THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
SEPTEMBER 19, 2012
DODD HALL AUDITORIUM
3:35 P.M.

I.   Regular Session

The regular session of the 2012-13 Faculty Senate was held on Wednesday, September 19, 2012. Faculty Senate President Sandra Lewis presided.

The following members attended the Senate meeting:
J. Adams, T. Adams, S. Aggarwal, E. Aldrovandi, G. Allen, A. Askew, TJ Atwood, H. Bass, P. Beerli, B. Berg, B. Birmingham, M. Buchler, W. Carlson, T. Chapin, E. Chicken, D. Cooper, A. Darabi, J. Dawkins, R. Dumm, I. Eberstein, G. Erickson, K. Erndl, J. Fiorito, G. Galasko, M. Gerend, J. Geringer, T. Glenn, E. Goldsmith, J. Gomariz, R. Gonzalez-Rothi, M. Gross, A. Guyas, M. Hanline, K. Harper, R. Horton-Ikard, D. Ikard, J. Ilich-Ernst, E. Jakubowski, S. Johnson, M. Kapp, T. Keller, Y. Kim, W. Landing, D. Latham, S. Leitch, S. Lewis, C. Madsen, R. Marrinan, U. Meyer-Baese, D. Moore, S. Norrbin, J. Ohlin, V. Richard Auzenne, N. Rogers, J. Saltiel, N. Schmidt, K. Schmitt, R. Schwartz, J. Standley, L. Stepina, B. Stults, P. Sura, J. Telotte, S. Tripodi, G. Tyson, A. Uzendoski, E. Walker, W. Weissert, S. Witte.

The following members were absent. Alternates are listed in parenthesis:
I. Alabugin, D. Armstrong, E. Baumer, E. Bernat, R. Coleman, A. Darrow **(W. Fredrickson)**, N. de Grummond, L. Debrunner, L. deHaven Smith **(V. Mesev)**, L. Edwards **(J. O'Rourke)**, M. Fair, A. Gaiser, L. Garcia Roig, A. Hirsch, C. Hofacker **(D. Jiang)**, E. Klassesn, S. Lenhert, C. Lonigan, H. Mattoussi, W. Mio, O. Okoli **(A. Vanli)**, J. Scholtz, N. Stein, P. Steinberg, F. Tolson, J. Tull, C. Upchurch, O. Vafek, P. Villeneuve, D. Von-Glahn, I. Zanini-Cordi.

II.   Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of the April 18, 2012 meeting were approved as distributed.

III.   Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as distributed.

IV.   Special Order: Remarks by the Faculty Senate President, S. Lewis

First, I would like to thank you for the confidence that you have placed in me by electing me to serve for a second term as your Faculty Senate President. It has been my pleasure to represent the faculty and our interests throughout the past year and I am honored that you

have asked me to continue in this position—a role that has allowed me to better understand the many complex challenges facing a research intensive university of this size and to appreciate that the solution to these problems lies in the many outstanding members of our faculty and administration who are committed to the continual growth of Florida State University as a leader among public institutions, both in Florida and across the country.

Over this year, I have become increasingly aware of the incredible pressures on the institution from the many diverse groups that believe that they should direct what we do. From disgruntled football fans to unhappy students and displeased graduates—I've heard from them all. I have also had the opportunity to work with hundreds of people—alumni, members of the Board of Trustees, volunteers with the Foundation, and students, faculty, and staff—who build this university's reputation in countless ways. I wish you could see the pride these people feel in their university and the unselfish commitments they make to create a stronger FSU. It's really incredible!

Still, it's the pressures on the university that are troubling. Of course, you're familiar with the issues related to university budgets and tuition. In the past, the state—and the people who ran the state—celebrated the value of a university education and recognized the importance of having a well-rounded, well-informed electorate. Based on these beliefs, they were willing to use state funds to support the education of our population. Today, it has become increasingly clear that legislators and policy makers question whether a university education is a wise investment. The cover story in the current edition *Newsweek* focused exactly on that question—and the writer's conclusion is that, for many students, a university education is not the ticket to success. I think that the real answer to that question is dependent on how you define success. If success is just the development of job skills in a particular area, then perhaps the author is correct—long term apprenticeships might be the direction to go. If, however, success is defined in terms of being able to think critically about a wide range of issues, to better understand the world around us, and to appreciate the contributions of art, music, science, economics, psychology, culture, sociology, and history on our behavior, then the education we provide at a university becomes more relevant. In the face of such questions—and the many possible answers to those questions—it becomes all the more important to be able to demonstrate that in fact, we are having an impact on our students' thinking and understanding. Demonstrating that outcome to the satisfaction of our policy makers is one of the significant challenges we face today.

The result of the uncertainty expressed by policymakers regarding the value of a university education is that they are no longer being willing to fund it at the same level as they have in the past. FSU has experienced cuts in recurring totaling $105.8 million dollars over the past 5 years and an additional 65 million dollars in non-recurring funds just last year. Looking forward, the university is faced with further limitations on our ability to increase tuition. These limitations have a direct impact on the future of the institution, since without additional funds, it is difficult to compete with other colleges and universities for faculty, to create the infrastructure that supports research and teaching, and to recruit the finest students.

Beyond that are other pressures that impact the institution. You will hear in a little while of the incredible resources that are being spent on the reaffirmation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). To continue to operate, this university must be reaffirmed. Because of the increased scrutiny of the cost and benefits of education and the large numbers of people who are defaulting on their student loans, SACS is demanding that

increasing levels of detail about the university's operations be provided to them. Every single aspect of what occurs at the university must be documented.

Now, most of us believe in the importance of self-review as a means to improve program quality, but you will no doubt ask yourself more than once over the next couple of years if reaffirmation is worth the cost, especially when the university is already struggling with a constrained budget. And the work of reaffirmation will impact you. You will be asked to use a common format for your CV, to review your certificate programs, to get copies of your transcripts, to report outcomes more carefully in the Institutional Effectiveness Portal, and to serve on committees to review or establish policy. In fact, you'll be asked to vote on some policies on which your committees have worked over the summer later today. Complying with SACS requirements isn't going to be the most fun you've ever had, but I repeat, SACS accreditation is not something we can afford to lose, and we will have to remind ourselves of that reality as we watch those dollars being spent.

We will also watch as our dollars are spent to satisfy the demands from the legislature, the Board of Governors, and the Governor himself for more detail about our practices, our students, and our outcomes. I've found it interesting that these demands for increasingly detailed reports come in proximity to complaints that there are too many people working in Westcott. I'm not sure who is supposed to be preparing these reports, but the more reporting demands that are made on us, the more people will have to be employed to prepare them, which takes funds away from our core mission.

We face a couple of other challenges. One is the interest being shown in the state for creating yet another university—the virtual university—a totally online institution that would have no buildings and few permanent (and, I suspect, no tenured) faculty. My guess is that it would look a lot like the Western Governors' University, which primarily provides its underpaid adjunct professors with pre-written syllabi, canned lectures, and grading rubrics—and little in the way of choice of how the curriculum is taught or how it is delivered. Faculty governance means little in this kind of institution. I think that we need to watch carefully the consideration of this topic in the legislature this next year and offer our voices to help shape its outcome.

Finally, and perhaps one of the most significant issues facing us now, is the implementation of the legislation passed last year that mandates changes to the basic studies requirements offered at FSU and other Florida colleges and universities. Dean Laughlin will provide more information about this law later in this meeting, but it is clear that it is a direct effort to limit the faculty's control over the curriculum. Now, some of you may say that you only teach upper division or graduate students, so this issue won't impact you, but it seems like we're on the edge of a slippery slope and we need to be vigilant that, in efforts like this one—(and the virtual university)—we aren't giving up too much of our responsibilities to shape a curriculum based on the expertise of a group of learned individuals and not just on one perspective. Luckily, we have Dean Laughlin in a prominent position on a statewide committee that is working with the state colleges and universities to develop an implementation plan and that several of our colleagues have accepted additional assignments to serve on other statewide committees to represent the interests of FSU's faculty. In addition, your new Faculty Senate Vice President, Gary Tyson, and I will be meeting in early October with representatives from other SUS faculty senates to discuss the implications of this legislation on faculty governance.

So, many challenges, but many pieces of good news, too. I heard yesterday that 42% of our graduates don't immediately get jobs—instead, they go on to graduate school. Approximately 92% of our freshmen return as sophomores, and 74% percent of students graduate within 6 years. The default rate of our students, at 3.4%, is way below the national average. For the first time in several years, the university is not running a deficit. U.S. News and World Report recently ranked us at 42nd among "national" public universities and 97th among all institutions. Not bad for a university that has lost so much revenue!

We are indeed fortunate that we are at a time at FSU when the leadership of the faculty and the leadership of the administration share common goals and are working together to achieve them. President Barron is a powerful voice for faculty. Dr. Stokes, our provost, is a powerful voice for faculty. Sally McRorie, the new Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement, is a powerful voice for faculty. These are people whose motivations are only to improve the university and to improve the working conditions and status of our faculty. They know that when the faculty is strong, students are more engaged and alumni more connected. They know—and demonstrate in their actions—that when the faculty of an institution is strong, the university itself is stronger and more effective at achieving its mission. They are also, however, alert to the political realities we face, so their progress may sometimes seem slow and cautious, but never once have I ever had the impression that any of them don't believe that the path to success doesn't include a strong partnership with an engaged faculty made up of tenured and tenure earning scholars.

