Man: [inaudible] How quickly do people need to be trained?

Koslow: It would take effect with the next bulletin which would be fall, 2014.
Previous man: So if you hire a TA in the fall do they have to be trained before classes start?

Tyson: Yes, that's the case now. That's the case with graduate TAs. So it would fall in the same way if does with graduate TAs. Other questions?

Man: I'm just wondering if it wouldn't make sense to send it back [inaudible]. I know you want to get it done today.

Koslow: Well there's only three words changed—I could put it up here—and one sentence removed.

Woman: Jen, you could still send it out to all of us. I mean we can still vote, but then send it out.

Koslow: So it's "credit-earning," "credit-earning," and then that's the line that turns to that. Does that make sense to everybody?

Tyson: Ok, other questions?

Birmingham: Bridget Birmingham, undergraduate research, University Libraries. Where is the training on how to identify and handle situations of potential conflicts of interest. Are there some examples of that across campus?

Koslow: Well the examples we talked about are we shouldn't be grading a roommate; you shouldn't be grading your girlfriend, boyfriend. And again, that may all seem like common sense to us but apparently it is not common sense to all undergraduates.

Birmingham: Yah. I could come up with a million of those. I was just wondering if there was some outline or framing. For instance, FERPA and sexual harassment are already created. There was some framing about some conflict of interest for undergraduates."

Koslow: We could certainly add some examples, but that is essentially- it's honestly what is common sense to us as faculty members. It's apparently not common sense to undergraduates.

Tyson: We've actually addressed this same issue of conflict of interest in faculty policies as well. And when we've had the chance to do it we've tried to be vague, and I have a feeling that we'd probably end up in the same situation here. To me that is not a big problem to have that in there and to apply common sense. Even in the training we are not going to go for much beyond some "here are some examples."

Koslow: if it's not on the list we run the risk of someone saying, "Well, it wasn't on the list so I guess it's not common sense to not grade my cousin" or something like that.

Man: One situation that might apply to the undergraduate that might not with the graduate would be things like fraternities and sororities.

Tyson: Right. That's certainly on our list of conflicts of interest.

Koslow: Again, that would fall under common sense. If someone is your quote "brother" you probably shouldn't be marking their paper.

Tyson: Other questions?

Koslow: And I thank you for working with me to try and get this done today. It just makes me very nervous that we don't have this.

Tyson: So I call for a vote. All in favor of approving this amended policy say, "Aye."

Many voices: "Aye."

Tyson: All opposed, like sign.

One voice: No

Tyson: Ok the "aye's" have it.

2. Dual Degrees and Double Majors

Koslow: Ok so the second question has to do with... So it came to our attention that - so the way in which undergraduates now function is if they take excess credit - if they declare a second major and they do not complete it - they get charged a huge bill because of the excess credit hour rule. So this was brought to us as an issue that students were waiting until the minutes before they were finishing school to pursue a double major not realizing that if they didn't finish it that they would incur this enormous debt. So the goal is to come up with something where students would basically have to sit down with somebody and say this is what I plan to do, and someone could talk through that; "If you do not finish this you do understand that this is going to be the bill you are going to incur." It's not meant to prevent students from pursuing a dual degree or double major at all but it's meant to provide some guidance to that process in an administrative way.

Many: Why do they get this huge bill if they don't complete it?

Mumbled voices: State law.

Moore: Jen, I'd like to volunteer a very friendly amendment and it's not about grammar. Right in the middle of that paragraph it refers to petitioning your academic dean. It sounds as if - if only in the spirit of interdisciplinary... It's possible that a student would decide to major in two different departments within a particular college, but it seems just as possible that a student might want to double major in, say, music and modern languages or something like that. I wonder about putting "s" there so it's dean or deans.

Tyson: So the reason this is not a grammatical correction is that it's really a policy correction. If a student is already in a major in one college and they choose to be a major in another, do we want both deans to be notified? Or do we want the first dean to approve or the second dean to approve or both?

Barber: For those of you who don't know me I'm Kim Barber, the University Registrar. Let me just address the point of academic policy and procedure as it's illustrated and functions right now on campus. In the case where a student is pursuing either a double major or double degrees, the student has a primary major that has been designated and that is the dean who has the authority to do all those things that deans have – approval or waiver or petition [-]. So if a student were attempting to declare a double major and the first major is in Arts and Sciences and the second major is in Engineering, if Arts and Sciences is the primary major for that student, then the Arts and Sciences dean would be the one meeting with the student and counseling them in this situation. If a student is attempting to pursue two degrees – and let me just note to you that students do not understand the difference between double majors and degrees – If a student is attempting to do a degree in modern language and a degree in engineering, the student must satisfy the requirements of each degree program and each dean would have a say in what is relevant to their particular degree. One of those is still primary from the standpoint of where do they start and that is whatever is listed first for that student by default.

Moore: So then would the friendly amendment be to say: “petition their primary academic dean.” I was suggesting [inaudible] make it as flexible and broad as you were [-].

Man: how about the “appropriate dean?”

Koslow: It's got to be their primary, right? If the primary says no, they can't. Right? That's the way it's practiced now.

Carlson: Woody Carlson, Sociology. So that means the primary dean has veto power over what the student can choose to go on to?

Koslow: That's the way we are functioning now.

Carlson: So you can't double major?

Barber: In the case of a double major, the primary dean would be the only dean if both majors are in the same college.

Carlson: But if they're not?

Barber: But if they're not, the primary dean is the controlling dean for both majors because the student is getting one degree offered by that one college and which the second major is—

Man: Does the dean prevent them from taking courses in other colleges

Barber: As a general operating rule they don't do that. It's a matter of proper advisement, so they understand what the student is getting into and what their time till degree completion is and what the potential cost of that is. But as a general rule they don't tell them, "You cannot take these classes" unless a student doesn't need prerequisites, access requirements, and all these other things they have to satisfy.

Maier-Katkin: Dan Maier-Katkin, Criminology. I really have a question for the registrar. Do I understand, and this is only loosely connected, that if a student got a dual degree in two different colleges that only the first department is credited with having that student as a major.

