



THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
DECEMBER 4, 2013
DODD HALL AUDITORIUM
3:35 P.M.

I. Regular Session

The regular session of the 2013-14 Faculty Senate was held on Wednesday, December 4, 2013. Faculty Senate President Gary Tyson presided.

The following members attended the Senate meeting:

J. Adams, T. Adams, A. Askew, H. Bass, B. Berg, F. Berry, B. Birmingham, R. Brower, M. Buchler, J. Carbonell, W. Carlson, E. Chicken, R. Coleman, J. Dawkins, R. Dumm, I Eberstein, J. Fiorito, S. Fiorito, K. Fishburn, R. Gainsford, G. Galasko, M. Gerend, J. Geringer, K. Goldsby, E. Goldsmith, T. Graban, M. Gross, K. Harper, C. Hofacker, J. Ilich-Ernst, C. Jackson, L. Jakubowski, S. Johnson, T. Keller, S. Losh, C. Madsen, D. Maier-Katkin, M. Mascagni, R. McCullough, U. Meyer-Baese, R. Miles, D. Moore, M. Neal, E. Peters, V. Richard Auzenne, N. Rogers, B. Schmidt, K. Schmitt, J. Scholtz, D. Slice, O. Steinbock, L. Stepina, P. Sura, J. Telotte, S. Tripodi, G. Tyson, M. Uzendoski, D. Von Glahn, E. Walker, W. Weissert.

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

J. Ahlquist, I Alabugin, E. Aldrovandi, T. Atwood, A. Avina, W. Deng C. Edrington, K. Erndl, A. Gaiser, L. Garcia Roig, J. Gomariz, R. Gonzalez-Rothi, A. Guyas, M. Kapp, C. Kelley, Y. Kim, E. Klassen, W. Landing, B. Lee (**D. Kim**), S. Lenhert, W. Leparulo, S. Lewis, T. Luke (**J. Sickinger**), T. McCaffrey (**B. Lovins**), W. Mio (**K. Gallivan**), R. Morris, S. Norrbinn, J. Ohlin, O. Okoli, J. Reynolds, S. Rutledge (**B. Cox**), J. Sobanjo, J. Standley, N. Stein (**S. May**), B. Stults, F. Tolson, J. Tull, J. Turner, O. Vafek, S. Webber, S. Witte.

II. Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of the October 23, 2013 meeting were approved as distributed.

III. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as distributed.

IV. Report of the Steering Committee, S. Fiorito

The Faculty Senate Steering Committee (FSSC) met five times since the last Faculty Senate meeting on October 22.

[Meeting dates: October 30, 31(with the Provost and VPFDA), November 6, 13 and 19 (Luncheon with Deans).]

We met with the chair of the Graduate Policy Committee (GPC), Lee Stepina who presented changes that the GPC approved for the Faculty Bulletin, which we approved. Dr. Stepina also discussed concerns over policy interpretations regarding graduate students applying for a dual degree, typically a Master's degree after the students have completed over 12 hours of graduate coursework. Further investigations into college policies needs to be pursued.

Jen Koslow, the chair of the Undergraduate Policy Committee (UPC) explained the changes the UPC was considering for oral communications and discussed the needs for changes. The FSSC offered some suggestions and changes to the document which will be brought before the entire FS today.

The FSSC received a letter from a faculty member who has an office in the Keen Building, which has been undergoing renovations for several months now. The letter brought to our attention serious health concerns within the building during renovations. Some faculty, graduate students and staff have been relocated while those still there are battling noise and dust. We will pursue these concerns with the President and Provost at our December 10th meeting.

We also received suggested changes in the Academic Honor Policy and discussed these briefly via email between our meeting dates. This also will be brought before the entire FS today.

Nancy Marcus, Dean of the Graduate College attended our November 6th meeting to get our opinion regarding a generic combined bachelors/PhD program to attract high achieving students, especially in the STEM fields. Examples of these programs already exist at Drexel and other universities. This program would enable students to move into research programs at an earlier time. In addition, Dean Marcus would like to pursue the development of a generic joint PhD/MBA degree program that would make it unnecessary for individual programs to have to develop specific proposals for these students. There are a number of these programs at other institutions.

The Torch Award nominees were approved by the FSSC and a ceremony to honor these individuals will take place December 11th.

At our meeting with Provost Stokes and the VP for Faculty Development and Advancement, Dr. McRorie on October 31st, we discussed policy changes in the procedures undertaken by the GPC and UPC. We also asked and Dr. McRorie agreed to be on the 25 for 25 committee that Dan Maier-Katkin is chairing. The public "launch" of this campaign will take place in January in front of Strozier Library. Please be alert for this announcement.

At this meeting the FSSC asked if there could be more transparency in the long-term plan for faculty hires and policies concerning "replacement" hires.

Finally, at our November 19th luncheon with academic deans, the FSSC discussed the importance and value of service that faculty provide through department, college and university committee work, and asked for their support in allowing and encouraging faculty to participate in service. The Dean's mentioned that they would be willing to allow faculty to report the outcome of their university committee work at college meetings and would welcome the information about policy and procedure changes. The Deans would like to

receive a list of faculty serving on university committees. The FSSC indicated that we would be happy to forward the lists to them. They had also recently discussed an article from the Chronicle of Higher Education that referred to service as “Leadership,” within the University.

All faculty senators and a guest are invited to a Holiday Celebration at Eric and Molly Barron’s on December 10th from 5:30-7:30. You should have already received an invitation, but if not, please contact Donna McHugh. This event has traditionally been a celebration with the Association of Retired Faculty.

Gary Tyson - Two quick items on that. We normally hold the celebration right after this Senate meeting – the December Senate meeting. We are not doing it today because the Provost and President are both out of town. That’s the reason it will be next Tuesday. That’s also the reason we are going to finish further today.

The Steering Committee actually pushed to have two luncheons a year with the deans. We did that because we want to improve communication between the Senate and the deans. We don’t have an agenda because we are trying to keep it informal but the theme for this meeting was really shared governance. And we talked about the changes that we are making at the university level and the need at the unit level that we have functioning faculty governance. And there’s a couple spots where that is questionable. That was the discussion we had this time. The theme for the spring meeting is actually going to be interdisciplinary research and interdisciplinary academic issues. This is the conduit for the faculty to have a voice with all the deans at one time. If there are topics you actually want us to cover, let us know and we’ll be happy to talk about that.

V. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Undergraduate Policy Committee, J. Koslow (See addendum 1.)