It has also been my impression that our leaders are committed to the concept of faculty governance. Similarly, your elected Faculty Senate Steering Committee is committed to assuring that faculty governance is protected at all levels. Over this past summer, the Steering Committee developed a document that we believe further clarifies the structure and procedures of faculty governance at the university, college, and department levels at FSU. I hope you picked up this document as you came in the room today. In this document, we emphasized that faculty governance at FSU is constructed using a decentralized model in which the Faculty Senate determines and defines policies affecting all academic units in the University, while enabling each unit to enact additional policies as long as they do not conflict with those established at the University. We noted that this system works best when the University-wide policies are limited to only those policies that **must** be applied to all units, leaving the bulk of academic policy to the College and Department level units. We believe that adhering to this framework and using it to evaluate proposed changes to bylaws and new and existing policies will allow FSU to be more responsive to faculty and student needs, thereby maintaining that small college atmosphere within a large, but robust research intensive university.

In closing, I'd like to introduce the members of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee: Ike Eberstein, Kris Harper, Don Latham, Cliff Madsen, Jayne Standley, Lee Stepina, and Gary Tyson. These are the people to whom you can turn when you have suggestions that you believe will improve the experience of faculty at FSU. In addition, I'd really like to thank you for the service you will give as Senators during the next year. We couldn't do anything without you and your voices. Thanks for your contributions!

V.   Report of the Steering Committee, G. Tyson

Since our last Faculty Senate meeting on April 18th , the Faculty Senate Steering Committee has met ten times (May 15, 22 and 29; June 5, 12, and 19, August 20 and 29, and September 5 and 12) and twice each with Provost Stokes and President Barron.

At the meeting with the President on June 13th, the primary topic of discussion was the impact of the veto of Senate Bill 1752, the State Universities of Academic and Research Excellence and National Preeminence Bill, and the reduction of the tuition increase made by the Board of Governors. We also discussed the acquisition of the civic center and Dr. Barron's assessment that this would be a good financial move. Dr. Barron repeated the message that two of his top priorities are new faculty hires and faculty retention.

The meetings with Provost Stokes focused on the organizational requirements for interdisciplinary programs at FSU, and the elevation of the Dean of the Faculties position to the level of Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement. We are delighted to welcome Sally McRorie to serve in this position. We have known Sally for years as a dean, and we believe that she is an excellent choice to serve in this new role. We did note that this will necessitate changes to the FSU constitution and many other policy documents that refer to the Dean of the Faculties position. We wish to acknowledge the outstanding performance of Jennifer Buchanan who served as the Interim Dean of the Faculties and who will now serve as the Assistant Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement. We also extend our welcome to Dr. Gary Ostrander who will start next month in the role of Vice President for Research, replacing Dr. Kirby Kemper who has performed outstanding service in that role for 9 years. This Friday we will be interviewing the first of 3 candidates for the Dean of Arts and Sciences. Kevin Carman is currently the Dean of Science at LSU. There will be an open forum for faculty to meet with Dean Carman at 1:00pm in room 105 Turnbull. Nicholas Giordano, currently chair of the Physics department at Purdue University will be on campus on Monday, September 24th, and our current interim Dean Sam Huckaba will be interviewing on September 25th. Open forums for Dr. Giordano and Dean Huckaba will also be at 1:00pm in room 103 Turnbull.

When the steering committee met on May 15, I was elected to serve as the Vice Chair of the steering committee. Over the summer, the steering committee discussed issues related to graduate studies, including some policy changes that will be presented to the Senate later today. We also discussed issues related to distance learning, faculty governance, SACS accreditation and interdisciplinary programs. We have included a statement on how faculty governance is currently divided among the university, college and program levels. We hope you will take the opportunity to read it. As you all know, well defined procedures for shared governance are necessary to the function of the university and the structural organization of faculty governance impacts not only the function of the faculty senate, but also how faculty and students relate to their college and department.

If you have not been aware of the documentation requirements of accreditation, consider yourself lucky, but know that you will soon know what many of your colleagues and most of the administration know about the scope of the task currently being performed. One additional requirement of SACS is that all certificates must be evaluated; this will lead to changes in many of the certificates currently offered by various programs.

The steering committee also spent quite some time discussing the best standards and practices for encouraging the development of interdisciplinary programs. Investment in growing new programs is vital to the health of a research university, but this growth must be efficiently managed to ensure the success of these new programs. One of the tasks for this year's Faculty Senate is to work with FSU administrators to develop a set of operating principles to develop and oversee new and existing interdisciplinary academic programs. We believe that having the faculty and the administration working together will lead to a period

of growth in interdisciplinary research and academic programs that will have a positive impact on the University for years to come.

Many of you are familiar with the changes made by the legislature to the Liberal Studies requirements across all state universities and state colleges. FSU is fortunate to have Dean Karen Laughlin to head the state-wide committee tasked with determining these new course requirements. Whatever changes are made, these changes are likely to have wide ranging effects to many of the departments that offer existing liberal study courses. The faculty senate will need to work with the administration on finding the best solutions to meet the new requirements.

We are also happy to report that the undergraduate degree program in Anthropology was reinstated by the Board of Trustees earlier this month.

Finally, we would like to correct the record on the vote for steering committee membership that took place in April. This being Florida, there was a recount of the votes for the final position on the steering committee. We had initially reported that Jane Ohlin was elected to serve a one year term on the committee. After recounting all the votes, it was determined that Kris Harper had more votes, therefore Kris will serve on the steering committee for this term. We would like to commend Jane for her gracious acceptance of this error.

VI.   Presentation by President Barron

It is nice to see you again. I thought I would come by and give you a little bit of an update. I am hoping that you are beginning to sense that the propellers are starting to turn again after quite a few years of struggle. We lost sixty-five million dollars, all one-time money. Basically we set ourselves up to a point where through a lot of conservative action on part of every single unit that we would start to say ok, we can do permanent things with those dollars because we have enough cushion to make sure that we are going to be able to come out of it. Now, that was kind of unfortunate but despite that fact, the university balanced its budget this year for the first time since 2006/2007. I don't know how you feel about this, but it seems it was an awful a lot of work and I am truly ecstatic at the fact that I am not looking at a recurring deficit. If the legislature will leave us alone we will begin to stop thinking about what is going to be cut next, but instead we might be able to invest. We have worked hard, the Provost and I both, to hold all of our academic programs harmless in all of the recurring cuts and even in one time moneys. The exception quite frankly, in one time money and the sixty-five million dollars, is that it was based on a percentage of our recurring dollars and we were more frugal than some other universities who would not have made all the cuts and are now struggling a little bit. Medicine had substantial recurring dollars and so they participated in giving back the sixty-five million dollars. Take that away and basically the academic programs were held harmless two years in a row. So this is our signal, if not pressure, to the deans that it's time to begin to feel that there is sufficient support at this university. Instead of having somebody be replaced by someone who is temporary or not replacing them the time is now to replace those faculty.

Four years in a row we had a net loss of fifty tenure line faculty each year. And basically you look at who we lost and who we decided that we could replace and we lost fifty per year for a total of more than 200 faculty over the four year period. So it was really encouraging to the Provost and I that this year when the new faculty came aboard, that we had hired this last year 21 more tenure line faculty than we lost. So, since five years ago, for the first time we

have gone back into the plus column in the rate of hiring. I stood up in front of the Board of Trusties and then to the Board of Governors and I said "I am going to tell you exactly what we need to get our tuition increased and then I'm going to come back to you a year later and I'm going to tell you that exactly what we spent our tuition increase on." A significant portion of the tuition increase was utilized to make our budget balanced but I have said we use some of those funds to hire faculty with big ideas such as the Entrepreneurial University, the Materials Energy as part of a STEM focus and Successful Longevity which is across the campus as the 3 areas of those Big Ideas that would be new and innovative. In addition, I pointed out that the worst largest tuition increase you can get is one that forces to students to stay a year longer because the courses they needed to graduate were not available because we don't have as many faculty as we used to have. And so I think the commitment that we would look at those places where there were significant decline to the faculty but increases in student demand and that would be the first cut of new hiring using those tuition dollars. It's not a great deal of money, when you come right down to it, but I think that it will have a significant increase its entirely focused on hiring beyond whatever our tuition rate is. I'm actually going to leave the details to that to Provost Stokes because this is her project and she's been working very hard with the deans to begin that hiring process. And then I intend to go back to the Board of Governors and say thank you for that tuition increase, this is what you gave me and this is exactly what I did with the money just as I said.