Barber: That would not be correct. Both colleges would get credit for having that student. Because with a dual-degree you have two majors pursuing-

Maier-Katkin: How about with a double major?

Barber: The degree completion will be created with the attributed to the college for which the degree was awarded but the department in which the student took additional coursework for that second major would earn credit, FTE, and so on for those courses which that student was enrolled.

Barber: The number of students they have would be reflected if you were only looking at the number of majors in this college

Barber: Both departments would be credited with having that student as a major. It would depend on the nature of the research question or data questions being posed as to whether or not you are looking at degree completion or if whether you're looking at just headcount of majors or credit hours generated by major. Anything that came down to major level, both departments would get credit for that.

Tyson: So Kim, I'm pretty sure you're not going to be standing up here giving an update on Campus Solutions. I do have a question for you. Let's say the Senate wanted to change the policy to require to have both of the deans approve of the declaration of the second major after 90 hours. The system doesn't really have it set up nicely. Would it be possible to enable that policy to be implemented?

Barber: Yes. It would require changing the other policy that dictates who the primary dean is in the case of double majors, and the requirement satisfaction has to occur for double majors to be signed off on that. So there would have to be an additional policy change that would have to accompany that if you were to say both deans in those cases where majors are split across multiple colleges.

Buchanan: The group that actually recommend that this be looked at by the UPC, and it had academic and associate deans, really saw this as something that would encourage students to notify someone who knows what they're doing, get advising, etc. Their sense was that really it would be a very liberal

policy and that they – and they would be the ones making those decisions on behalf of their dean – would be very liberal so the student can complete the two majors. There is no way they would say no to that. That’s why that sentence is in there. If you get to the end of the whole training there and you have two majors you have to go to your dean and talk about it.

Tyson: Yah, I expect that there will be a fairly liberal policy. We can’t tell a student they can’t do it when they have a very good reason not to do it. The only question left is do you want to have both deans involved in that or just one.

Buchanan: I think the people in that group would probably say no because it’s extra work for that other dean’s office. You’ve already taken those classes. It’s not a matter of giving you permission to do it. I think they would say unnecessary.

Koslow: Right. I think the goal here is not to prevent students from – if they’re a philosophy major and they take a history class and want to pursue that dream of being a dual major. That’s not an issue. Or they suddenly find that they want to do something outside of music. I can’t imagine – it’s hard to picture what students are going to be getting dual degrees in. But it’s not supposed to stifle them. It’s supposed to make sure they sit down and know –not through any of FSU’s doing; this is the state legislature that made the decision about the excess credit—and understand that if they do not complete that dual degree or the dual major, what the price tag of that is. That’s unfortunate, but it’s something that needs to be conveyed to the students.

Man: [inaudible]. I assume from the way it’s worded now that if a student has two majors—a dual degree—that the state required 100% surcharge would kick in even if they have a double major. If they complete it, they will get a refund. Is that the way it works?

Koslow: That’s my understanding. Kim is nodding her head so that’s correct. Yes. Correct.

Tyson: And I believe that is the primary reason for having them have to go to their dean if they’re doing this very late in their career. My concern when I saw this was the other reason that I thought potentially that we have four year graduation rate as one of the criteria that we need to meet and a student doing a double major may miss that. So I was concerned that the deans may not have a liberal policy on it but it seems like they are intending to have-

Buchanan: They just want them to tell them earlier

Tyson: So my concern about that was abated.

Man: So if that’s the purpose, should we—like would this appear as a paragraph [inaudible].

Several voices: Yes.

Previous man: So maybe we should say explicitly that students need to be aware – do out of state students have a tuition to pick up?

Koslow: But I think that is somewhere else in the bulletin.

Previous man: Have something there that explicitly says you will still have to pay the surcharge. If you complete the second degree, you will receive a refund. If you do not complete the second degree, you must pay [inaudible].

Koslow: Right. That's the last line. "The student will not be eligible for refund, excess credit, charges--"

Previous man: But it doesn't tell them that they will still have to pay...

Koslow: I think that's elsewhere in the bulletin.

Moore: Gary, I liked your question about whether or not we should allow the possibility of both deans have to weigh in or be included. It sounds like for practical reasons that would [be a problem]. So if we are going to continue the way that the registrar has just explained, I think for clarification for the student I think we should use the word "primary."

Tyson: Primary academic dean. How about that in place of "deans." Any other questions? Call for vote. All those in favor of this policy as amended say, "Aye."

All: "Aye"

Tyson: All opposed, like sign. Ok.

Koslow: Thank you.

- b. Graduate Policy Committee, Lee Stepina (See addendum 2.)
 - 1. University-wide Teaching Standards for Graduate TAs

I'm glad Jen got to go first. Hopefully she's worn you out to the point that we can just cruise through these. These are – as she mentioned—what we decided to do. We had a meeting with the Dean of Graduate Studies, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, with Sally, and Jen, and I. We decided that rather than trying to make one policy for grad and undergrad teaching that we should split them up. What you see in front of you on the University Standards for Graduate Teaching, you can see there is not much change in there. There are places where it is vague and it specifically refers to graduate students. There is some additional detail in terms of the requirements for each level but there is not a whole lot new in the standards. Any questions?

Tyson: So since this came from the GPC, it does not need to be motioned or seconded. We're talking about the University Wide Teaching Standards for

Graduate TAs as distributed. Any comments on that before we take it to the vote?

Lewis: Sandy Lewis from education. It appears on page 2. It refers to the companion policy in the second paragraph in blue. That applies to voluntary and payees of undergraduates as teaching assistants. So we probably need to take out the voluntary piece.

Tyson: Well the whole thing applies to graduate students at this point. Take out the whole thing. Friendly amendment to remove that? Other questions? Yes.

Slice: Dennis Slice, scientific computing. What's the procedure for [inaudible]. There's a "which" instead of a "that."

Tyson: Which "that" – no which "which" do you want to take out?

Slice: "Programs which do not use"

Tyson: Do we need someone from English on the GPC? Other questions? I call to vote. All those in favor of the amended policy say, "Aye."