What you should have gotten is a two page or a three page or four page back-to-back. And basically one of the things that the UPC is concerned about is that our students get college level training and experience in oral communication especially within their disciplines. And so we’ve been moving toward this trying to rewrite the OCCR protocols so that more faculty will develop courses, and we’ve also begun to look at the ways in which the bulletin language makes exceptions for high school students. So we thought this would be a moment of opportunity since we are reformulating how we do liberal studies on this campus anyway that this would be a good moment to rethink how we do OCCR exceptions. So the front two pages are the rationales. We know that employers want students who can speak and speak intelligently about their discipline. We also began--it took a while—to research the numbers of exceptions that are given. It appears that we give very few exceptions per year for high school experiences. We give more exceptions for students who take high school speech. The goal is then to transform the exceptions in a sort of rolling pattern so that nothing happens too abruptly and if we get to 2015 and we have fewer OCCR courses rather than more OCCR courses, the UPC knows they will have to revisit this issue. But this is our goal, this is our hope, that we can encourage enough faculty to develop more courses for oral communication within their disciplines and that we can hopefully give every student on this campus a college level experience in communicating. So with that, what we did is try to re-write the bulletin language as best we could. And you can see here, the first thing is that

students may petition their baccalaureate dean. This is a change that hasn't been done by the UPC per se; this is an administrative change that has occurred. All exceptions used to be examined by Undergraduate Studies. It's the only exception that Undergraduate Studies looked at. Everything else is looked at by the dean and college from which the student is graduating. So that's why that language changed. Then we felt like "B" was a repetition of "D." So we tried to clean up the language in making these changes. So the only other major thing is in practice we've been doing one year experience in competitively selective leadership positions at the university, so this change from two years to one would just be making our practice consistent with what what's in the bulletin. Questions?

Question: [Inaudible]

Answer: There are two different ways in which people can use high school. They can take a high school speech class and we have about 400 students a year at the university who we give exceptions to for the OCCR requirement for taking high school speech. Then there is another set of students who do high school experiences, so they do a debate program or [inaudible] or some other form of high school experience that's not an actual class. There are about 30 a year who do that experience. Those are much more difficult to know whether the students are really getting instruction. One of the major components of OCCR is that students receive instruction on how to communicate orally not just have an experience. So the UPC believes those should go away sooner. And then the high school speech class has instruction.

Question from someone from political science: It sounds like this could be very expensive---processing a lot more students. The type of classes I'm picking up, they have very intensive working [inaudible] very small. Is that what you had in mind with the new OCCR approval for courses? Or would a 20 person group course that has presentations and some instruction about how to do presentations---is that the kind of course that would be acceptable? [inaudible]

Answer: So what we've seen, the UPC doesn't want to create an unfunded mandate which is why we went with rolling targets, but what the UPC has approved different depends on the discipline, so we've seen different models. So in the large speech classes, for instance, there is instruction in a large lecture hall and then the students break up into small discussion sections of approximately 15. And that's been what we've seen. We haven't really seen any classes where it's 25 or 30 students. Although if there were multiple oral communications given with instruction throughout the semester, it's possible it might be improved. It really all depends on how the faculty member constructs this. So far what we've seen are---because the "W" is going to be subsumed into the new "E" series for liberal studies, we've seen some departments actually excited about creating an OCCR class that maybe might have 100 students but would have small discussion sections within which the students would actually give their speeches. So there are multiple ways that people have been approaching this question. But our goal is not to create an unfunded, expensive program on departments.

The motion passes.

- b. Graduate Policy Committee, L. Stepina

Just a quick update. Gary wasn't quite correct; we're still wordsmithing away on the dual-graduate enrollment transfer credit issue. We've cleaned up some language that we needed changed because of the Collective Bargaining Agreement concerning graduate faculty status, co-director status, etc. and we've also added conflict of interest from the Collective Bargaining Agreement to go in the graduate catalog.

This semester we reviewed: geography, motion pictures, international affairs, and anthropology, which is a particularly interesting one when you're reviewing a program that doesn't exist. We heard from I think half the anthropology department showed up at the meeting. Basically we encouraged the administration to consider reinstating the master's program in anthropology. This spring is: urban planning, interdisciplinary program in humanities, and library and information studies. I want to thank all of you who responded to my pleadings to be on the subcommittees. And that's about all. Any questions?

VI. Special Order: Tom Jennings, Vice President for University Advancement

Gary, thanks for the opportunity to speak. It's a pleasure to be here with all of you. I wanted to start just by congratulating and thanking our College of Music for what's one of my favorite nights last night, the Prism concert. It was, as always, a great event for me.

We're in the midst of a campaign, as you know, and we're about almost at the midway point. We started counting gifts July 1, 2010 and by our professional standards, allowed to take up to 8 years, and we're going to take the full 8 years and that will take us through June of 2018. And the goal has been less than a billion dollars. Depending on how far we are along next October we may go as high as 1.2 billion in terms of our final goal. A lot of that depends on how successful we are at fundraising this year. Normally when you run a large campaign like this you want to have to have 50-60% of the funds committed before you announce your final goal and you have to identify the donors that you think are going to commit before the end of the campaign term. You want to set goals that are achievable but also a stretch. So far, we are at \$504,000,000 received as of October 31st against what we are saying is a billion dollar goal right now. Of that 504, 141 million of that goes toward athletics and 363 million toward academics and co-curriculum activities.

This past year we established a couple of volunteer campaign committees. One we're calling The President's Campaign Cabinet. This is comprised of some donors that have given \$5,000,000 or more to the institution plus the Chamber of the Board of Trustees of the University. We've also established a national campaign committee which is comprised of about a dozen couples who have [inaudible] or more in this campaign plus the president of The Student Foundation plus Gary Tyson as Chair of the Faculty Senate and member of the Trustees. We've got a good representation on that group as well. That group also has representation from the Seminole Boosters, the FSU Foundation, and the Alumni Association. We're looking at next October 18th to launch the campaign publically. That's, we're hoping, going to be a home football game---we have some inside news on that that I can't share---but that's going to be a big weekend of us. The plan there is to invite all our top volunteers and many of our top donors back to campus to really show off the best of FSU. Get them charged up about committing gifts, additional gifts in some cases to the campaign. More on that to come. We've got a committee together that is planning that. Again, that's for next October.

Gary mentioned some of the new initiatives. One Susan also mentioned: the faculty/staff campaign. I'm grateful for those who have already contributed to this. It has a great marketing tagline that Gary came up with called 25 for 25 which recognizes President Baron's goal of having FSU recognized among the top 25 public universities in the country and having faculty show their support for that by giving a gift that has a 25 in it. It can be \$25; 25 pay period; \$2,500. You get the idea. As a featured initiative of that, I chose the university libraries because that is something that many faculty members connect with. It's a critical part of your work at Florida State. Gary and Dan have worked to create a committee that's going to include faculty and staff. All gifts made by faculty and staff members during the campaign period will count in the campaign. Because our database was able to code members of the university community as faculty and staff we will be able to report on our progress toward that total as the years go on. Faculty and staff will be able to give to any part of the institution that is meaningful to them. And there is no pressure here. We want this to be a voluntary, joyful experience for people not any kind of pressure or expectation. What it does tell the outside world is that the people who know the institutional best are willing to step up and support it. I've made annual gifts to the campaign. Many of you in this room have too. To the extent that you can help us raise awareness and raise support for it, so I think we will be successful. And it helps my development officers at the Foundation go out and say X percentage of the faculty have contributed to the campaign. You'll hear more about this in January. We want The United Way campaign to run its course and not to compete with that in the same time period before the holidays. So that's something that is very exciting.