Last piece of this is our bargaining is going a bit more slowly than I would like. I'm not going to stand up here and try to create any tousle between the members of the people bargaining. But I want you to understand a couple of things. One is we are basically told in no uncertain terms do not give an across the border increase because we know you are doing that in the backs of our students and families, in these tough economic times. And you're going to use those tuition dollars to promote raises. This would be a very tough thing to then turn around and in the press and be used to say we used tuition increases to promote raises. You may have noticed that UF completed their bargaining and really there is nothing there for the faculty. So, we basically have two universities out there that are going to do something, but otherwise everyone is going zero raises, zero bonuses. Now at the same time you know that my commitment is that we have got to have more dollars going into the faculty. This is the reason why we have proposed a promotion and going from 9-12% from assistant to associate 12-15% from associate to full professor. We are also working very hard to put dollars in there associated with a wide range of merit opportunities, a wide range of performance areas, and a wide range of equity areas. So this is our objective to put as many dollars as we can into the pool for faculty salaries without crossing that line of something that's across the board. Now we will see how all of the turns out, I just want you to know that this is our position partly governed by the political realities and as you know it was a very tough vote getting our tuition to the Board of Governors and next year will be partnered, so this is going to be interesting.

Ok the last thing is kind of fun, to see us go up in the rankings by 4 in the US News and World report. Breaking into the top 100 for the first time since 1999 we have basically had this slow decline and in the last three years we have been ticked up, and ticked up so that's good. It's equally fascinating to see that our financial resources were ranked 204 last year, while we were ranked 101 this year .We were ranked 97, 42 among the publics. But are financial resources rank slipped all the way to 212. They only ranked 270 universities .We went up in every single category, in alumni giving percentage we went up. Just so you know, of all the universities in the state of Florida, Florida State's alumni giving rate as a percentage of our alumni giving is now the highest in the state, which is something nice to be proud of.

Our alumni are being to step up. So every single category GPA, SAT scores, freshmen retention rate, graduation rate, you name it and it went up. There is only one category for which we went down, and that is faculty resources. This consists of two components, one of which is salaries and one of which is student to faculty ratios. Now, it's hard to beat those when that one is much more dependent on the state. But hear is step one, adding twenty-one faculty above what we lost, step two regards telling you about the number we are going to add next year over again for what we may lose. Step two, any dollar that we can put back in that is merit association, equity association, or performance association but doesn't quite go across the board. So this is our highest priority, to see that number turn around. It is more simplistic to take this approach based on rankings. Yet there is a psychology here which is we basically look at all these things going on and look at this one category. We are dedicated to change this; we are dedicated to changing this as fast as we can. We also have to live with a certain amount of political reactive. And with that I will stop and if you have question about this, I just thought this would be a useful update on where we are sitting; I'll take any question on that or on any other topic.

Question: Jack Fiorito – I heard you say that there would be no consideration for across the board increases. I did not hear you say that there would be no consideration for merit based increases.

Answer: I think that the stronger the argument in reporting those individuals who have excelled the easier my conversations will be. Remember we didn't even get our 15% tuition increase when we almost had a preeminence bill that would have allowed us to go above the 15%. So there will be great scrutiny as to what we spend our funds on. In all fairness, the argument that I am prepared to make is that this institution is teaching more credit hours with fewer faculty. There is no reason that we shouldn't be returning those dollars to the faculty. The last thing I want to do is walk in to the room and get nothing.

Question: For people who have been promoted, will it a retroactive thing? I have heard several different things.

Answer: There are certain things that I want that Jack wants to hold back until we get some other things done. We won't do negotiations out loud but we are very sensitive to the issue.

VII.   **Announcements by Provost Stokes**

All right, my remarks are going to be pretty short I did want to make an announcement that had to do with Sally McRorie and her hire. I could not be more delighted, she started on July 30th and she is going to be great to work with. I also hired Janet Kistner. She is the current chair of Psychology she is going to be starting as an Associate Vice President in my office on Friday September 28th. She will fill the vacancy that I have from when Joe Nosari passed away. I am delighted to be building my team of people that will help serve this institution. You already know that I am doing dean searches. We have got the Arts and Sciences dean search which is already mentioned. There are ongoing searches for the dean for Visual Arts, Theatre, and Dance and College of Music, also a later search for a dean of Nursing. So I don't think I can handle anymore searches right now in my office. I am fortunate to have good chairs but we have a lot going on.

The big news really has to do with what we have been doing to try to carve out resources to deal with the highest priority which is, there are two, there are faculty retention and faculty

recruitment. It is time to fill out the faculty ranks and I am very happy to tell you that while we are losing fifty a year we have launched searches for at least one hundred tenured and tenure track faculty, to begin in 2013. This will make a big difference in terms of our numbers. Some of those will be funded through the colleges but I have found more $4 million in recurring dollars that I am allocating for faculty recruitment and the colleges. Twenty-five positions are going directly to the colleges themselves to recruit in areas with the highest need some of significant stem focus but beyond that as well. More than half the colleges are going to benefit from allocation of those lines. In addition we are allocating tenure and tenure tracked lines related to the big ideas. So we are hiring a total of ten tenure and tenure track faculty associated with those big ideas. We will be launching a search for eight faculty in the energy and materials area, and we will be launching a search for two faculty associated with successful longevity. So that's ten tenure and tenure tracked faculty lines in addition to the twenty-five that are being allocated to serve areas of needs within the colleges. So, I am still looking for additional partnerships so we can put that number even higher than one hundred. Because, at that rate we will make a significant dent and this is something that we want to keep moving forward. I listened to what was asked earlier about the graduate stipends that is on our radar, but I think trying to figure out ways to retain faculty and recruit faculty are the top priorities and then we will begin really focusing on the graduates stipends.

So there are a lot of things going on right now in my office. There are a lot of initiatives that I will be perusing as I have my focus all in place. Probably the most disappointing thing to me is that I bring Sally McRorie in to start working on faculty development and first thing we do is hit her with a lot of SACS related things so it's a lot of work to that. But I think that we are starting to see we are really beginning to move in a different direction. I hope that you start to feel a little more optimistic about the direction that Florida State is heading as a result of our carving out these resources to really begin building back faculty. I am happy to answer any questions you might have about these initiatives or anything else in the Provost's office.

VIII.   Special Order: Statewide Changes to General Education, Dean Karen Laughlin

Forgive me I know some of you have already heard this tale. So I will try to be brief and then answer any questions that you might have. As you heard, this spring the legislature passed a law that among other things is making two significant changes in general education. The first one is that we are required now by law to reduce our number of hours in general education from thirty-six to thirty. The second one is that we will be required to offer a set of course courses in each of the five areas of general education. That will be the same across the state, in the state Universities as well as in the Florida College System (FCS) community colleges and state colleges. So every public university in the state will need to offer these core courses. Now the way this process is set up to work is that all the universities and state colleges have been asked to submit the names of faculty nominees to serve on faculty committees that will begin meeting, we hope, this fall to start identifying these core courses. We are required by law to have a maximum of five core courses in each area. There could be fewer than five. The areas are defined as communication, mathematics, humanities, natural science, and social science. Of which leaves open some interesting questions. I do not think anyone is thinking that the visual and preforming arts are left out of the humanities area. Where history will land is a question that has been discussed quite a bit. I do not know how that is going to play out yet. Actually I am leaving town tomorrow to go to Orlando for a meeting for the state wide steering committee of which I am serving. I am actually just one

of the twelve members of the steering committee. But I will do my best to advocate for Florida State University as well as for the FCS generally. At that meeting on Friday I think the goal of the meeting is to identify these discipline committees for the five areas, then to get those committees working. The other big issue in this legislation is that the law says that all of this must be in place by Fall of 2014. Everybody who is on the steering committee has said all along that when this law was put into effect, the proponents of it really did not think about the impact on the timeline. Even the common course prerequisites, which some of you live with in your departments, also the fact that obviously we know this is going to make some shifts in enrollment hours on all our various campuses. It is going to make work for you as the Faculty Senate and the Undergraduate Policy Committee to be processing how we implement these core courses but then what effect this has on our overall liberal studies curriculum. So we are free to do what we want with the fifteen hours of general education that they have left us. We are also free to do what we want with the six hours that have been removed from liberal studies. But remember that those are, in effect, lower division credit hours. So, it is going to be tempting, and I think very possible to put in graduation requirements. We are going to have the departments consider what they would like to do with the six more hours. But we are going to have to watch that because of the balance between lower and upper division and articulation and what that means for transfer students coming in. So it is kind of an interesting ball of wax. Provost Stokes sent forward the names of the five nominees from Florida State. I think every effort will be made to ensure that all the state universities are well represented on those discipline committees but each discipline committee will only have six people from the SUS, so not every state university will have a voice on every committee.

The last thing I will say, and then if you have any questions I will be glad to try and answer them. For my counter parts around the state, this has been on our radar since really the end of the legislative session so the undergraduate deans have been talking about this quite a lot. I think all of us are believers in are general education curricula and have been involved in development and the administration of that curriculum. We are all consulting a lot and trying to come up with a unified voice for the state university system. The five SUS members on the steering committee consist of three undergraduate deans, including myself, one provost, and one associate vice provost. There is a lot of discussion and communication. I am in close contact with Provost Stokes about this. I really welcome your thoughts about these issues, so please do not hesitate to email me if you have a particular concern or question. I would be glad to do my best to responsive and if you have any particular suggestions. The law also mandates that we establish learning outcomes, sort of higher order learning outcomes, for each of the five areas. So especially if you have assessment expertise or particular thoughts you have on how we might define those, Florida State University has done this of course for a lot of our accreditation work so I will take with me some of that information. If you have any thoughts in that area that is, we hope the committees will start by talking about the learning outcomes and then look at the best courses to achieve those outcomes. I'm sure that since it is a very political process there will be a lot of negotiating back and forth about how these courses are selected and how they play out on out various campuses.