All: Aye

Tyson: All those opposed, like sign. It passes. The next one.

2. Dual Enrollment Policy

Stepina: The next one. This is a Dual enrollment policy, and the issue here is that there are some departments around the University where people are working on their degree and they take some additional classes in another area and they take some more additional classes. And all of a sudden they are applying to their secondary program with 30 hours of credit. The idea here is to make sure people have good advising, good plans of study, and that people, with the exception of the graduate dean, could accept more hours of credit. The idea is 12 hours of credit, somebody is not going to be doing another degree full time, so that's probably as many as four semesters. The idea, again, is – going to one of our metrics – completion rates in programs. And doctoral students occasionally take quite a while to get done. We want to keep people focused and, make sure as it says in the policy, that people are getting good advising. Questions?

Slice: Slice from scientific computing. So we're talking about the dual enrollment. I understand the motivation part but the wording it says "must be approved before the completion of 12 hours." It implies that if you miss that, you're not allowed to [-]. So perhaps you should have an exception in it, "by exception of the dean" [-] the undergraduate policy.

Someone: I'm fine with that.

Stepina: It's implicit. Nancy?

Man: This says is must be approved before a student completes 12 hours. Implying that if you don't, you're never going to be approved whereas the undergraduate statement for dual majors says with appeal for exception from someone.

Stepina: Right now, the way it works is that people who are doing dual degrees have to be approved both programs and a form goes to the Dean of Graduate Studies who then approves it.

Tyson: We could add that.

Moore: It might be easier for the University to follow this suggestion if we had that paragraph. Would it be possible – again this would be similar language. That last sentence [inaudible] I wonder if you could simply delete that last sentence.

Tyson: This one here? Well that wouldn't apply to graduate students.

Moore: Exactly. I'm not saying just use this paragraph but take wording from this paragraph.

Tyson: It would be nice to have consistent policy between the UPC and GPC on this. It really is addressing some of the same issues. Comments on that?

Man: I'd like to go back to the comment about the 12 hours. It doesn't just say 12 hours period. It says 12 hours counted toward second degree. It doesn't just say 12 hours; it says if you want to go for that second degree you can bring in 12 hours before you apply.

Tyson: So it's not constrained as to when you do it.

Previous man: If you bring in 18 or 21 hours before you apply to the department for admission then you have to get special permission from the graduate dean to bring in the rest of those hours. Because you're late. You should have been doing that earlier.

Stepina: We discussed this at length and then went back and forth about how many hours would be appropriate.

Tyson: So we have two different approaches here, I think. One is to count hours towards the second degree as the standard and the other is to count hours completed so far like we did with the undergraduate policy. Is there a feeling in the Senate about which of those approaches makes more sense?

Man: My argument would be that credits towards the second degree and that it would be treated similar to the policy for non-degree seeking students in terms of how many credits they are allowed to carry into their degree before they enter a degree program.

Stepina: That was our model for what we are doing here.

Tyson: Tom?

Tom: What if we took the middle sentence out of the undergraduate policy and tacked it onto the end of this policy?

Tyson: So which sentence?

Tom: The “in special circumstances”

Tyson: Take this sentence and stick it somewhere in the long one?

Tom: Put it on the end.

Tyson: So that’s not a bad idea. My preference would be to get something closer to the undergrad – something concisely stated. If that’s what we want to do which is kind of what you suggested. Take something from the graduate one and put it in the undergraduate one and make it graduate. We could go either way. I think this is a good discussion to have. So I think part of this discussion would be who handles exemptions. In the undergraduate policy we have some discussion about it but we said ultimately it was the primary academic dean. A single dean can handle this. Then if you look at the graduate one it’s both academic deans and the Dean of the Graduate School. So now we’ve got potentially three deans involved. Do we really want to have a policy where we think a dean is fine at the undergraduate level but we think three deans need to be involved at the graduate level? I’m just worried about the consistency of the two.

Woman: At the graduate level, University policy is that graduate students are admitted to the University in one, single specific program. Any time they choose to go to another program either changing or adding on, they have to go through the department of admissions procedure for that, and that’s where the second dean gets involved. That’s why it differs at the undergraduate level because there is no additional admissions requirement in the undergraduate level that is required at the graduate level.

Woman: [inaudible] I’m in favor of the approach the GPC has taken. We have a lot of students getting dual degrees and I don’t want to specify at what point they can do that but this makes sense to me to make sure that they are admitted before they spend a lot of money taking credits that then are not going to be able to use. It makes a lot of sense to me the way the GPC did it.

Fishburne: Kenan Fishburne, Interior Design. I actually feel the same way. I feel like the graduate policy is quite different from the undergraduate and should be.

Erndl: Kathleen Erndl, religion. I agree with both of these comments. The graduate procedure is different enough from the undergraduate degree to require a different kind of policy. And I find that the way it’s written here.

There are always going to be exceptions that can be petitioned for and I don't think these possible exceptions need to be included in this policy statement.

Lewis: Sandy Lewis. This came to my attention when people were being denied a second degree even though the second degree people were happy with it, so maybe having that stated in the policy might be appropriate.

Tyson: So that goes back to Todd's suggestion. Yes?

Man: I would argue that [inaudible]

Tyson: As amended that would require potentially two academic deans and the Dean of the Graduate School to all approve, and if any one of them said no, then it's no. Is that what we want to do? To go to Sandy's point I think we had that similar situation where we had a disagreement in administrators about whether this is an exception that should be warranted or not. So we are saying that any of those academic deans or the Dean of the Graduate School has the ability to veto or deny a request for dual majors.

Robert: I don't see why anyone but the new dean would have to give permission. I agree with Todd's suggestion that only new dean approves. That is good enough for me.

Tyson: Questions on that?

Woman: To clarify, part of this is to make sure students are making academic progress. If the program they are actually in is not aware that they are actually in the pursuit of another degree; that is problematic.

Stepina: The current system now is that technically all three deans have to ok that.

Okoli: We have a student who is in industrial engineering who decided to go to physics.

Stepina: I think everybody – the primary dean/unit needs to know, the secondary unit needs to know.