Something else that is new in the fundraising world is "crowd funding" or "crowd gifting." Many people do use Kickstater or similar kinds of websites to raise money for private enterprises and for some charitable work. We've had some FSU students and faculty members begin to try that as a mechanism to raise money for their own projects. This comes with some interesting issues. Like when someone makes a gift to that fund, the donor doesn't really get any credit with the university for making that gift because they made it to a separate entity. We weren't able to give the donor recognition or gift credit for that. We are not able to capture their information to continue to send them information about the university. There are a number of audit related issues on that because the University doesn't have much if any control over whether the money is actually spent for the purposes that the student says they are raising money for. That could cause all kinds of interesting things if the students decided to go out and have a party that involved underage drinking. You could imagine the scenarios that could play out there. Those are some concerns. So rather than just say, "Hey, kid, do this or we're going to put an end to this," I charged my Foundation colleagues to come up with an alternative. The head of Advancement Services, Jeanne Pecha, has been working with a group of deans and Gary and others on campus to come up with our own crowd gift fundraising site and we've got something that mimics some of the best aspects of Kickstart but it also allows us to have a little more institutional control, if you will, over the projects that come up. So if you are going to use the FSU name and the FSU symbol, it has some approval by a dean or someone in the department level has say in that particular area. It actually allows us to generate data, keeps the credit cards PCI compliant, and you don't get charged the 5, 10, or 15% that Kickstarter generally charges you for going through the site. So we can provide a lower price option and provide the kind of institutional control but still allowing people to be entrepreneurial in the kinds of fundraising activities they want to do. I see us building this out over time so that we have many more allies in the fundraising business. I can imagine over time student organizations participating in

something like this so that as they are raising money from their own parents and family and friends, that we are able to raise money for student organizations as well. [inaudible]. That group is still meeting. I believe in January or early February they have the next phase of the website and we're going to go live in early 2014 with that.

There are a couple of things that I am going to mention now that other universities are already doing, but Florida State was ironically not. We are creating a life-time giving society that crosses all the DSO's at the university. One of the reasons we couldn't do this before at FSU is because the Seminole Boosters had a different database than the FSU Foundation until about 4 years ago. We had a common database conversion and we've made it successful through that. We've had some cleanup of Booster data over the last year and a half and now we are able to go out with a recognition societal to encourage donors to make cash or cash equivalent gifts. The Foundation will still retain its giving societies, which really acknowledge pledges and commitments by donors or gifts and pledges. The Boosters have their own recognition society which really recognizes commitments. This giving society is going to recognize a person's cash gifts. Why is that important? In the fundraising world, if someone has given \$600,000 say to FSU and we think they have the capacity to reach the million dollar level, having a donor recognition wall that recognizes folks at the million dollar level can be an incentive to get people to either a) pay off pledges that [inaudible] or b) introduce that next threshold of giving. It allows us to steward donors who care about us a great deal more than we are right now. Mostly the part of this I'm proud of is that we have the Boosters and the Foundation, again one of the several examples I have of ways we are working together and have come together to tackle some really tough logistical hurdles to make this happen. Behind the scenes on this, was enacting in October a gift acceptance policy and a gift counting policy that's common across all the DSOs. Again something that's in place at many other universities but hadn't been at place at FSU because over time our predecessors hadn't gotten an agreement between the Foundation and the Boosters and the Ringling Foundation and the Research Foundation about how we were going to count charitable gifts. So a committee led by of Jerry Vance at the Foundation spent a year working on this issue with multiple drafts, and as October 1 we have our first university-wide gift counting policy at Florida State. And that's important for a lot of different reasons, partly because our donors can give through multiple areas of campus and so having a common set of practices is going to be something donors have asked for too.

Another change: we've increased the amount of development officers inside the colleges. Each college has a development officer. Some of the larger colleges with large numbers of prospective donors have more than one development officer. As you would expect, Arts and Sciences and the College of Business and so forth—some of the larger entities—have more than one development officer. And some of them because we've been working with where the donors exist within the colleges some of the programs that have high net worth donors have development officers assigned to them like the real-estate program in the College of Business in the Dedman School. We really looked at each college's donor pool and the wealth capacity of that donor pool and the number of prospective donors and we've tried to assign our development officers according to where they can be most effective with our places that have money. We love everybody, but in the development word we have to pay special attention to a few people because there are only so many hours in the day. With 300,000 alumni we have to choose the 10,000 that are really going to make the financial difference in this campaign in terms of where we assign our development staff.

I became concerned this year that our Alumni Association membership drive, the Booster membership drive, and the Foundation's annual giving efforts—with direct mail, email, from

the phone, so forth--were coming in conflict with each other. We were really hitting our alumni too many times for gifts. So I've engaged a consultant to come in and look especially at the Foundation's annual giving compartment and the Alumni Association membership compartment because I'm worried we've got a duplication of services and that our alumni are going to "cry uncle" pretty soon if we keep calling and emailing them with the same kinds of messages from 3 or 4 or 5 different entities of the institution.

Last couple of things: The total university endowment stands just north of \$550,000,000. This is great. It puts us in second place in Florida. That's the good news, but the bad news is we are still a ways behind U.F. One of my goals is to close that gap a lot over the next few years. We've had great performance on that endowment, though. Our Foundation investment committee is made up of: Peter Jones, who chairs the committee and is one of the top 5 people from Templeton; John Field, who is the C.E.O of Merrill Lynch and one of our alums; Ash Williams, who is the chief investment officer for the Florida Pension Program. We've got some really great folks who are managing our investments. The last thing I'll mention is two years ago we created a new direct support organization called the Real-estate Foundation. A couple reasons: First, we were worried that as the Foundation accepted gifts of real-estate, if there was a problem with it or if an accident happened on the property while the Foundation held it, it was possible that our endowment would be at risk in a lawsuit. So we wanted to shield the Foundation endowment, which is about \$450,000,000 of that 550,000,000 total endowment, from lawsuits. So this gave a little organizational buffer, if you will. Second thing, we noticed that a lot of our peer institutions were able to be more flexible because their pools are a little more flexible with direct support organizations than they are with state entities like the university, especially Florida. And the third thing is our Facilities Planning Group has incredible expertise in campus planning but they didn't have much expertise in real-estate development, so as we are looking to the borders of our campus and what's going to the highest and best use of properties especially as we develop areas like the Civic Center precinct, this Real-estate Foundation brings the kind of expertise that the university doesn't have internally in the administration right now. So there is a board of 9 people of which I am one. The other 8 actually know something about real-estate. Many of them are graduates from our real-estate program. And we just hired in September our first ever executive director of the Real-estate Foundation, Kevin Gram, who is a 1993 graduate of the College of Business in finance and real-estate. One of the main tasks of the Real-estate Foundation is to take on the Civic Center precinct and the master planning effort that is under way right now about how that area could or should be developed over the next decade.

My time is short; I'm out of time; I'm happy to answer any questions about the Foundation or the Alumni Association or the Boosters or the Real-estate Foundation.

Question: [inaudible] faculty/staff campaigns [inaudible] I'm curious, though, how much information and what information [inaudible] as it relates to who gives and how much [inaudible] protect that process.