IX. Reports of Standing Committees
a. Distance Learning Committee, S. Fiorito

Good afternoon. Prior to the document that you received with your faculty senate agenda and minutes, we had a previous document that was published in the year

2000 (see addendum 1). So, this is only the second distance learning document that we have had as far as I could recall. Since the year 2000, what the distance learning committee has done is dealt with issues in the curriculum reform, academic fraud in online testing, approval of online undergraduate program proposals, distance learning fees, the course evaluation process, increasing return rates, SACS requirements for distance learning, reporting definitions of what a hybrid or blended course is, and to trigger faculty to let them know when the renewal process is coming up for the distance learning courses. The 2012 distance learning policy document was developed using existing Dean of Faculties, Faculty Senate, administrative policies, in order to consolidate widely scattered information in one accessible document. In regard to the new reporting requirements for distance learning courses that we have been hearing that are referenced in the policy, I will address those in just a minute. These come from the board of governors, SACS and can be found on the provost website and the Board of Governors website. Susann Rudasill from the Office of Distance Learning is here with us to respond to your questions as well. The ODL staff attorney helped with the interpretation of the statues and regulation related to Florida State University policy that went into developing this document. Some of the new reporting requirements from SACS include compliance of off campus programs with standards and documentation of how these standards are being achieved. Examples include how do off campus courses have access to materials and library service, where are the faculty that are teaching these off campus courses, what kind of space do they have, what student support is available for students that are taking online courses/off campus courses. We need to document the equivalency of credit hours and labs being offered alternatively. We need to document what we are offering, where it is being offered, to whom it is being offered, show how we are in compliance actually with our own policies. SACS requires that we show equivalents for different modes of instruction.

As a result of all these new data requirements, a committee was established this summer to revise all the curricular forms. That is the curricular request forms. We have three curriculum forms that we are currently using that is the curricular request form where you can add a new course, delete a course, or change a course. We have a file syllabus form and we also have the form two which is our alternate motive instruction. The committee this summer met many times to get all of these forms into one document and to have in web-based. So all of the information that you are reporting on a hand copy that you had passed around and signed is going to have electronic signatures, is going to be visible to everyone one who is working in the stream, and the data will be collected automatically. We are hoping that over time that this will result in a decrease in work load. At first, this is going to be an increase in workload because we are working with two systems. We are still working with the old forms this semester but we are beta testing the new online form that is to begin in about two weeks. What we told the ODL that Melissa and I, after we have our curricular meeting, we will go to the ODL and we will put in all the information that is on your forms into the new distance learn form. Then we will call faculty and departments for the additional information that is not currently on our forms but is required by SACS the Board of Governors. We are going to do this so that we will understand the process of putting this information together, how difficult it is to get, how the system works. So she and I are going to work with this for a while doing all of this before we send it out for all of you to use. We will have videos to test the online form. I do not have examples now, although Susann did download it. We

wanted to wait until possibly Darren could come, who is the developer of this, to demonstrate it to all of you. We will have plenty of opportunity to learn how to do that.

One other thing before we go into the policy, the standards of course reviewed are strictly up to the academic departments. They are submitted through your curriculum committees. Your curriculum committees review them, ultimately approve them, and any policies of course we will approve as a Faculty Senate. The curriculum committee does not use a program that will look at the quality of your course before approving it. That should have been vetted through your department and through your college. We are looking mainly in the university curriculum committee at making sure that you have the correct documentation for honor code in your syllabus. We are looking at things to make sure that it is clear to the students how they are being evaluated. That is what the university curriculum committee does. You and your departments are responsible for the quality of the courses that you are going to be delivering.

In the document that you received we would like to get any questions. There are some changes and additions; this was presented to the Faculty Senate Steering committee on September 5th. It was suggest by the committee this summer and suggested that we change the renewal period for online courses for five years to three years. This suggestion is because technology does change because different people are teaching different classes. We hope that with this new form that we are developing, that it will be very easy to make those changes. You will be triggered every time there is a renewal, to let you know that you need to go in. If nothing is changed it will be a very easy review process. If it has changed, if you have different objectives, if you are using a different evaluation system, then we will look at only those things that have changed and be able to do that easier with the online form. So we are requesting a different time period. The other comment in here is that Quality Matters. Quality Matter is the program, that ODL has purchased that will allow faculty while developing their courses to use these criteria in the developing their courses to assure a quality online course. They have excellent people in the Office of Distance Learning who want to help you in developing your course.

Question: What constitutes a high-stakes test?

Answer: There is language that the ad-hoc Academic Integrity committee talked about but I think it is around 20% of the grade.

There was a motion to approve the Distance Learning Policy document.

The motion passed.

b.   **Graduate Policy Committee, D. Johnson**

As you know the graduate policy committee deals with QER reviews and that is what we are known for. We also address issues pertaining to graduate education on campus, and coordinate and clarify policy language across a variety of different documents, including the faculty handbook and the graduate bulletin. We have been doing that for more intensely the last year or so. Issues come to us for changes in

policy, policy of language, typing and clarification of errors from a variety of sources through our own scrutiny of these documents and from faculty members and the graduate school. What you have before you now are three such issues.

I want to talk about the longest one first which in fact does not constitute a change in policy but rather a clarification of language. This is the document concerning university wide standards for teaching assistants at Florida State University (see addendum 2). The changes that you can see indicated on this document underlining were necessitated, the necessity being appliance by SACS, and the contract requirements. If you look at everything that is underlined, they are all little details. They are not actual policy changes, with regards to these standards. However we feel our report needs to be accurate and the idea is to incorporate this particular set of language. It will be updated on The Graduate School faculty and staff blackboard site also on gradspace and it could go into the graduate bulletin. This one, I think, should be rather straight forward but I will obviously take any questions you may have, if there are any.

The motion passed.

Now I would like to take up the policy of the language that begins recommended change to the existing policy see Faculty Handbook Section 5 Faculty Development (see addendum 3). This is actually a change with respect, a straight forward change, with respect to graduate teaching status. As you can see here the only highlighted change has to do with extending the period under which these colleagues are authorizing graduate teaching status from one year to three years. The idea there is reduction of paperwork and to give greater flexibility to the units who maintain and hire these colleagues. So the idea is in fact reduction of paperwork and work in general. The recommendation gives us one change that has to be negative for us which I would regard as a friendly amendment that is not yet amended but not yet moved but that of course has to do with changing the name of the Dean of the Faculties to Vice President of Faculty Development and Advancement. There is one change that came from the steering committee. The insertion of the phrase "using criteria established by the Faculty Senate."

The motion passed.

This one has to do with essentially it is inserting coming up with language that was absent before there was no official statement on conflict of interest policy and you can see here what that looks like (see addendum 4). This went through several rounds of revisions in the GPC and the steering committee. This is what came back from both us and the steering committee. The idea is that it should be inserted in the graduate bulletin section on graduate degree requirements in supervisory committee subsections for masters going on page 86 for the masters and also for the doctoral students in page 87. Then it should also be included in the appropriate place in faculty handbook. And again you can see from the date here that it is an issue we have discussed quite a bit in the GPC and the steering committee.

The motion passed.

X.   Old Business

There were no items of old business.

XI.   New Business

There were no items of new business.

XII.   University Welfare
a.   Torch Awards, V. Richard Auzenne

If you have nominations for the Torch Awards, please send them to Vall Richard Auzenne by October 1, 2012.

b.   Updates on Bargaining and Related Matters, J. Fiorito

Good afternoon! In view of the late hour and that we have already had a report on collective bargaining from President Barron, I will try to be brief.

Collective Bargaining

As President Barron suggested, budget cuts and the political environment have made for a difficult bargaining environment. Since last spring we have held consultations with President Barron and Provost Stokes twice and held weekly meetings with the Administration/Board of Trustees bargaining team.

In fact, I just came from a bargaining session that is still in progress, so I found President Barron's comments particularly interesting. There seems to be some contradiction between President Barron's remarks and what I just heard from the Admin/BOT team. Last year we talked at length about President Barron's desire to build a culture of merit, but the Admin/BOT team just told our UFF faculty team that they would not consider our proposal for merit raises. We will need to work on improving communications.

There are numerous and complex issues under discussion. These include academic freedom, performance evaluation, promotion, tenure, the salary plan for professors, benefits, and specialized faculty (NTTF) reclassification. The working document on specialized faculty alone runs 44 pages and involves numerous changes to our contract. The faculty team has continued to push for changes recommended by the Faculty Senate, including improved employment security for specialized faculty. Discussions of the salary article include promotion raises. As previously stated, the UFF faculty team has offered to sign off on the Admin/BOT proposal on promotion raises, but the Admin/BOT team has insisted on tying that proposal to Administrative Discretionary Increases. The only new condition in the faculty team's counterproposal on promotion raises is retroactivity to the promotion date.