Man: What degrees are we talking about? [inaudible] complete two dissertations...

Stepina: Usually – a common example of this is someone who is getting a Ph.D. in something and they decide to do an educational major or statistics. That would be an example. Generally it would be someone getting a Ph.D. and then they would get a Master's.

Previous man: My second question would be is the primary degree funding the secondary degree?

Stepina: That department is going to know that that student is applying to another department and that would be something that the department would make a decision about.

Previous man: The reason I am saying this is that if the primary department is funding the secondary degree, the primary dean should be the one calling the shots.

Tyson: Can I interrupt for a second? It's 5:00. We're at item 4. I think we are not finding a quick resolution for this one, so I'm sorry but I think in your case – I'll ask you guys – I think it should probably go back to the GPC.

Stepina: Essentially is what I'm hearing is that we want to stick the sentence from the undergraduate policy in? Or something more than that? Or something less than that?

Schmitt: Karla Schmitt from nursing. In the sense of whether it needs to go back, can't we just have a few people go one way or the other to get a sense from our peers rather than take it back? We've already spent months on this one.

Tyson: Let me get a feel from the people here if they feel like they have enough information to actually make a good decision. How many of you would like to see this called for question? Raise your hand. How many of you would like to see this go back to the committee and be worked on? Ok let's go on to question. Any other comments?

Slice: I'd like to suggest – Slice, scientific computing – 12 credit hours of course work that are counted in the department. Is "are counted in the department" by the student or program? There are lots of ways [-]. I think it should say "could be counted." [inaudible talk] They certainly can't get the degree if they don't count. These are courses that would count for a second degree if they were allowed to take they do count. This says they "are counted," so it should say "they could be counted." But it doesn't mean that they definitely, automatically are.

Stepina: I'm good with that.

Man: That actually might cause a problem. You can imagine two degree programs where they have substantial overlap and they don't intend to use it for the second degree but they could use it for the second degree. So they absolutely are prohibited from doing that second degree under that policy. Because it's a "could be" instead of a "they are doing it."

Woman: Can I address that. A policy already exists which addresses the majority of that in the programs. In some cases degrees were denied because there was too much overlap when the majors fall in the same degree program and the policy already exists to not allow that in those cases.

Tyson: So you're saying they could not be even though they are a portion of that because of this additional policy? [talking over each other]. So that overlap policy is turning things that if you look on the book at the second degree program without looking at the first, would fall under "could be" but because of that policy, no longer fall under "could be" because you can't allow that many credits to transfer.

Previous woman: Correct

Tyson: I don't like policy relying on other policy not changing, but I think in this case--. So why don't we do this: Todd you have a proposal that seems to be favorable to take a line from the dual-degrees to allow academic deans to have an exemption and apply that to the graduate policy. Do I have a second on that proposal? There is a second on that. Are there any questions?

Moore: With that word primary being inserted for the undergraduate version – is that having meaning at the graduate level?

Tyson: No. So we don't need "primary" in there. So amended to remove "primary." Other comments or questions on that? Ok I move a vote to amend the Graduate Policy Committee to include the sentence from the undergraduate policy committee and insert it probably at the end of paragraph two, I guess. Right here after "registration" to then say, "In special circumstances, students may petition their academic dean –or deans I suppose –for an exception." All in favor say, "Aye." All opposed, like sign. That amendment is passed. Now – we're not done – we have to pass or not pass the policy. So with that amendment we are saying that the academic deans and the Dean of the Graduate School all have the ability to deny the establishment of a second degree program after a certain point in time. Any questions on that? It's after 5. All in favor of that policy say, "Aye."

Many voices: Aye

Tyson: All opposed, like sign.

Two voices: No

Tyson: That's two. It passes.

VI. Old Business

There were no items of old business.

VII. New Business

There were no items of old business.

VIII. University Welfare

a. United Faculty of Florida Update, J. Proffitt

Jennifer Proffitt, UFF-FSU president and associate professor in communication. I'll be really brief because we've run out of time. I'll be happy to send my report to Faculty Senate President Tyson if that's ok with all of you. (See addendum 3.)

b. 25 for 25 Update, D. Maier-Katkin

I won't take long. I do want to say a couple of words about 25 for 25 campaign which is continuing even after the changed circumstances of the University. In particular the part of the campaign that we are getting ready to kick off is the campaign to support the library. I brought some things which we don't have to circulate now. I wanted you to see that when you get books from the library from now on there will be things about the campaign. There will be posters and flyers like this, and we are very much hoping that members of the Faculty Senate will take on the responsibility of making their colleagues and departments and colleges aware that there is a faculty/staff campaign for the library on the way. So we have prepared a list of talking points just that you have something to start from when you talk to your colleagues about the fact that they are trying to do something on behalf of the library. And all I want to do is circulate these. So I'll walk along here and pass them out.

IX. Announcements by Deans and Other Administrative Officers

There were no announcements by Deans or Other Administrative Officers.

X. Announcements by Provost Stokes

Well this is a pretty tough thing to do today. We are after 5:00 and I am going to be pretty quick, but I did want to get up here. I'm sure you've hear a little bit, perhaps from Gary Tyson, about the timing of the presidential search but I wanted to be sure that I told you myself that the Board of Trustees meet today. They plan to name an interim during the regular Board of Trustees meeting on March 7th. President Barron will complete his term as president on April 2nd. The feeling was that we really needed to get through our SACS reclamation process, and that was really crucial to the decision about the timing. There will be a presidential search website – a lot of input from the campus community in the process. So you'll get a lot more information about that going forward. I did want to mention SACS and the QEP. Mainly because when I looked at my calendar to see when the next Faculty Senate meeting is going to be, we at Florida State will be hosting the Board of Governors here in Tallahassee on the day of the next Senate meeting which is the week before the SACS site visit team is actually on our campus. I wanted to be sure that all of you were all aware that we are spending a great deal of time making sure that the community knows what the QEP is – Think FSU: critical thinking in the disciplines – and that we are all really ready for the SACS site visit team to be on campus the week of March 24th. We are doing a search for the Director of Successful Longevity. Art Crammer from Illinois Urbana-Champaign is going to be on campus tomorrow and Friday. This crosses many college lines and is one of the Big Ideas that we're seeing move forward. We're delighted to have him here. He will speak at 4:00 about the institute itself and his vision for successful longevity in Turnbull on