Answer from Jennings: First of all, the stewardship of individual donors varies by college, and partly because of the volume of thank-you letters and so forth varies by college. So Arts and Sciences, as you can image, has an enormous number of gifts and "thank you"s and the College of Motion Picture Arts less. So they have different processes. Typically the dean—depends on the dean--can request lists of donors on a weekly or monthly basis, however they want, but it varies by dean. But the dean will have access to all the donors to the

college. The main rule related to gifting for faculty/staff campaign is the faculty member can't have control over the use of the money that they gift. So there has to be some measure so you are not giving to a fund you also sign off on. So each college has to develop the protocols for that. At the Foundation we have over 2,000 separate funds across the various colleges and units. If we have a process—and we may but I don't know what it is right at the moment—the main thing is we're going to be looking for when a faculty member makes a gift, is the fund that it's being directed to controlled by them and if they are a signer of that fund we are going to have to ask them to make it for something else or create a system where someone else in their college can sign off on the use of those funds.

Some of the deans, Don Weidner is an example of a dean who writes a “thank you” note for every gift over \$250 and he often calls the vast majority of those alumni who make those gifts. And they have a fabulous job of getting their faculty to participate in the alumni giving drives they do every year. The faculty actually, in some cases, set up challenge gifts for their students to encourage student giving. Again, when I speak with the deans about the faculty/staff campaign, it's the same message I deliver to you which is that it should be a joyful, voluntary, spontaneous sort of thing without pressure from any administrator. We hope we'll have 100% or as close to 100% as we can in this. [inaudible].

VII. Old Business

There were no items of old business.

VIII. New Business

a. Academic Honor Policy Changes, Jennifer Buchanan for Amy Guerette (See addendum 2.)

Thanks, Gary. I'm here on behalf of the Academic Honor Policy Committee. It's a committee of three students and three faculty members appointed by the president and recommended by the Faculty Senate or Student Senate. The chair of that committee, Amy Guerette, expresses her regrets; she couldn't be here with you but asked me to go through these relatively simple changes with you so that you'd understand them and answer any of your questions. This all started with the need to rid the world of vestigial references to the Dean of the Faculties. You wouldn't believe how many times the “Dean of the Faculties” was in the Academic Honor Policy, so thank goodness for “find and replace.” We knew we needed to do that, so as we did that, we thought let's look at places where we could improve and clarify the language so that people can understand the real process better and make it fit with actual practice of the Academic Honor Policy. So a couple of notes about process the proposed changes that you see here on this draft for your review have been discussed twice at the Academic Honor Policy Committee. If approved by Faculty Senate, they will also need to be approved by Student Senate, and then they'll need to be approved by the Board of Trustees and finally put in the regulations. It's a long process; hopefully we can get that done before bulletin changes go in. So, if you would like I will go through very briefly a couple of these—they are mostly clarifications—and make a couple of comments.

At the bottom of page 1, we thought we ought to include ghost writing paper services because that is running rampant across the world—not only the country but the world. On page 3, the red you see there is simply a clarification of the existing policy and practice just to make things clearer to students that they cannot drop classes where there

has been an academic honor policy violation. Flipping the page to page 4, you'll see the yellow highlights indicate areas that the committee discussed the last time we discussed these. We had more extensive conversations about this portion you see in yellow, and that portion is really the only substantive part of the changes that we have before you. The intention here is to try to communicate to students that the bar is high for this process that we call Referral to Contest the Sanction. Very briefly, we have the step-1 process which is very straightforward: here's the alleged violation, here's my proposed sanction, you did it, yes, don't do it again, sign the paper done, right? That's step 1. Referral to Contest the Sanction is used in the situation in which the student says yes, you've caught me plagiarizing or cheating on an exam yet I really think your proposed penalty is too harsh; I'd like to take this route of sending this to my office for a review of this proposed sanction to see whether it's outside the bounds of what should normally be imposed. And this language strengthens that to show those students that the burden is on the student in that situation to show that this is extraordinarily disproportionate to the offense. In other words, it's not a slam dunk; don't get your hopes up too high about that. Page 5 down at the bottom, some language is changed there in yellow because the former language basically setting out criteria for faculty members to make a determination about the proposed sanction, had "frequency" in there. So that created some problems with students and parents who said, "Wait a minute, it's Joey's first time. Why did Joey get an F in the course based on this violation?" So we wanted to change that, and this is our proposed modification to that. It was very confusing to people who were first offense but they had committed a serious violation and an F in the course is what was going to be proposed. At the end where you see the red under "Step 2" and the different penalties that can be assigned. The original language for these sanctions was essentially copied from the Student Conduct Code for non-academic offenses. So as the years have gone by and we have implemented this process we have seen that some of them just don't work in this process. They aren't used by Academic Honor Policy hearing panels when they determine a case. So these changes are intended to make the list of penalties actually reflect what we use in the system. I'll give you an example of that: conduct probation was in the student conduct code system because they work on a very step-wise kind of a basis. Let's say a student goes before the conduct boards the first time she is drunk under age. She might get put on conduct probation on a lower level. The second time she's confronted by a police officer, she rips down a stop sign and then runs the other way. She's put on disciplinary probation. In the Academic Honor Code Policy, if a student comes before a panel on second offense they should really never be given the message that if they do this again you might get put on disciplinary probation. A third time, really a student would have to work pretty hard not to get suspended or dismissed from school. And that, my friends, is about it. The minor changes on the last page have to do with who should really get the letter and be notified, etc. Any questions about the proposed changes to the Academic Honor Policy?

Question from Dennis Moore: I just have the simplest kind of edit to recommend. On page 6 [inaudible] almost at the very bottom of page 6 there is a sentence that says there have got to be "restrictions may be placed." I think it would be very helpful to insert a "that" -- "restrictions that may be placed include but are not limited." And may I ask a question too? In the process of going through not only the "find and replace" part of it but thinking about how the system works, was there any discussion about the connection to or possible overlap with the whole grade appeal process?

Answer from Dr. Buchanan: I don't really understand your question because the only problems I've seen where people have conflated the two policies and have a sense that

they can be given a proposed sanction and then appeal it, but that's not how the policy works. Does that answer your question?

Dr. Moore: That helps, yes.

Question from Ike Eberstein: [inaudible] Where the student is supposed to demonstrate that the proposed sanction is substantially disproportionate; one of the questions I've been asking because I haven't know the answer to, so I'll ask you. Is there data available on tendencies that students can use to say this proposed sanction is outside [inaudible].

Answer from Dr. Buchanan: That's a good question, Ike. The student could always request those kinds of data from our office. We have those data and could provide them to them. It's interesting. We've never had a student do that, but they could.

The motion passes.

IX. University Welfare

a. United Faculty of Florida Update, J. Proffit

Several provisions of the 2013-2016 collective bargaining agreement have been implemented since the Faculty Senate last met, including raises for promotions, performance and sustained performance, merit, competitive adjustments, and of course, administrative discretion increases. Most faculty members also will see a one-time payment in their December 13 paycheck. This bonus will be around \$200. Reclassifications for Specialized Faculty should be completed this month as well.

At our October consultation with President Barron, Provost Stokes, VP McRorie and other administration representatives, we discussed such wide-ranging topics as the prestige raises, parking, faculty salary compression and market equity, and promotion committees for specialized faculty. The next consultation will be held next week.