McRorie Luncheon on September 26th

We are pleased to feature Vice President Sally McRorie as our special guest at next Wednesday's UFF-FSU luncheon. All Senators are welcome. Lunch is free for UFF

members and their guests, and $12 for others. The luncheon is at 12:30pm on Wednesday, September 26th in the Florida Room at the Oglesby Union.

XIII. Announcements by Deans and Other Administrative Officers

There were no announcements by Deans or Other Administrative Officers.

XIV. Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 5:02p.m.

Melissa Crawford

Melissa Crawford
Faculty Senate Coordinator

The Florida State University
Distance Learning Policy and Process

September 2012

Review and Approval Timelines
Reviewed by the Faculty Senate Distance Learning Committee, Provost and Administrators April 2, 2012
Updated and reviewed by the VP for Planning & Programs and Budget Director August 10, 2012
Reviewed and revised by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee September 5, 2012
Submitted to the Faculty Senate for Final Approval September 10, 2012
Approved by the Faculty Senate _____
Published for SACS review September 20, 2012

Faculty Senate approval requested for changes and additions to policy highlighted on Pages 7, 13 and 14 as outlined below:

1. Online courses will be assessed at least every ~~five~~ three years by the appropriate committee of the Faculty Senate
2. QM review of all online courses may be conducted by the FS Curriculum Committee or as required by the Faculty Senate.
3. In addition, online courses and programs are assessed at least every ~~five~~ three years by the appropriate committee of the Faculty Senate to insure they meet the requisite level of quality and provide comparable quality and effectiveness to on-campus versions.

Table of Contents

Overview and Authority

Online distance education was initiated at the Florida State University (FSU) in 1999. Since that time, FSU has provided centralized support for its online and distance education services to registered students located wherever they have access to the Internet. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) Substantive Change Committee that visited the campus on January 28-30, 2001, approved the University's centralized approach. The University provides distance learning in compliance with applicable state and federal laws and regulations. The Office of Distance Learning (ODL),[1] situated within the Office of the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs and advised by the university's Faculty Senate distance learning Committee (FSDLC),[2] bears responsibility for administrative oversight of distance education at FSU.

Definition of Distance Learning

According to SACSCOC, distance learning is a formal educational process in which the majority of the instruction in a course (interaction between students and instructors and among students) occurs when students and instructors do not share the same location. Instruction may be synchronous or asynchronous. A distance learning course may use the Internet; one-way and two-way transmissions through open broadcast, closed circuit, cable, microwave, broadband lines, fiber optics, satellite, or wireless communications devices; audio conferencing; or video cassettes, DVD's, and CD-ROMs if used as part of the distance learning course or program.

The State of Florida defines distance learning a bit differently for the purposes of assessing a distance learning course fee. For that purpose, a distance course is a course in which at least 80 percent of the direct instruction of the course is delivered using some form of technology when the student and instructor are separated by time or space, or both. (1009.24 (17) F.S.) For the purpose of further distinction, hybrid/blended courses are defined as those where 50 to 79 percent of the course is delivered using some form of technology in a combined class offering where the student and faculty are not engaged in traditional face-to-face instruction.

Florida State University delivers its instruction in several different ways. These delivery methods differ, in part, in whether some form of technology serves as the equivalent of contact hours for purposes of defining a student credit hour. The difference turns in large measure on how they differ regarding student-faculty contact hours that are key in defining a student credit hour. Contact hour equivalence is fundamental to establishing equivalent Student Credit Hours and is determined by peer review curriculum committees at the Department/School/College level.

Classes are of three general types: standard, technology enhanced and distance learning.

A standard class, "typically occurring in a classroom or lab, the delivery of the instruction may or may not make use of the follow technologies or devices: chalk or white board, overhead, TV, VCR/laser disc/DVD, radio/audio, computer LCD projector, Internet. Technology is not used in lieu of class meeting time or as a supplement to the course beyond the use of such materials within a classroom. Seat time (contact hours) is not replaced or supplemented by any alternative delivery method or medium." (Office of the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement (FDA), Distance Learning Evaluation Guidelines for Use with the Curriculum Request Form)[3]

In a technology enhanced class "The delivery of the instruction makes use of technology or instructional materials beyond those available or distributed in the "standard" (traditional) classroom. Enhancements to learning therefore must include activities or instructional resources developed for student use that extend beyond the classroom instructional use of these items. In short, the use of the technology supplements but does not replace contact hours. (FDA, Distance Learning Evaluation Guidelines for Use with the Curriculum Request Form)[3]

There are two types of distance learning classes. A Combined Class Offering is typically delivered in the traditional face-to-face format on the main or branch campus. "Combined courses offer less than 80% of the total course content through the use of some alternative means, i.e., Website, video, iChat, etc. The delivery of the instruction makes use of technology or instructional materials beyond those available or distributed in the "standard" (traditional) classroom. In short, the use of the technology does supplement and replace some contact hours for courses taught on the main or a branch campus.

In a distance learning class, "The delivery of some or all of instructional content is reliant upon an alternative delivery method in addition to or in place of traditional face-to-face instruction where students and the instructor meet in the same place and at the same time. If any one student receives instruction (contact hours) through an alternate delivery method then the course by default may be termed as a distance learning course." (FDA, Distance Learning Evaluation Guidelines for Use with the Curriculum Request Form)[3]

When a class does not meet face-to-face with the instructor, alternative modes of instruction may substitute for standard classroom contact hours" provided that the substitution has been approved by the university Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee (FSCC) and the authorization is on file with the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement. For example, the

Faculty Senate has determined that an asynchronous discussion board on the web might substitute for some standard classroom contact hours, just as some standard class time might be used by the instructor for class discussion. It is the responsibility of the peer review curriculum committees at Department/School/College level to determine the appropriate and academically-justified number of contact hour equivalents assigned to each element of the proposed alternate delivery variant of a class." Notably, it is the policy of the Faculty Senate that "Unplanned contact between instructor and student(s) that does not directly relate to planned delivery of course content or achievement of course objectives should be regarded as the equivalent of office hours, and should NOT be assigned equivalents to standard classroom contact hours:" (Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement, Distance Learning Evaluation Guidelines for use with the Curriculum Request Form)[3]

Governance and Curriculum

The FSCC is responsible for recommending approval to the Faculty Senate of courses and degree programs offered by the University. Both undergraduate and graduate courses are subject to criteria established by the FSCC after receiving approval from within the sponsoring department and/or college. All new courses are subject to review, approval and recommendation by either the undergraduate or graduate policy committees. The FSCC must approve all new courses. Both courses and programs, especially those offered by distance learning, must comply with the criteria established by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, The Commission on Colleges (SACS).

The Florida State University Faculty Senate Graduate and Undergraduate Policy Committees, in conjunction with the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement, the Graduate School and the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, have determined that the following criteria must be met before a degree program can be offered in an online format.

1. The proposed degree or program meets demonstrable need and does not negatively impact existing undergraduate or graduate offerings of the University.
2. A complete degree program is offered that enables enrolled students to graduate in a timely fashion.
3. There are sufficient program facilities and faculty and support staff, willing and able to deliver the degree program at the requisite level of quality
4. The faculty involved will be able to meet their other commitments (undergraduate teaching, doctoral student training, etc.), or appropriate arrangements have been made to release the faculty from these other duties.

5. The online degree program meets all relevant University degree program requirements.
6. The online degree program will be comparable in quality to the on-campus version.
7. Adequate plans have been formulated for developing the online degree program, for respecting the requirements of good online instructional design and delivery, and for evaluating the effectiveness of the program on a regular basis.
8. The Integrity of the student work and the credibility of degrees and credits are ensured.
9. The program adheres to the SACS guidelines on distance and correspondence education.

New single distance learning courses are subject to a related set of standards. Specifically, before a single course can be offered in an online format the following criteria should be met:

1. The online course meets demonstrable need and does not negatively impact existing undergraduate or graduate offerings of the University.
2. The online course allows enrolled students to graduate in a timely fashion or enables departments to schedule classes that might otherwise not be offered to students.
3. There are sufficient facilities, faculty and support staff willing and able to deliver the course at the requisite level of quality.
4. The faculty involved will be able to meet their other commitments, or appropriate arrangements have been made to release faculty from these other duties.
5. The online course meets all relevant University course requirements.
6. The online class will be comparable in quality to an on-campus version.
7. Adequate plans have been formulated for developing the online course, for respecting the requirements of good online instructional design and delivery, and for evaluating the effectiveness of the courses on a regular basis.
8. The Integrity of the student work and the credibility of courses and credits are ensured.
9. The course adheres to the SACS guidelines on distance and correspondence education.

Institutional Responsibility for Distance Learning Activities

The faculties assume primary responsibility for and, through its committees, exercise oversight of distance learning at Florida State University. The faculty ensures the rigor of distance learning courses and programs and acts to maintain the quality of instruction. The Faculty Senate, through its committees, ensures that sound and acceptable practices are used for determining the amount and level of credit awarded. Faculty committees, with the approval of the Faculty Senate, ensure that courses and programs constitute coherent entities that are compatible with the university's mission and appropriate to offer at an institution of higher education. The Faculty insures that they are appropriately trained to offer the material in approved courses and that

there are sufficient members qualified to develop, design, teach and oversee approved programs. The Faculty works with the administration of the university to establish and monitor instruction in distance learning courses and programs.