Thursday. He'll do a research talk in the psychology auditorium on Friday afternoon. And that announcement has gone out to all faculty. I hope you've seen it. I know many of you are visiting with faculty hiring initiatives. It's a crazy time for interviews. Some of you are probably not getting much sleep lately. The legislative session starts on March 4th. We do expect a lot relating to performance funding and perhaps related to preeminence [plus-ups?]. So we are really hoping for a successful legislative session although there are a lot of politics, you know that. It's an election year, so it will be interesting time for us to watch. And I know you got my announcement about doing some meetings with various constituency groups about interdisciplinary teaching or research on campus. I do hope you'll be participating in that. We're going to gather a lot of feedback over this term, my group will do a report over the summer, and then we'll have town hall meetings in the fall to really tackle this important issue for Florida State. That's it. I hope that was short enough. And thank you very much for all that you do.

XI. Announcements by President Barron

President Barron was not in attendance.

XII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.



Melissa Crawford
Faculty Senate Coordinator

UNDERGRADUATE POLICY COMMITTEE

University-wide Standards for Undergraduate Teaching Assistants at Florida State University

These are University-wide standards that any undergraduate student must meet prior to assuming one of the various instructional roles. These are meant to be university-wide minimum standards; departments may adopt additional or more stringent standards. Programs that do not use undergraduate students in instructional roles would not be affected by these standards. These standards are meant to cover the formal use of undergraduate teaching assistants, whether paid or working in a volunteer capacity, in course instruction.

As a general rule, undergraduate TAs should not engage in grading the work of their peers when grading requires subjectivity. The term "Undergraduate TA" used in this document shall be understood to apply to University-sponsored and/or sanctioned extra-help sessions, tutoring, and voluntary tutorials offered in addition to regular class meetings and other forms of peer instruction. The companion policy, University-wide Standards for Graduate Teaching Assistants at Florida State University details the policies that apply to the voluntary and paid use of graduate students as teaching assistants.

General:

Administrative responsibility for the teaching assignment rests within the department or program in which the student is employed as an undergraduate teaching assistant (UgTA). Each department is responsible for providing orientation, training, supervision, and evaluation of its UgTAs, and for assigning a faculty member to work closely with the individual undergraduate student to assist him or her in carrying out teaching responsibilities and to facilitate professional development. There should be a departmental orientation for UgTAs prior to beginning their teaching responsibilities. Departments must also ensure that all UgTAs receive training about sexual harassment, FERPA, the Academic Honor Policy, and how to identify and handle situations of potential conflicts of interest.

It is recommended that each program have a discipline-specific teaching manual for its undergraduate teaching assistants to supplement the university teaching manual, *Instruction at FSU*, which can be viewed on line (<http://distance.fsu.edu/instructors/instruction-fsu-guide-teaching-learning-practices>)

Undergraduate Assistantship Job Code:

To monitor compliance with university policies and Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) requirements, it is imperative that the proper appointment classifications be used for undergraduate teaching assistants. It is the responsibility of departments that employ undergraduate teaching assistants to establish the appropriate job code according to teaching responsibility. The Human Resources Office will verify the requirements for each classification and are the offices to contact if there are any questions. Job codes can be accessed at:

Approved by the UPC on 2/12/2014

http://hr.fsu.edu/PDF/Forms/compensation/NRA_Job_Codes.pdf These codes are only to be used for undergraduate students.

Minimum Requirements for Different Types of Roles (provided face-to-face or online):

All students must:

1. attend training on Sexual Harassment, the Academic Honor Policy and the Federal Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)
2. receive supervision by the instructor of record and by the administrator in charge of departmental and/or program curriculum.
3. participate in planned and periodic evaluations of the teaching assistant
4. demonstrate successful completion of the course or equivalent

In addition:

A. *Grading Assistant*

- must follow program specific guidelines for grading
- should be an undergraduate majoring in the discipline or related field

B. *Proctor for Computerized Exams and Laboratories*

- must follow program specific instruction on proctoring exams and laboratories
- should be an undergraduate majoring in the discipline or related field

C. *Lab section assistant*

- must follow program specific instruction in laboratory demonstration
- should be an undergraduate majoring in the discipline or related field

D *Recitation/discussion section assistant*

- should be an undergraduate majoring in the discipline or related field

E. *Class Tutor*

- must demonstrate successful completion of the course or equivalent

Sexual Harassment, Academic Honor Policy and FERPA Policies and Equivalency:

University policy on sexual harassment training is provided by the Office of Equal Opportunity and Compliance (EOC) within Human Resources (<http://www.hr.fsu.edu>), the Academic Honor Policy training is provided by the Office of the Vice President of Faculty Development and Advancement (<http://fda.fsu.edu/>) and the Dean of Students Department, and the FERPA training is provided by the Office of the University Registrar (<http://registrar.fsu.edu/>).

Certification of Spoken English for Undergraduate Teaching Assistants:

Departments who choose to employ international undergraduate students who are not native speakers of English as UgTAs must certify the student's ability to communicate in spoken English using either the SPEAK exam or the speaking portion of the IBTOEFL. A score of 50 or higher on the SPEAK test, or 26 or higher on the speaking portion of the IBTOEFL, certifies a student to teach at any level. A score of 45 on SPEAK, or 23-24 on the Speaking section of

Approved by the UPC on 2/12/2014

TOEFL iBT, certifies a student to teach at levels 1 & 2. The Center for Intensive English Studies (CIES) offers courses in Spoken English (EAP courses.) CIES also administers and scores the SPEAK test. For more information, please see www.cies.fsu.edu. Departments must send documentation regarding those UgTAs it has certified in English competency to the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement.1/28/

Dual Degrees and Double Majors

Dual degrees and double majors must be declared by the end of the semester in which a student will earn 90 cumulative credit hours toward their degree program at Florida State University. In special circumstances, students may petition their academic dean for an exception. If a dual degree or double major is declared, but not completed, the student will not be eligible for a refund of excess credit charges accrued while working on their dual degree or double major.