In legislative news, we are following the implementation of one of the bills passed in the spring that should be of interest to all faculty members: HB 7029 opens the door to for-profit entities to offer online courses to university students in Florida, courses that would replace our faculty-led courses. The Department of Education (DOE) has been tasked with writing a report regarding the implementation. That report is due February 1st.

We have time to influence the implementation of accreditation for corporate-controlled, rather than faculty-controlled, courses and programs by contacting our legislators to let them know that faculty must retain control of curriculum decisions. There must be strict oversight and accountability regarding accrediting courses offered by for-profit corporations such as MOOCs, or Massive Open Online Courses.

The Legislature will need to vote in 2014 for the DOE plan, or some other plan, or it does not become law. UFF's legislative campaign in the spring of 2013 helped to counter the most egregious proposals in the original bill, such as mandating a switch

from SACS accreditation to a Florida Department of Education accreditation system, so with the help of faculty across the state, we should make our voices heard both at the DOE and in the legislature before and during the 2014 legislative session. If you have questions about HB7029, feel free to contact me at president@uff-fsu.org, and I can send additional information to you.

Gary Tyson: So that particular bill is one that directly attacks faculty governance. The Steering Committee is definitely keeping our eye on it and we'll bring it to you as we do.

Comment from College of Business: Would it be appropriate for the Senate to consider a resolution to let the legislatures know we are strongly opposed to anything that takes away that control? [inaudible]

Tyson: That's a discussion we should have. What do you all feel about that?

Response from criminology: [inaudible] Red flag in our legislature. [inaudible]

Response from Bill Wesser, Political Science: [inaudible] proposals

Tyson: Right. I'm not actually suggesting we do anything at this meeting. I think it's a topic that certainly the Steering Committee has talked about before and will talk about again. I'm actually leaning more towards Jack on this. I think it would be good for us to speak out. The administration is definitely on our side. Nobody wants to give control of the universities over to the legislature. I think we want to do some coordination with them to figure out the most effective way to have our voice heard on that.

Response: In terms of the calendar is there a Board of Trustees meeting between now and that February 1st?

Tyson: Yes. Yes, there is.

Responder: Might that be the kind of body to make the statement we've been talking about? On our behalf? On the behalf of our faculty?

Tyson: They certainly could. I don't know if they would necessarily give as strong a voice to that as the Senate. I can guess as individuals what they might think about that. But certainly the faculty care about retaining faculty governance more than anybody else. But yes there is a meeting of the Board of Trustees on January 20-something.

Response: This might be a good opportunity to educate the rest of our Board of Trustees. I would use it as an educational opportunity because sometimes the Board doesn't realize that the faculty codes the curriculum and then where we stand on this. That would be my suggestion.

Response from College of Medicine: I would also suggest [inaudible] make available more information to both the Senate and across campus. The faculty are better educated on this bill than [inaudible].

Response: I would like to suggest the possibility of connecting [name's] and [name's] ideas together. [Inaudible] Ask them to join in expressing concern so it's a united front with that.

Tyson: When is our January meeting?

Melissa: 29th I think. 22nd. It's the 22nd.

Tyson: So we could theoretically do that. Let the Steering Committee talk about it.

Response: And does the Steering Committee want to think about adapting [inaudible] because that was my other point. Educate them so they can educate for us.

X. Announcements by Deans and Other Administrative Officers

a. Dean Patricia Flowers, College of Music

Gary, thank you for the invitation to be here. I understand that I was asked to talk about the College of Music, where we stand and where we might be headed, and perhaps some of the unique features that define our programs. I'm in my fifth month here, so I'm still learning. It's a big program and a fast learning curve. I work with the greatest faculty in the world and have much support. I see many music faculty here today.

I decided to bring some facts and figures. I'm going to read these quickly to give a picture about the size and scope of our enterprise. We have 86 tenure and non-tenure track faculty, 15 adjuncts, 31 staff, 129 OPS, and 223 G.A.s. Many of the G.A.s, are quarter time and third time—probably more than at most universities. We've got nearly 1,200 students, about 35% graduate. We're the third largest program in the United States. We're the 12th ranked music program nationally, and 5th ranked among public universities. This is in the context of 650 accredited music programs in higher education. So as Alabama can tell you, it's pretty hard to stay at number 1. It is part of my vision to maintain our high ranking—it's not easy to stay at that rank. The College of Music offers numerous areas of study. It is an impressive list and much more expansive than many universities including some very good ones. In no particular order, we've got: jazz, sacred music, music education, composition, music theory, music therapy, performance including most instruments you can think of including organ which is rare (there are only a handful of organ programs left in the U.S.) pedagogy, arts administration, piano technology (that's another unique program), music theater, accompanying, conducting, historical musicology, ethnomusicology, commercial music and so on. It's a really comprehensive range of curricular and programmatic offerings. We offer over 500 recitals and concert performances a year. Prism is going on right now. I know some of you love that and I understand that it's sold out. On Friday night, our early music people are performing *A Festival of Lessons and Carols* at St. John's Episcopal Church. They will be directed by our new faculty member, Dr. Sarah Eyerly. She is doing the lessons in different languages which is a really nice and unusual twist. And there is the Seasonal Celebration concert on Saturday and Sunday. The concert series is in addition to many symposia, guest speakers, and collaborative and interdisciplinary events. I especially like symposia where the academic faculty and the performance faculty

come together—we don't always divide ourselves according to administrative areas. We've had some very rich events this fall. For example, Theory put together the Ligeti Symposium which was mind boggling. We have 5 concert or recital halls, 1 amphitheater, and our classrooms are spread over 5 buildings. We have 2 research centers (the Center of Music of the Americas and the Center for Music Research), 7 bands, 7 choral ensembles, several early music groups, 3 large jazz ensembles, many jazz combos, 2 orchestras, two full opera productions every year, and over 400 students participating the Marching Chiefs from all over campus. We have the AccaBelles whom you've probably seen on YouTube recently. We also have African music, gospel, Andean, Balinese, Blues, Chinese, Irish fiddling, Old Time Ensemble, Salsa, and steel pan. We have some specialized programs at the graduate and undergraduate level, for example an undergraduate program in entrepreneurial studies. The entrepreneurial specialization ties into some of the Big Ideas and we'll talk about that later.

Another thing that is unique about this College of Music is its strong town-gown relationships. I'm still pondering how this got to be so rich and so strong. One of the things I've been busy doing in my 5 months here is making friends throughout the community. Some of our community music groups include Tallahassee Symphony, the Music Guild, the Capital City Children's Choir, Bach Parley, Community Chorus, Youth Orchestra, Tallahassee Winds, and the Artist Series. We get a lot of requests for town-gown reciprocity. For example, I just received a request last night to replicate our instrument petting zoo that we rolled out during football season. So there are a lot of ways we enhance the community, but they also enhance us. Some of you may be members of the University Musical Associates. UMA membership includes a subscription series for our concerts plus reserved parking which the community loves. Contributions beyond the cost of the tickets go into a fund that supports our students. This might seem like a small thing—a small measure of annual giving—but in fact, so far this year I've expended probably \$80,000 in student support; this is used primarily for sending students to conferences and competitions, and bringing guest artists to our campus. Tallahassee is a little bit isolated, and so part of our educational enterprise is to bring prominent guests here and to send our students out. The University Musical Associates is comprised of community members who care about our students—they know some of them by name; they know the ensembles and who performs in them. I'm amazed at what they know and how involved they feel. The College gets lots of love. It's fun to be the music dean!