The faculty, through ongoing assessment and evaluation, regularly updates courses and programs. Online courses and programs are subject to the same institutional effectiveness practices as traditional offerings. In addition, online courses will be assessed at least every five three years by the appropriate committee of the Faculty Senate to insure they meet the requisite level of quality and provide comparable quality and effectiveness to on-campus versions.

Administratively, the university Office of Distance Learning (ODL) supports the faculty and helps realize the University's mission to extend education statewide by offering courses and degree programs online and at many off-campus sites around the state. As its primary mission, ODL serves academic departments by providing guidance and technological assistance to develop, deliver, assess, maintain, and improve distance learning degree and certificate programs for graduate and undergraduate students.[4] Specifically, ODL provides resources to promote, implement, facilitate, and assess University initiatives related to teaching enhancement and technology-mediated learning environments that support student academic achievement. ODL works with a range of campus offices to insure the continued financial viability of distance learning courses and programs. ODL ensures that the university deploys technology appropriate to the nature and objectives of courses and programs and also communications directly with students about university expectations regarding the use of such technology.

ODL faculty and staff members collaborate with distance learning faculty and teaching assistants to promote instructional excellence at Florida State University through the use of effective educational and communications technologies, evidence-based instructional principles and strategies, and research studies on teaching innovations. Working with other university offices, students in distance learning courses and programs have effective use of appropriate library resources. Students taking distance courses are also provided with adequate and accurate information about course and program requirements along with available services. ODL deploys technology and employs procedures that insure the integrity of distance learning course and program offerings. This includes procedures keyed to integrity and security that demonstrate that the student who registers in a distance education course or program is the same student as the one who participates in and completes the course or program and ultimately receives credit for those activities. These security measures include secure logins and unique pass codes. ODL is online at http://distance.fsu.edu.

The ODL Organizational Structure

ODL accomplishes its mission and assists faculty through a clear, well-defined organizational structure. ODL consists of four main units:

The Blackboard Learning Management System (http://campus.fsu.edu): Provides the University community a secure environment for teaching and learning, participating in sponsored organizations, and using Secure Applications to transact University business. The Blackboard system and all on-line courses meet the section 508 federal accessibility standards.

Online Programs and Student Support (http://distance.fsu.edu): Academic Coordinators within ODL provide personal ongoing educational support to distance learners across the nation throughout their entire tenure at The Florida State University. From the prospective student's first inquiry about a program to their final semester, FSU ODL academic coordinators and support staff is available to guide, advise and assist.

Online Course Development and Faculty Support (http://online.fsu.edu): FSU ODL Instructional Development Faculty work with departments to help them determine quality standards and best practices in online teaching and learning to produce and promote innovative distance learning (DL) strategies and technologies.

The ODL Assessment and Testing Unit (http://cat.fsu.edu): Provides course evaluation services (http://cat.fsu.edu/cat/courseevaluations/index.cfm), tests and test-taking services (http://cat.fsu.edu/cat/test/index.cfm) and coordination of proctoring for DL exams (http://cat.fsu.edu/test/distancelearning/FSUDL.cfm) as well as a range of scanning services that involve using mark-sense forms to collect responses for paper-based multiple-choice exams and surveys.

Process and Procedures for ODL Assisted Distance Course Development

ODL serves departments, programs, faculty and students by using current technologies to deliver University courses and degree programs beyond the main campus. In addition to its activities involving individual courses, ODL supports the development and delivery of numerous degree programs that include majors in business administration, communications disorders, computer science, criminology, educational leadership, higher education, instructional systems, library and information studies, engineering, nursing, interdisciplinary social science, social work, special

education, emergency management and geographic information systems. ODL also provides support to undergraduate and graduate distance learning certificate programs.

The process to translate an existing or new course or program of instruction to distance learning distribution varies according to the type and disposition of the course or program. An interested individual or unit seeking ODL support to deliver a course or program via distance must first work through the university approval process. It is recommended that the initial appropriate university application(s) be initiated at least two semesters before the first course is to be offered to allow time for all stages of the process.

Individuals and departments proposing to develop new rather than converting existing degrees, majors or certificate programs, should begin by contacting the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement (FDA) in the Office of Academic Affairs. New degree programs require a formal exploration stage as well as an implementation stage. The application templates for each situation are available online and once completed and submitted are subject to a thorough review and approval process requiring approval at eight levels (undergraduate) or nine levels (graduate), including notification to ODL that a new distance course or program is pending.[5]

With departmental approval and support, individuals or units can apply to ODL for E&G development funding to convert existing and new courses and programs to an online format. To obtain this funding, the appropriate university application and a FS curriculum request form for each individual course is required. After the necessary university approvals are in place, an ODL distance learning course development proposal can be submitted.[6] The ODL proposal template allows the requestor to detail the educational need for the online offering and indicate support of the Dean, Chair, and/or faculty offering the course, program or certificate.

Once the ODL proposal is reviewed and accepted, the next step is to prepare and sign a Letter of Agreement with ODL establishing responsibility of the respective development and support roles.[7] To translate a currently offered, on-campus class or course of study to a distance-learning delivery format, a program director must develop and submit an outline of the program, the prerequisites for taking the course, the syllabus, an enrollment estimate, an application to offer the course in a technology enhanced mode of instruction and a per annum budget template.[8,9] Proposals for ODL development funding for graduate certificate programs are processed similarly. These actions will typically require involvement of a faculty member, department and FS curriculum committees, the department chair, and dean.

After the Letter of Agreement, 3-year auxiliary budget projections, estimated enrollments and university approvals are in place, ODL's instructional development faculties will advise and consult on:

- instructional design and project management for online learning (including appropriate student activities and assessments),
- processes for developing multimedia and other online course materials,
- FSU administrative procedures for approving and offering online courses, and
- development of a detailed budget projection and enrollment estimates.

Faculty and Student Support

The Office of Distance Learning also has the responsibility of providing FSU's distance learning instructors and teaching assistants with:

- assistance with the conversion of instructional materials to a format suitable for online delivery,
- training in the use of current technology tools to enhance the online learning experience,
- research, development and collaboration with distance learning faculty at FSU as well as other schools for the dissemination of best practices methodology in the distance learning environment,
- information and training on intellectual property issues, copyright, and fair use of media and publications in online courses
- management of grants and award opportunities for distance learning faculty who wish to engage in developing innovative instruction and applying new technologies to their online instruction, and
- quality enhancement initiatives for curriculum and teaching improvement to support student success, academic integrity and successful program completion in the distance-learning environment.

Likewise, the Office of Distance Learning is responsible for providing FSU's distance learning students with access to distance courses and programs. Distance students are able to do everything at a distance that is necessary to matriculate at FSU, from application and registration to checking grades and getting transcripts. In addition, ODL works with the Office of Technology Services, Admissions, the Registrar's Office, and the Controller's Office to develop and maintain a mandatory online orientation process for distance students. These services are equivalent to on-campus face-to-face assistance but can be accessed online or via Email and telephone.

Prospective students can contact ODL distance learning coordinators for:

- assistance with finding online courses, certificate and degree programs that are specific to student's academic status and educational goals,
- information about online course and program costs and locations with direct links to the college and department advisors who are offering those courses and programs,
- navigation through the university's admissions, advising, and registrations processes, that are specific to off-campus students,
- connection to online mentors and teaching assistants
- virtual access to library materials and services for distance learning students,
- access to affordable textbooks for all courses,
- help with secure-access and help-desk support for the learning management system (Bb™), and
- virtual access to frequently asked questions and answers as well as a link to file complaints for prospective and current distance learning students is available at http://online.fsu.edu.

Both faculty and student support are complemented by a number of workshops and online tutorials. Faculty members are provided tutorials that cover topics ranging from exam writing to development of course websites. The ODL website allows faculty to collaborate with colleagues to strengthen their pedagogy and skills in the use of new technologies.

Financial Aid Policy for distance learning Students

The Office of Financial Aid and ODL share information on respective polices related to distance learning programs and communicate on any updates required.

- Financial aid is available to all students admitted/enrolled in degree programs.
- Students should apply for aid by completing the online Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) at http://www.fafsa.ed.gov each year, as soon as possible after January 1.
- To be eligible for financial aid disbursement, students must be enrolled each term for at least half-time enrollment (minimum of 6 credit hours).
- Students who withdraw or fail to complete coursework may be required to repay aid. Additional information can be found in the FSU Bulletin at http://registrar.fsu.edu/bulletin/undergrad/info/financial_info.htm

Distance Learning Fee Characteristics and Development

Under Florida Statutes and in accordance with FSU policy, the university will assess a student who enrolls in a course listed in the Florida Higher Education Distance Learning Catalog a per-credit hour distance learning course fee [s.1009.24 (17) Florida Statutes]. The FSU Board of Trustees has the authority to set all mandatory tuition and fees assessed by the university, including fees associated with distance learning. The amount of the fee may not typically exceed the additional costs of the services provided which are attributable to the development and delivery of the distance-learning course. Distance learning courses that are partially funded by contracts or grants, for expenses associated with those courses, can proportionally reduce the amount of the DL fee, but can not eliminate the need to charge the fee to recover those expenses not paid by the contract or grant.