GRADUATE POLICY COMMITTEE

Dual Enrollment Policy

The language below is from the Graduate Bulletin on p. 67. It is in two contiguous sections. The highlighted text is the proposed additional new language. It will follow the text as noted.

Under certain special circumstances it is possible for a student to work on two degrees in two different departments at the same time. Students intending to do this must be accepted by both departments. A Dual Enrollment Request Form showing endorsement by both department heads and dean(s), as appropriate, must be sent to the Dean of The Graduate School for approval. Once approved, the Office of the University Registrar will be notified of the dual registration.

Note: Initial admission to a graduate program at Florida State University must be to one program only. After the first semester, the student may apply and be accepted to the second degree program desired.

Dual Degrees are two degrees earned simultaneously when a student is accepted by both a department/programs and is approved by appropriate deans and the Dean of The Graduate School. A student must be admitted to one academic program initially, and after the first semester, may apply and be accepted to the second degree program. There is no formal relationship between the two degree program requirements in a dual degree situation.

To ensure that students entering a second graduate degree program receive timely and effective advisement on a program of study approved by the second department, admission to the second graduate degree program must be approved before the student completes more than twelve credit-hours of coursework that are counted in that department toward the second graduate degree.

This limit of 12 credits earned only applies to students admitted to their first graduate degree program in the Fall 2014 semester and onwards.

Approved by GPC on 3/28/11; Revised 09/23/11 to reflect procedural change; Additional revisions approved by GPC 11/21/12 and subsequently approved by Faculty Senate 12/5/12; grammatical corrections 1/16/13; [revisions approved by GPC 10/21/13](#)

University-wide Standards for [Graduate](#) Teaching Assistants at Florida State University

These are University-wide standards that any [graduate](#) student must meet prior to assuming one of the various instructional roles. These are meant to be university-wide minimum standards; departments may adopt additional or more stringent standards. ~~Graduate p~~Programs which do not use graduate students in instructional roles would not be affected by these standards. They are meant to cover the formal use of [graduate](#) teaching assistants in course instruction. Extra help sessions and voluntary tutorials in addition to regular class meetings would not normally fall under these requirements. [The companion policy, University-wide Standards for Undergraduate Teaching Assistants at Florida State University details the policies that apply to the voluntary and paid use of undergraduates as teaching assistants.](#)

Certification of General Teaching Competence:

Each semester in accordance with guidelines of the Commission on Colleges (SACS) and the standards outlined in the following sections, the Academic Dean of each College is required to certify in writing to the Vice President of Faculty Development and Advancement and the Dean of The Graduate School that each [graduate](#) student who serves as a [graduate](#) teaching assistant (TA) in the classroom or online is competent to teach and for international [graduate](#) teaching assistants (ITA) that they are also competent to teach in spoken English. (SACS statement see below)

General:

Administrative responsibility for the teaching assignment rests within the department in which the student is employed as a [graduate](#) teaching assistant (TA). Each department is responsible for providing orientation, training, supervision and evaluation of its graduate student TAs, and for assigning a faculty member to work closely with the individual graduate student to assist him or her in carrying out teaching responsibilities and to facilitate professional development. There should be a departmental orientation for TAs prior to beginning their teaching responsibilities. It is also recommended that all TAs attend the fall orientation program sponsored by the Program for Instructional Excellence (PIE) before beginning their teaching responsibilities.

It is recommended that each program have a discipline-specific teaching manual for its [graduate](#) teaching assistants to supplement the university teaching manual, *Instruction at FSU* which can be viewed on line (<http://distance.fsu.edu/instructors/instruction-fsu-guide-teaching-learning-practices>)(<http://learningforlife.fsu.edu/ctl/explore/onlineresources/I@FSU.cfm>).

Graduate Assistantship Job Code:

To monitor compliance with university policies and Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) requirements, it is imperative that the proper appointment classifications be used for [graduate](#) teaching assistants. It is the responsibility of departments that employ graduate teaching assistants to establish the appropriate job code according to teaching responsibility. The

Approved by GPC on 3/28/11; Revised 09/23/11 to reflect procedural change; Additional revisions approved by GPC 11/21/12 and subsequently approved by Faculty Senate 12/5/12; grammatical corrections 1/16/13; [revisions approved by GPC 10/21/13](#)

Graduate School and the Human Resources Office will verify the requirements for each classification and are the offices to contact if there are any questions. Job codes can be accessed: http://hr.fsu.edu/PDF/Forms/compensation/NRA_Job_Codes.pdf These codes are only to be used for graduate students.

As a general rule:

Levels 1-4

W9185 Graduate Assistant (Teaching) - Stipend (FLSA Exempt)

This Graduate Assistant shall be classified as a degree-seeking graduate student who assists in the teaching function, but does NOT have primary responsibility for teaching. The appointee must be fully admitted to and meet the requirements of the University, be fully admitted to a graduate degree program, and be under the supervision of a faculty member. EXAMPLES: Graders, tutors, recitation leaders, lab supervisors, assistant to faculty instructor.

Levels 5-7

M9184 Graduate Teaching Assistant – Stipend (FLSA Exempt)

This Graduate Teaching Assistant shall be classified as a degree-seeking graduate student who has a master's degree in the teaching discipline or 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline and performs primary teaching duties that are related to that student's academic program. The appointee must be admitted to and meet the requirements of the University, be fully admitted to a graduate degree program, and be under the supervision of an appropriate faculty member. EXAMPLE: A graduate student having full instructional responsibilities for a credit class.