The next thing I want to talk about has to do with vision. Everybody asks me what is my vision. Where are you headed? What are you going to do? You're in music education. You're an oboe player. Are you going to favor those areas or something else? In my quiet moments of critical self-analysis, I don't think I ever answered that question very well during my interview. I don't want to go through another interview but I'll say a few things about it here. I've spent my career, which is now getting to be rather long, with one foot in administration and one foot in the faculty ranks. It does not seem right to say that since I've been here for 5 months I know exactly where we are going. It really comes down to faculty governance. The curriculum is indeed in the hands of the faculty. The research agendas are in the hands of the faculty. And I think it takes a while to get the lay of the land about where we're going—where we might go—without stifling responsibility and faculty entrepreneurship. I think we are unique in the number of choices that our faculty

have been able to make—what they can try, what ideas they can develop. I think that’s part of the reason we are ranked so highly. However, there is always room for leadership. And I think the leadership needs to provide opportunities for faculty to use their creativity and expertise to advantage and to encourage innovation. I also think it’s important to connect the University to the outer world, the local community as well as the national and international community. We are strong in outreach and I’d like to do even more of that. My vision for the College also includes a strong relationship with the FSU goals and objectives across the board. I don’t ever want to be an isolated enterprise. Looking at the University mission—from where we stand at the moment—I see some ways where the College of Music can engage. One is in entrepreneurship; another one is longevity. We have majors in music therapy and music education plus all of our ensembles; we already have a close relationship with Westminster Oaks. Quality of life is part of music. We have so many stories of people calling to ask, “Do you have any idea what your subject matter means to us?” And the answer is: “Yes, we actually do!” And so I’d like to build faculty interest and continue to go in that direction [aging and longevity]. I’m also interested in international travel for our students. I know that we have students who need to get out and about a bit more. We have some international programs on board and I could see some more. Finally I’m interested in the Creative Crucible idea, even though it is not a major building project for music. But I love the idea and I like working with the other arts deans—that’s a partnership that I’m interested in and I think is good for the university.

It’s also important to increase our self-sufficiency and sustainability through fundraising. We can’t rely exclusively on public dollars; no state university can. A lot of my time so far has spent on fundraising. I’m developing quite a platform of priorities for where this might lead. Scholarships and G.A. stipends need work. They are not high. We attract great music students but I don’t know how they live on that little money. We need more endowments directed toward student support. I’d like to see us become a 21st century library. We need work on our facilities, our collections, and our connectivity. I can see some avenues for incremental renovation; I think we are tapped out a little bit on that after Ruby Diamond but there are areas that need work and I think there are willing donors who can help us continue to improve our facilities. And then there are the fun projects—the esoteric stuff—the donor who really loves Baroque music, the opera lover, or early music aficionado. Those are some fundraising targets that are broad enough that we can match donor interest to our needs.

Challenges, concerns, and opportunities. I’ve had some very hard conversations about compression and inversion. I look at our salary structure, and it’s not good. Music is not the highest paid college in the university, and there is a very high standard deviation among faculty salaries within the College, not always representing level of accomplishment. We need to keep addressing this.

Problems aside, some things make us unique that might be different from your own academic disciplines. For example, we have a lot of one-to-one instruction in the form of private lessons; I know that dissertation hours and lab time is often individual but it’s nothing like in music where we have numerous performance studios with 18-22 students. That presents some interesting challenges. We are extremely interdependent in our curricula. If we got rid of one program, it might not

help our budget very much because we'd have to keep the faculty members anyway since they're teaching required courses for another major within the College. We have other unusual driving forces. For instance, there is no reason why we need more violinists than we do bassists except that decisions were made in the eighteenth century about orchestral instrumentation. In a perverse sort of way, eighteenth century enlightenment is affecting our admission decisions today, and it creates some curious enrollment decisions. We need a lot of clarinets and not too many oboes. And if you admit too many oboes, you need to have another band and then you need even more clarinets! We need podium time for the conductors. We need ensemble time for composers to have their music performed. We have many internships all around the state: arts administrations, music therapy, music education, probably others. We are very well placed in that way. Another unique aspect of college music programs is that study in our field starts very young—elementary school, middle school, high school. A student can't choose music as a major somewhere along the way because she or he simply loves music; skill development starts early. We are extremely dependent on parents and public schools to make our admissions possible. So it's hard to do the "up by the bootstraps" approach when you get to school and fall in love with music because you probably need 10 years of lessons before you can even get your foot in the door at an audition. So we are connected to the educational enterprise kindergarten through doctoral study.

The metrics that we use don't always define the arts and humanities very well. I have no aversion to metrics. I think there are a lot of good outcomes that we can share, but they are not always made public. Sometimes the value of music flies under the radar, but it's alive and well. To make that point, I went on YouTube and looked at how many hits the AccaBelles have now. If you haven't looked them up, you should go there. They are absolutely fantastic. They have over 6 million hits now. Then I looked at the Auburn-Alabama game to see how many hits the winning touchdown got. The AccaBelles are winning many times over. There are 5 pages of AccaBelles hits with over 6 million on the top one. On the Auburn touchdown there are only four pages and the highest one has 200,000 hits. So, music has traction! Music is alive and well in our culture. Music is always changing, as are the institutions that support its creation, performance, and transmission. Technology has always been a change agent for music—this is not something new. For example, at one time, the flute was advanced technology. Before that it was the recorder. Before that, it was a piece of grass between your thumbs. Music is always changing. Music is connected to the physical structures in which it is performed, it is a result of economy, and biased toward the interests of those who support it. People who imagine that music as we know it has come to an end are thinking about the past. Music is vital and ever changing. We can lead and we can participate in it joyously rather than looking back and saying this is an ending.

To end this talk, I want to say a few words about the last dissertation I advised. It was conducted by a doctoral student in music education. She did this study in Michigan where she used to teach high school music. The music program in this particular school district was highly successful, even though music curricula were being cut in many other districts throughout the state. The dissertation project was a year-long case study where she had access to everything: interviews, budget, minutes, school records, and so on. She dug deeply into the music culture of this community. At the end, she concluded that the success of the music program was affected less by

economic factors than community identity and will. Everybody knew that they were about music. They loved music. They supported it. It's who they had always been and what they expected to be in the future. It was their legacy, even though their demographics were not dissimilar from other districts who were letting go their music and arts programming. But because the superintendent and the families were so intent on keeping music, they found a way.

To me, that's what I'm finding out about Tallahassee that makes it so unique. I believe that music and the arts are strongly tied to this University and community. That's part of my vision as dean—to nurture that identity, engagement, participation, value, and community involvement. We will find a way to keep the College of Music strong. We send out these [AccaBelles] young women to a free competition and they come up all over America. We can keep doing that kind of magic because music really matters to people and we will continue to find a way.

That ends my comments. Thank you, Gary, for inviting me to speak the Faculty Senate.