Universities are also allowed to propose and have approved by the Florida Board of Governors (BOG) market rates for graduate-level courses offered online when such courses constitute an approved degree program or college credit certificate program. Such market tuition rate courses are subject to criteria established by BOG rule [BOG Regulation 7.008 (15)]. In either case, the ODL, working in cooperation with the university Office of Budget, develops and maintains a template that enables the requirement that a distance learning fee be established or the BOG approved market tuition rate be justified. The template provides a means for estimating enrollments and program costs that allows for a simple cost-benefit analysis. The ODL academic coordinators and fiscal staff assist faculty and staff within FSU colleges and departments with:

- budget development for setting annual distance learning fees for individual course/programs,
- preparing the budget office templates and applications for auxiliary accounts,
- managing expenditures, appointments and reporting for distance learning auxiliary accounts, and
- entering distance-learning courses into the course schedule master (CSM) to ensure that those courses are properly coded and posted for registration in accordance with university registration course coding procedures.

Distance Learning Technology

As part of its mission, the ODL provides the University community a secure environment for teaching and learning. All distance courses are hosted in the FSU Learning Management System (LMS) through Blackboard™ (Bb). Bb™ is an LMS designed to provide secure access to course information, academic materials, and communications with faculty and other students. The Bb

Grading Center provides a platform for secure online testing within Bb™. All FSU distance courses also have the option to prescribe proctored exams at external sites monitored by the FSU ODL Assessment and Testing Unit. Mentors (online teaching assistants) are assigned to the faculty conducting online courses to ensure that students are properly assisted with the academic course content and associated digital materials. Through Bb™ secure access, distance students will also access their individual, graduate or undergraduate admissions and registration information, and can virtually contact academic advisors from each department. The Blackboard system is designed to facilitate faculty and student-to-student interaction.

The ODL technology unit is also responsible for providing help-desk support for all face-to-face as well as distance-learning students and instructors, since all FSU courses reside in the Bb™ LMS. Faculty and teaching assistants who teach online courses are provided with specialized training in various technologies that are required for synchronous and asynchronous teaching at a distance. Instruction in the development and use of specialized digital materials, textbooks, and other media is provided to all DL as well as face-to-face faculty and students. ODL is responsible for tracking student completions rates through Bb™. In 2010/11, FSU online graduate students had a completion rate of 98%; online undergraduates had a completion rate of 92%.[10]

Quality Assurance through Assessment and Evaluation

The ODL Strategic Plan[11] is a dynamic process that drives development and measurement of distance learning goals, objectives and outcomes as reflected in the FSU Institutional Effectiveness Portal (IEP).[12] In support of those outcomes, and in partnership with the FSU Faculty Senate Academic Integrity Committee, ODL faculty representatives subscribe to the University of Maryland Online (MOL) Quality Matters program. Quality Matters (QM) is a faculty-centered peer review process designed to certify the quality of online and blended courses. As a peer-based approach to quality assurance and continuous improvement in online education and student learning, QM has received national recognition. The Quality Matters Rubric consists of eight general standards and 41 specific standards used to evaluate the design of online and blended courses.[13] The Rubric includes annotations explaining the application of the standards and their interrelated meanings. A scoring system and online tools facilitate the evaluation by a team of reviewers. ODL makes these resources available to all FSU distance-learning faculty during the development of online courses. QM review of distance learning courses is required for all courses developed with ODL funding. QM review of all online courses may be conducted by the FS Curriculum Committee or as required by the Faculty Senate.

Departments offering distance courses, programs and certificates, work with ODL, to assure the comparability of instruction offered by on-line distance learning. They conduct assessment of student learning and program outcomes involving measures ranging from embedded course performance to student retention and student satisfaction. Appropriate units of the university work with the library and the Office of Student Affairs to assess the effectiveness of their services to students engaged in distance instruction. Online courses and programs are subject to the same institutional effectiveness practices as traditional offerings. In addition, online courses and programs are assessed at least every ~~five~~ three years by the appropriate committee of the Faculty Senate to insure they meet the requisite level of quality and provide comparable quality and effectiveness to on-campus versions.

A critical component in the on-going evaluation of the quality of distance learning programs is the assessment and testing of our distance learning students and instructors. The ODL assessment and testing unit (ODL/AT) provides proctored and secure testing environments for DL students. ODL/AT is also responsible for mentor, instructor and course evaluations for face-to-face as well as distance courses. In addition to testing and assessment services, distance learning instructors receive support for developing secure assessment strategies as part of their online course plans. Online and face-to-face workshops and consultations are provided for distance learning instructors and teaching assistants.

Academic Integrity

To assure academic integrity, distance-learning students taking online classes at The Florida State University gain access to course materials and educational resources by means of secure login authentication. Upon admission to the university, each student creates a unique electronic identity, which is protected by a password. All communications are managed through the secured learning management system, including contact with the instructor, collaboration with peers, submission of assignments, and accessing grades. This solution is in compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) since all student-related data are password protected and access is appropriately restricted.

Course and Teaching Evaluation of online courses is accomplished using a web-based form that comprises student-related information, a standard set of questions, as well as optional additional questions that can be customized by the department and the instructor. A sample of the form and summaries of numeric questions are available to the public online. Results are used for both formative and summative evaluation of the courses and the instructors. Instructors use the

14

feedback in order to identify areas for improvement, and administrators use it to make decisions about promotion, tenure, and recognition (e.g. teaching awards).

Instructors who teach distance courses and who use high-stakes exams to test students' knowledge and skills partner with the Office of Distance Learning's Assessment & Testing unit to coordinate proctoring. The unit uses a network of professional testing centers to proctor exams for remote students within 100 miles of their domicile. ODL staff work with individual students to accommodate special needs and to identify and validate proctors that are outside of the current network. The process is guided through an online resource on ODL's website.

The Office of Distance Learning works with several university committees and task forces that impact and govern all aspects of teaching online. The Faculty Senate Distance Learning Committee (FSDLC) considers curricular policies and procedures at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The FSDLC is in charge of monitoring the effectiveness of procedure and standards governing online courses and programs and proposing changes to the full Faculty Senate when needed. The Faculty Senate Teaching Evaluation Committee ensures that all courses are evaluated and proposes procedures and policies to ensure the effectiveness of the evaluations. In addition, the ODL faculty participates in special task forces and ad-hoc committees, such as the Ad-hoc Committee on Academic Integrity, which was charged with the review of current practices to support and enforce academic integrity.

Reporting and Auditing

ODL is responsible for maintaining aggregate data and responding to information requests from numerous internal and external entities. In cooperation with the FSU Office of Institutional Research (FSU/IR), ODL creates reports regarding distance learning retention rates, course sections, student enrollments and trends. The ODL, working with FSU/IR insures accurate headcount information on student participating in on-line instruction. The ODL also works with FSU Student Financial Services to project, track and report DL tuition and fee receipts. The Office also prepares various reports for the Florida Legislature and responds to DL data requests from the Florida Board of Governors and the Florida Distance Learning Consortium. The ODL, working with the university Department of Legal Affairs, insures compliance of on-line distance learning activities and procedures are in compliance with the applicable state and federal laws. In addition to data gathering and reporting, ODL participates in numerous "best practices" consultations with higher education and distance learning consortiums, research institutes and colloquia. ODL is often called upon to respond to media requests through the FSU Office of

Communications. FSU departments that engage in distance learning often have additional accreditation reports requiring ODL assistance.

The ODL insures there is adequate funding for faculty, staff, service and technological infrastructure to support on-line distance instruction. ODL works closely with academic departments and the FSU Budget Office on the establishment and management of distance-learning financial auxiliary accounts. For administrative and financial purposes, all DL activities coordinated by ODL are treated as auxiliary operations. The Budget Office assists the Auxiliary Service Board (ASB) in the oversight of all Florida State University auxiliary operations and coordinates with ODL on the establishment and management of distance learning auxiliaries. ODL is therefore responsible for the management of fundable distance learning supported with a distance learning course fee, non-fundable supported distance learning and market tuition rate graduate program (Non-Fundable distance learning) auxiliary accounts.

Financial oversight of DL auxiliary operations includes adherence to FSU's Cash Management Policy for auxiliary operations.[14] DL auxiliary operations are subject to internal audit by the FSU Office of Audit Services as well as external audit by State and Federal entities. The ODL business manager and accountants are responsible for detailed and auditable accounting records that differentiate between the revenues generated by multiple distance learning courses and programs. ODL ensures that academic DL account owners and auditors have secure access to auxiliary DL account summaries in the Bb™ Budget Snapshot Organization. These online reports document appointment details for DL development and teaching, year-end cash on hand, account receivables, expenditures, current DL fee billing rates and FSU overhead assessments. The online reports also include the methodology for annual adjustment of DL fees by program. In addition, the ODL DL auxiliary budget manager and accountants provide financial information pertaining to DL auxiliary accounts to the FSU Controller's Office annually.