Minimum Requirements for Different Levels of Instruction (provided face-to-face or online):

1. *Grader*

- [program specific guidelines for grading](#)
- [undergraduate degree in discipline or related field](#)
- [some graduate work completed or enrolled in](#)
- [attend training on Sexual Harassment, Academic Honor Policy and the Federal Educational Rights and Privacy Act \(FERPA\)](#)
- [supervision by a faculty member in the teaching discipline](#)
- [planned and periodic evaluations of the teaching assistant](#) ~~-a program specific statement of standards for graders~~

2. *Proctor for Computerized Exams and Laboratories*

- [program specific instruction on proctoring exams and laboratories](#)

Approved by GPC on 3/28/11; Revised 09/23/11 to reflect procedural change; Additional revisions approved by GPC 11/21/12 and subsequently approved by Faculty Senate 12/5/12; grammatical corrections 1/16/13; [revisions approved by GPC 10/21/13](#)

- [-undergraduate degree in discipline or related field](#)
- [-some graduate work completed or enrolled in](#)~~undergraduate~~ [majoring in the discipline](#)
- ~~-specific instruction on proctoring exams and laboratories~~
- attend training on Sexual Harassment, Academic Honor Policy and the Federal Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)
- supervision by ~~the a~~ faculty member [teaching the course in the teaching discipline](#)
- [-planned and periodic evaluations of the teaching assistant](#)

3. *Lab section*

- [-program specific instruction in laboratory demonstration](#)
- [-undergraduate degree in discipline or related field](#)
- [-some graduate work completed or enrolled in](#)~~undergraduate~~ [majoring in the discipline](#)
- ~~-specific instruction in laboratory demonstration~~
- attend training on Sexual Harassment, Academic Honor Policy and the Federal Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)
- direct supervision by senior lab assistant /or faculty member in the teaching discipline
- planned and periodic evaluations of the teaching assistant

4. *Recitation/discussion section*

- undergraduate degree in discipline or related field
- some graduate work completed or enrolled in
- attend the TA Orientation/PIE Teaching Conference held each fall before the beginning of the semester or an equivalent
- attend training on Sexual Harassment, Academic Honor Policy and the Federal Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)
- direct supervision by a faculty member in the teaching discipline
- planned and periodic evaluations of the teaching assistant

Course level types 5-7 presume the [graduate](#) teaching assistant is providing the primary instruction in the course.

5. *Lower-level course*

- 18 hours of graduate work in teaching discipline
- attend the TA Orientation/PIE Teaching Conference held each fall before the beginning of the semester which includes training on the following FSU teaching policies: Sexual Harassment Policy, Academic Honor Policy, American with Disabilities Act (ADA), the Federal Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), Grading Policies, Textbook Adoption Procedure Policy, Syllabus Policy, Class Attendance Policy, Final Exam Policy, Copyright Law Regulations

Approved by GPC on 3/28/11; Revised 09/23/11 to reflect procedural change; Additional revisions approved by GPC 11/21/12 and subsequently approved by Faculty Senate 12/5/12; grammatical corrections 1/16/13; [revisions approved by GPC 10/21/13](#)

(Copyright Revision Act of 1976 “fair use”) and Course Evaluation Policy or an equivalent

- student participation in a “teaching in the discipline” course or equivalent departmental orientation
- direct supervision by a faculty member in the teaching discipline
- planned and periodic evaluations of the teaching assistant

6. *Upper-level non-major non-liberal studies course*

- Master's degree or equivalent
- attend the TA Orientation/PIE Teaching Conference held each fall before the beginning of the semester which includes training on the following FSU teaching policies: Sexual Harassment Policy, Academic Honor Policy, American with Disabilities Act (ADA), the Federal Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), Grading Policies, Textbook Adoption Procedure Policy, Syllabus Policy, Class Attendance Policy, Final Exam Policy, Copyright Law Regulations (Copyright Revision Act of 1976 “fair use”) and Course Evaluation Policy or an equivalent
- student participation in a “teaching in the discipline” course or equivalent departmental orientation
- direct supervision by a faculty member in the teaching discipline
- planned and periodic evaluations of the teaching assistant

7. *Upper-level major course*

- Master's degree or equivalent
- enrolled in doctoral level course work and strongly encouraged to have completed two semesters of doctoral level course work
- attend the TA Orientation/PIE Teaching Conference held each fall before the beginning of the semester which includes training on the following FSU teaching policies: Sexual Harassment Policy, Academic Honor Policy, American with Disabilities Act (ADA), the Federal Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), Grading Policies, Textbook Adoption Procedure Policy, Syllabus Policy, Class Attendance Policy, Final Exam Policy, Copyright Law Regulations (Copyright Revision Act of 1976 “fair use”) and Course Evaluation Policy or an equivalent
- student participation in a “teaching in the discipline” course or equivalent departmental orientation
- direct supervision by a faculty member in the teaching discipline
- planned and periodic evaluations of the teaching assistant

Certification of Spoken English for Graduate Teaching Assistants:

As noted above Academic Deans are required to certify to the Vice President of Faculty Development and Advancement and the Dean of The Graduate School that the TAs in the

Approved by GPC on 3/28/11; Revised 09/23/11 to reflect procedural change; Additional revisions approved by GPC 11/21/12 and subsequently approved by Faculty Senate 12/5/12; grammatical corrections 1/16/13; [revisions approved by GPC 10/21/13](#)

college are competent to teach. This statement should also include certification that all graduate TAs whose native language is not English are competent to teach in spoken English.

All international graduate students who are not native speakers of English, and who are going to be TAs, should take the SPEAK test when they arrive on campus (as noted below, students who scored 26 or higher on the speaking portion of the IBTOEFL may be exempted from taking the SPEAK test). The Center for Intensive English Studies (CIES) administers and scores the SPEAK test, CIES also offers courses in spoken English (EAP courses). The SPEAK test is administered several times in the week(s) prior to the beginning of each semester, and the scores are available within three to four days of the date the test is administered. Departments are urged to take advantage of this opportunity to receive an initial estimate of speaking ability. In addition, the SPEAK is routinely administered as an end-of-term evaluation for students enrolled in EAP courses. TAs not enrolled in EAP courses may also take the test at that time. Course offerings, as well as test dates for SPEAK tests, are published in fliers distributed periodically to departments, as well as via email to TA coordinators. This information is also available on the CIES Web site (www.cies.fsu.edu).