XI. Announcements by Provost Stokes

Provost Stokes was not in attendance.

XII. Announcements by President Barron

President Barron was not in attendance.

XIII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:57 p.m.



Melissa Crawford
Faculty Senate Coordinator

Resolution:

The UPC recommends that the Faculty Senate endorse the following plan to phase out the acceptance of high school speech (or its equivalencies) at Florida State University and to encourage disciplines across the university to create more OCCR courses for our students.

This plan is reflected in the proposed changes to the Bulletin copy

Rationale for Changes in OCCR

The faculty and staff at FSU are primarily concerned with student career success. Survey after survey of employers reinforces what academics already know-- that employers across disciplines want college graduates to be skilled in oral communication (indeed, their first priority). To insure that FSU graduates are skilled in oral communication, the OCCR subcommittee believes our students need to participate in a *college* level OCCR course or verify substantive *college-level* training and experience in oral communication. We do not believe that high school courses or experiences should continue to be accepted.

Although specific numbers are not available, a rough estimate of current students who fulfill OCCR through a high school "oral communication experience" is estimated at 30/year, and the number of FSU students who fulfill OCCR through having a "B" or better in high school speech is estimated at 400/year. Hence we recognize that a multi-year approach is needed to achieve our goal of *all* FSU students taking a *college* OCCR course or verifying *college-level* experience. More specifically, we recommend the following:

- 1) Current high school "oral communication" equivalencies will no longer be accepted as "waivers" for students entering the University, Fall 2014.
- 2) A "B" or better in a high school speech class on transcript will no longer be accepted to fulfill OCCR for students entering the University, Fall 2016.
- 3) OCCR will be built into students' Curricular MAPS as of Fall 2016.
- 4) OCCR will be listed as a milestone for students in their junior year as of Fall 2016. (*Note: failure to meeting this "milestone" would not trigger a registration stop or a requirement that students change their major.*)
- 5) Faculty developing new discipline-specific OCCR courses will be supported as follows:
 - Broad publication of the 2012 revised OCCR Guidelines campus-wide
 - Active discussions of the need for new OCCR courses at CAAD and in other appropriate venues
 - Help for faculty to design and then supervise discipline-specific courses that their GTAs can teach.
 - Posting of exemplary syllabi of discipline-specific 1-hour, 2 hour and 3 hours OCCR courses on UPC's website.

6) Additional funding requested for training of TAs across the discipline to teach OCCR classes. Three initiatives to support this:

- graduate students across the disciplines *with* previous teaching experience could enroll in a 1 or 2-day training course for GTAs that will focus on critiquing presentations in various disciplines.
- graduate students across the disciplines with *no* previous teaching experience could enroll in a 3-hour graduate seminar, SED 5346, "Teaching Oral Communication Courses."¹
- tuition-waivers for graduate students who were endorsed by the departmental units to take the SED 5346 class.

7) A demand vs. availability analysis will take place in each October, with the goal of reaching 5,000-5,500 available seats by the Fall of 2016.

¹ This course currently trains GTAs in FSU's School of Communication, if there were more university-wide interest in the course, there would need to be support for the professors to teach additional graduate seminars.

From 2013-2014 *Undergraduate Bulletin*

Oral Communication Competency

Competence in oral communication is indicated by demonstrating the ability to transmit clearly ideas and information orally in a way that is appropriate to the topic, purpose, and audience. It also involves demonstrating the ability to discuss ideas clearly with others, to hear and respond to questions, and to assess critical response appropriately.

A student will satisfy the requirement for competency in oral communication in either of two ways:

1. Petition to have prior demonstration of oral communication competency accepted in place of an approved Florida State University course. Students may petition ~~their baccalaureate dean the Office of Undergraduate Studies~~^{2 1} to have prior demonstrations of oral communication competency accepted in place of a course at Florida State University. Acceptable substitutes may include but not be limited to:
 - a. A grade of “B” or above in a high school oral communication or speech class²; or
 - b. ~~Verified successful participation in a forensic or debate program in high school, community college, or college; or~~
 - c. Passing with a “C–” or higher a course in public speaking or argumentation in another college or university (including community college); or
 - d. ~~Verified successful participation for at least one semester on a university team~~³ Verified successful participation for at least one semester in a forensic or debate program in high school, community college, college, or university Participation for one semester on a university team in which a student’s debating skill or the creation of an original speech is judged competitively (e.g., Forensics, Moot Court, Debate Team, World Affairs); or
 - e. ~~Two One~~ years experience in a competitively-selected leadership position in a university-directed, university-sponsored organization with a substantive speaking commitment (e.g., FIG Leaders, University Ambassadors, Orientation Leaders). Administrative positions in fraternities, sororities, or student government do not meet this standard.

The need for specific oral communication skills (such as formal lecture/presentation, interviewing skills, or group dynamics) will vary from discipline to discipline, and while a minimum level of oral competency is required, means of assessing such competency must remain flexible. Thus, several courses will be identified as including basic tests of oral competency, and students passing these courses with a grade of “S” (in S/U courses) or “C–” or higher (in letter graded courses) will automatically be assumed to have completed the requirement.

2. Earn a grade of “S” (in an S/U course) or “C–” or better (in a letter graded course) in a course which has been approved by the Undergraduate Policy Committee for oral communication competence credit:
 - a. Earn a grade of “S” (in an S/U course) or “C–” or better (in a letter graded course) in a course for one to three semester hours in the major or minor that has been certified by the Undergraduate Policy Committee (UPC) as meeting the standards for oral communication competency; or
 - b. Earn a grade of “C–” or better in one of the following courses: SPC 1017, Fundamentals of Speech,

¹ August 26, 2013 memo from Karen Laughlin and Jennifer Buchanan noted that the approval process is “now changing to give this responsibility to the baccalaureate deans as part of students’ clearance for graduation.

² A “B” or better in high school speech class on transcript will no longer be accepted to fulfill OCCR for students entering the University, Fall 2016

³ Current high school “oral communication” equivalencies will no longer be accepted as “waivers” for students entering the University, Fall 2014

or SPC 2608, Public Speaking.

Regardless of the vehicle, to complete the oral communication competency the student must demonstrate the ability to:

1. Generate an original oral message that clearly presents ideas and/or information;
2. Make effective use of both vocal and physical delivery in the presentation;
3. Adapt the presentation to the particular audience; and
4. Be receptive to questions and/or criticism.

Because speaking experience must focus on generating “an original oral message” courses that emphasize the interpretation or performance of literature do not satisfy this requirement.

Currently Certified Courses:

AFR XXXX Sequence of three courses. (see the Department of Aerospace Studies for details)

CJL 4565 Courts and Social Policy (3)

CIS 4250 Ethics and Computer Science (3)

COM 3110 Communication for Business and the Professions (3)

ECH 2050 Chemical Engineering Communications (2)

EDG 4410 Classroom Management and Professional Issues (3)

EEL 4911C Senior Design Project I (3)

CGN 4800 Pre-Senior Design and Professional Issues (2)

AND

CGN 4802 Senior Design Project I (3)

Note: Both courses must be taken to satisfy the requirement.

EML 4551C Senior Design Project I (3)

AND

EML 4552C Senior Design Project II (3)

Note: Both courses must be taken to satisfy the requirement.