Appendix A

Attachments and Hyperlinks

1. The Office of Distance Learning at http://Distance.fsu.edu
2. Faculty Senate Distance Learning Committee at http://facsenate.fsu.edu/Standing-Faculty-Senate-Committees/Distance-Learning-Committee
3. Distance Learning Evaluation Guidelines for Use with the Curriculum Request Form at http://facsenate.fsu.edu/Curriculum-Forms
4. Distance Learning Courses and Programs at http://online.fsu.edu
5. Process and University forms required for new Programs and Majors at http://ctl.fsu.edu/onlineCourse/process.cfm
   a. Certificate Programs (Graduate) at http://provost.fsu.edu/sacs/graduate_certificate_program.pdf
   b. Certificate Programs (Undergraduate) at http://provost.fsu.edu/sacs/undergraduate_certificate_program.pdf
   c. Online (existing) Degree Programs (Graduate) at http://provost.fsu.edu/sacs/online_graduate_degree.pdf
   d. Online (existing) Degree Programs (Undergraduate) at http://provost.fsu.edu/sacs/online_undergrad_degree.pdf
   e. New Degree Program at http://provost.fsu.edu/sacs/New_Degree_Proposal_Form.pdf
   f. New Major within Existing Degree at http://provost.fsu.edu/sacs/New_Major_Proposal.pdf
6. ODL proposal for distance course/program development funding at http://ctl.fsu.edu/onlineCourse/process.cfm
7. ODL Letter of Agreement at http://ctl.fsu.edu/onlineCourse/process.cfm
8. Budget Office Guidelines for Distance Auxiliaries at http://bad.fsu.edu/content/download/56474/460390/file/DL Manual_Final.pdf
9. Auxiliary Budget Templates at http://budget.fsu.edu/Auxiliaries
10. Completion_rates.pdf
11. ODLStrategic_Plan.pdf
12. FSU Institutional Effectiveness Portal at http://iep.cpd.fsu.edu/
13. QMRubric.pdf
14. FSU Cash Management Policy at http://policies.vpfa.fsu.edu/bmanual/budget.html

Legal & Other References

1. Florida Statutes § 1004.09 Florida Higher Education distance learning Catalog
2. Florida Statutes § 1009.24 (17)(a) State university student fees
3. Florida Statutes § 1011.47 Auxiliary enterprises; contracts, grants, and donations
4. State University System of Florida Board of Governors (BOG)
5. BOG Regulation 9.013 Auxiliary Operations

6. BOG Regulation 7.001 Tuition and Associated Fees
7. BOG Regulation 7.002 Tuition and Fee Assessment, Collection, Accounting and Remittance
8. BOG Regulation 8.002 Continuing Education
9. Southern Association of Colleges distance and Correspondence Education Policy Statement
10. The National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) College
    and University Business Administration (6th edition, 2000)
    NACUBO Financial Accounting and Reporting Manual
    NACUBO Advisory Report 1999-2 Accounting and Reporting for Auxiliary, Auxiliary-Other,
    and Other Self-Supporting Activities (July 8, 1999)
    Office of Management and Budget Circular A-21 Cost Principles for Educational Institutions
    (May 10, 2004)

Distance Learning Policy Development Online Resources

1. Southern Regional Education Board
   1.1. The Policy Laboratory focused on three overarching themes in distance learning:
        increase access; improve and ensure quality; and drive down costs.
        http://www.sreb.org/page/1272/distance_learning_policy_lab.html
2. Florida SUS Board of Governors
   2.1. http://www.flbog.org/forstudents/upi/distancelearning.php
3. Florida Distance Learning Consortium (now the Florida Virtual Campus)
   3.1. Florida SUS Distance Learning Links
   ▪ Florida Atlantic University - Boca Raton - http://www.fau.edu/provost/files/distlearn.pdf
   ▪ Florida Gulf Coast University - Ft. Myers
   ▪ Florida International University - Miami
   ▪ Florida State University - Tallahassee
   ▪ University of Central Florida - Orlando
   ▪ University of Florida - Gainesville
   ▪ University of North Florida - Jacksonville -
     http://www.unf.edu/president/policies_regulations/02-AcademicAffairs/General/2_0450P.aspx
   ▪ University of South Florida - Tampa
   ▪ University of West Florida - Pensacola http://uwf.edu/atc/AboutUs/distanceLearningGuide.pdf
   ▪ Also see the University of Maryland:
     http://www.provost.umd.edu/PCC_DOCUMENTS/DesignIII_Off-
     Campus_and_distance_Programs.htm
   ▪ Library services: http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/guidelinesdistancelearning
     DL materials copyright:
     http://www.ncolr.org/jiol/issues/viewarticle.cfm?volID=5&IssueID=18&ArticleID=88&Source=2
4. Open Access Textbooks (2011): http://www.openaccesstextbooks.org/pdf/ModelDraft.pdf
5. The American Distance Education Consortium
   http://www.adec.edu/admin/papers/GPforDL.html

University-wide Standards for Teaching Assistants at Florida State University

These are University-wide standards that any 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 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 teaching assistants in course instruction. Extra help sessions and voluntary tutorials in addition to regular class meetings would not normally fall under these requirements.

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 Dean of the Faculties and the Dean of The Graduate School that each student who serves as a teaching assistant (TA) in the classroom or online is competent to teach and for international 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 teaching assistant (TA). Each department is responsible for providing orientation, training, supervision and evaluation of its graduate student TAs, and for assigning ~~one or more faculty members~~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 ~~new~~ TAs prior to ~~the~~ beginning ~~of~~ their teaching responsibilities~~classes each term~~. It is also recommended that all ~~new~~ 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 teaching assistants to supplement the university teaching manual, *Instruction at FSU* which can be viewed on line
(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 teaching assistants. It is the responsibility of departments that employ graduate teaching assistants to establish the appropriate job code according to teaching responsibility. The 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

As a general rule:

Approved by GPC on 3/28/11; Revised 09/23/11 to reflect procedural change

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 ~~Graduate School~~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 ~~Graduate School~~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*
   -a program specific statement of standards for graders

2. *Proctor for Computerized Exams and Laboratories*
   -undergraduate majoring in the discipline
   -specific instruction on proctoring exams and laboratories
   ~~-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 ~~Code~~Policy and the Federal Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) ~~or equivalent (see below)~~
   -supervision by the faculty member teaching the course

3. *Lab section*
   -undergraduate majoring in the discipline
   -specific instruction in laboratory demonstration
   ~~-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 ~~Code~~Policy and the Federal Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) ~~or an equivalent (see below)~~

-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 ~~Code~~Policy and the Federal Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) ~~or an equivalent (see below)~~

-direct supervision by a faculty member in the teaching discipline
-planned and periodic evaluations of the teaching assistant

Course level types 5-7~~8~~ presume the 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 ~~Code~~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

~~6. *Liberal studies 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 Code~~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 faculty member in the teaching discipline~~
~~-planned and periodic evaluations of the teaching assistant~~

6~~7~~. *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 ~~Code~~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~~8~~. *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 ~~Code~~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 Dean of the Faculties and the Dean of The Graduate School that the TAs in the 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.

Approved by GPC on 3/28/11; Revised 09/23/11 to reflect procedural change

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 a higher level once they achieve a score of 50 on SPEAK.

- 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 a higher level once they achieve a score of 50 on SPEAK.

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,~~skills can be exempt from some of the requirements in 3-7~~8~~, 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:
~~All TAs are expected to have a~~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 ~~Code~~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 ~~Code~~Policy training is offered by the Office of the Dean of Faculties (http://dof.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. ~~Departments can also set up departmental training by contacting these offices.~~

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.

Recommended change to existing policy (see Faculty Handbook; Section 5: Faculty Development; Graduate Faculty Membership)

Under special circumstances qualified persons who are not regular members of the FSU faculty may be accorded Graduate Teaching Status on a temporary basis with the approval of the academic dean and the Dean of the Graduate School. Temporary graduate teaching status is course-specific and expires after ~~one~~ three years. Renewals may be requested by the department. Persons holding appointment as adjunct faculty or Post Doctoral Research Associates (9189) are not eligible for Graduate Teaching Status. Exceptions to this policy may be made by requesting Courtesy General Faculty status as well as Graduate Teaching Status for such persons through the Dean of The Graduate School and the Dean of the Faculties.

A supervisory committee's judgments on the quality of a student's thesis or dissertation should be based solely on the academic merits of the work before them. Any other standard risks a breach of professional ethics or law and undermines the integrity of the process and those involved. Any personal or financial relationships (e.g. involving the major professor, committee members, and/or student) that may create the perception of bias in that process must be avoided. This would not include the typical practice of hiring a student on a university assistantship in the home unit, but would include the student being hired by the major professor's private company. If any such conflicts of interest could exist, they should be reported to the administrative head of the student's academic unit, who will evaluate same for potential harm and take appropriate action.

David Johnson 2/17/12 11:25 AM
Deleted: conflicts of a

David Johnson 2/17/12 11:25 AM
Deleted: nature

David Johnson 2/17/12 11:27 AM
Formatted: Highlight

David Johnson 2/17/12 11:27 AM
Deleted: do