The standards for certification of spoken English are as follows:

- A score of 50 or higher on the SPEAK test, or 26 or higher on the speaking portion of the IBTOEFL, certifies a student to teach at any level.
- A score of 45 on SPEAK, or 23-24 on the Speaking section of TOEFL iBT, certifies a student to teach at levels 1 & 2; and to teach at levels 3 & 4 for up to two semesters if also concurrently enrolled in an appropriate CIES English language course. By no later than the end of these two semesters, if the student's skills have not improved sufficiently to achieve a score of 50 on the SPEAK exam, the student will be eligible to only teach at levels 1 & 2. The student will only be allowed to teach at levels 3-7 by meeting at least one of the following two criteria:
 - Achieve a score of 50 on SPEAK.
 - Enroll in Advanced Spoken English for ITAs (EAP4831) and score 90 or better in the course.
- Student's scoring 40 or below on SPEAK should enroll in the appropriate CIES English language course(s) if the goal is to be a TA. Once a 45 on SPEAK is achieved such a student will be certified to teach at levels 1 & 2; and to teach at levels 3 & 4 for up to two semesters if also concurrently enrolled in an appropriate CIES English language course. By no later than the end of these two semesters, if the student's skills have not improved sufficiently to achieve a score of 50 on the SPEAK exam, the student will be eligible to only teach at levels 1 & 2. The student will only be allowed to teach at levels 3-7 by meeting at least one of the following two criteria:
 - Achieve a score of 50 on SPEAK.

Approved by GPC on 3/28/11; Revised 09/23/11 to reflect procedural change; Additional revisions approved by GPC 11/21/12 and subsequently approved by Faculty Senate 12/5/12; grammatical corrections 1/16/13; [revisions approved by GPC 10/21/13](#)

- Enroll in Advanced Spoken English for ITAs (EAP4831) and score 90 or better in the course.
- The standard for international students serving as ITAs in Modern Language and Linguistics is 45 (SPEAK) or 23 (TOEFL) if the student is teaching a course in their native language.

In unique instances a Department Chair or Dean may appeal the application of these standards by submitting a request to the Dean of The Graduate School. The Dean of The Graduate School will convene a committee to consider the request. The committee will consist of the Director of the FSU Center for Intensive English Studies; the Chair (or designee) of the Undergraduate Policy Committee; the person making the appeal; and the Dean of The Graduate School.

Equivalent Previous Experience and Emergencies:

With the exception of the 18-hours-in-the-discipline rule for primary instruction and in accordance with guidelines provided by the Commission on Colleges (SACS), the following options will be available to deal with special circumstances:

A student who through previous preparation or teaching experience has demonstrated knowledge and strong teaching skills can be exempt from some of the requirements ~~in 3-7~~, as appropriate, by certification of the program chair.

In an emergency a department may appoint a graduate teaching assistant who has not met all the University-wide requirements for that level of appointment if there is an assurance that the student will meet the requirements by the end of the term in which the student is teaching.

SACS Statement:

Graduate teaching assistants: master's degree in the teaching discipline or 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline, direct supervision by a faculty member experienced in the teaching discipline, regular in-service training, and planned and periodic evaluations. (Reference: Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); Commission guidelines "Faculty Credentials" (Adopted Dec 2006).

Sexual Harassment, Academic Honor Policy and FERPA policies and equivalency:

University policy on sexual harassment training is provided by the Office of Equal Opportunity and Compliance (EOC) within Human Resources (<http://www.hr.fsu.edu>), the Academic Honor Policy training is offered by the Office of the Vice President of Faculty Development and Advancement (<http://fda.fsu.edu/>) and the FERPA training is offered by the Office of the University Registrar (<http://registrar.fsu.edu/>). These offices provide training at the fall TA Orientation /PIE Teaching Conference. In addition PIE facilitates sessions in the spring usually during the second week of classes.

Approved by GPC on 3/28/11; Revised 09/23/11 to reflect procedural change; Additional revisions approved by GPC 11/21/12 and subsequently approved by Faculty Senate 12/5/12; grammatical corrections 1/16/13; [revisions approved by GPC 10/21/13](#)

Program for Instructional Excellence Workshops:

The Program for Instructional Excellence (PIE) supports and complements departmental TA training programs. To prepare TAs for immediate undergraduate classroom responsibilities, PIE conducts an annual two day teaching conference the Wednesday and Thursday before classes start in the fall semester. The conference is free to participants and focuses on policies and services at FSU as they relate to teaching. PIE offers workshops on teaching during the fall and spring semester and an online training series the “Basics of Teaching @ FSU”. PIE also assists departments in developing TA departmental training programs.

UFF-FSU Report to the Faculty Senate, February 19, 2014

Good Afternoon!

In bargaining news, you may have noticed that seven different types of raises and bonuses from the latest contract have been implemented with an eighth one still to come, which is the \$600 merit bonus for 35% in June.

Please be on the lookout for the UFF-FSU faculty poll in April. I can't emphasize enough the importance of responses to our poll, for your responses help us represent all of you in bargaining and beyond.

At our consultation with President Barron, Provost Stokes, Vice President McRorie and other administration representatives last week, we discussed such topics as faculty salary compression and market equity, Administrative Discretionary Increases, parking, and the budget. I've posted the minutes from our December consultation on our website, uff-fsu.org.

In legislative news, the Senate Community Affairs Committee voted 5-4 yesterday to introduce the FRS reform bill SPB 7046, which would close the traditional pension plan to all new employees except law enforcement and emergency personnel. Those hired after July 1, 2015, would be required to choose between an investment plan and a "cash balance" plan. The House plan to reform the FRS has not been announced yet. Though many of us are in the ORP rather than the pension plan, this does not mean we are immune to "reform," especially considering that, whether we are in the pension plan or ORP plan, we have lost roughly half of our previous state contribution to our retirement plans. We are also continuing to follow the implementation of HB7029, which is the bill I've discussed previously that deals with MOOCS and other corporate vendors offering online courses, as well as the implementation and implications of the performance funding model approved by the Board of Governors in January.

I'd be happy to take any questions at this time. Thank you for your consideration.