FIL 2090r Professional Communication (1)

GEB 3213 Business Communications (3)

MET 3940r Weathercasting (1)

MUE 3491 Communication Skills for the Musician: Choral (2)

AND

MUE 3495 Music Education Laboratory (1)

Note: Both courses must be taken to satisfy the requirement.

MUE 3493 Communication Skills for the Musician: Instrumental (2)

AND

MUE 3496 Music Education Laboratory (1)

Note: Both courses must be taken to satisfy the requirement.

MUY 4402 Music Therapy: Methods and Practicum II (3)

NUR 3076 Communication in Health Care (3)

NSP 4546 Substance Abuse: Effects on Health, Family, Profession (3)

PHY 3091 Communication in Physics (2)

SMT 4664 Project-Based Instruction (3)

SOW 3350 Interviewing and Recording in Social Work (3)

SPC 1017 Fundamentals of Speech (3)

SPC 2067 Communication for Arts and Design (3)

SPC 2608 Public Speaking (3)

SPC 4620 Strategic Speaking (3)

THE 2020 Introduction to Theatre for Majors (3)

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC HONOR POLICY

Introduction

The statement on *Values and Moral Standards* says: “The moral norm which guides conduct and informs policy at The Florida State University is responsible freedom. Freedom is an important experience which the University, one of the freest of institutions, provides for all of its citizens – faculty, students, administrators, and staff. Freedom is responsibly exercised when it is directed by ethical standards.” (*Values and moral standards at FSU* retrieved from the current General Bulletin located at <http://registrar.fsu.edu/>)

The statement also addresses academic integrity: “The University aspires to excellence in its core activities of teaching, research, creative expression, and public service and is committed to the integrity of the academic process. The [Academic Honor Policy] is a specific manifestation of this commitment. Truthfulness in one’s claims and representations and honesty in one’s activities are essential in life and vocation, and the realization of truthfulness and honesty is an intrinsic part of the educational process.” (*Values and moral standards at FSU* retrieved from the current General Bulletin located at <http://registrar.fsu.edu/>)

Guided by these principles, this Academic Honor Policy outlines the University’s expectations for students’ academic work, the procedures for resolving alleged violations of those expectations, and the rights and responsibilities of students and faculty throughout the process. The Academic Honor Policy Committee may take direct jurisdiction of a case under extraordinary circumstances when it is determined by a majority vote of the committee that taking direct jurisdiction is appropriate.

Students in the College of Law and the College of Medicine are governed by the academic integrity policies and procedures of their respective colleges, which are subject to approval by the Academic Honor Policy Committee.

FSU Academic Honor Pledge

I affirm my commitment to the concept of responsible freedom. I will be honest and truthful and will strive for personal and institutional integrity at The Florida State University. I will abide by the Academic Honor Policy at all times.

Academic Honor Violations

Note: Instructors are responsible for reinforcing the importance of the Academic Honor Policy in their courses and for clarifying their expectations regarding collaboration and multiple submission of academic work. Examples have been provided for the purpose of illustration and are not intended to be all-inclusive.

- 1. PLAGIARISM. Presenting the work of another as one's own (i.e., without proper acknowledgement of the source).**

Typical Examples Include: Using another's work from print, web, or other sources without acknowledging the source; quoting from a source without citation; using facts, figures, graphs, charts or information without acknowledgement of the source; [utilizing ghostwriting or pay-for-paper services](#).

2. **CHEATING. Improper access to or use of any information or material that is not specifically condoned by the instructor for use in the academic exercise.**
Typical Examples Include: Copying from another student's paper or receiving unauthorized assistance during a quiz, test or examination; using books, notes or other devices (e.g., calculators, cell phones, or computers) when these are not authorized; procuring without authorization a copy of or information about an examination before the scheduled exercise; unauthorized collaboration on exams.
3. **UNAUTHORIZED GROUP WORK. Unauthorized collaborating with others.**
Typical Examples Include: Working with another person or persons on any activity that is intended to be individual work, where such collaboration has not been specifically authorized by the instructor.
4. **FABRICATION, FALSIFICATION, AND MISREPRESENTATION. Unauthorized altering or inventing of any information or citation that is used in assessing academic work.**
Typical Examples Include: Inventing or counterfeiting data or information; falsely citing the source of information; altering the record of or reporting false information about practicum or clinical experiences; altering grade reports or other academic records; submitting a false excuse for [a class](#) absence or tardiness in a scheduled academic exercise; lying to an instructor to increase a grade.
5. **MULTIPLE SUBMISSION. Submitting the same academic work (including oral presentations) for credit more than once without instructor permission. It is each instructor's responsibility to make expectations regarding incorporation of existing academic work into new assignments clear to the student in writing by the time assignments are given.**
Typical Examples Include: Submitting the same paper for credit in two courses without instructor permission; making minor revisions in a credited paper or report (including oral presentations) and submitting it again as if it were new work.
6. **ABUSE OF ACADEMIC MATERIALS. Intentionally damaging, destroying, stealing, or making inaccessible library or other academic resource material.**
Typical Examples Include: Stealing or destroying library or reference materials needed for common academic purposes; hiding resource materials so others may not use them; destroying computer programs or files needed in academic work; stealing, altering, or intentionally damaging another student's notes or laboratory experiments. *(This refers only to abuse as related to an academic issue.)*
7. **COMPLICITY IN ACADEMIC DISHONESTY. Intentionally helping another to commit an act of academic dishonesty.**
Typical Examples Include: Knowingly allowing another to copy from one's paper during an examination or test; distributing test questions or substantive information about the material to be tested before a scheduled exercise; deliberately furnishing false information.
8. **ATTEMPTING to commit any offense as outlined above.**

Student Rights

Students have the following important due process rights, which may have an impact on the appellate process:

1. to be informed of all alleged violation(s), receive the complaint in writing (except in a Step 1 agreement, described in the Procedures Section, where the signed agreement serves as notice) and be given access to all relevant materials pertaining to the case.
2. to receive an impartial hearing in a timely manner where ~~they~~ the student will be given a full opportunity to present information pertaining to the case.

Students are also accorded the following prerogatives:

1. when possible, to discuss the allegations with the instructor.
2. privacy, confidentiality, and personal security.
3. to be assisted by an advisor who may accompany the student throughout the process but may not speak on the student's behalf.
4. to choose not to answer any question that might be incriminating.
5. to contest the sanctions of a first-level agreement and to appeal both the decision and sanctions of an Academic Honor Hearing.

The student has the right to continue in the course in question during the entire process. Once a student has received notice that he/she is being charged with an alleged violation of the Academic Honor Policy, or when a student has been found "responsible" for an Academic Honor Policy violation, the student is not permitted to withdraw or drop the course, ~~unless the final outcome of the process dictates that no academic penalty will be imposed~~. Should no final determination be made before the end of the term, the grade of "Incomplete" will be assigned until a decision is made.

Students should contact the Dean of Students Department for further information regarding their rights.

Procedures for Resolving Cases

Step 1. Throughout the Step 1 process, the instructor has the responsibility to address academic honor allegations in a timely manner, and the student has the responsibility to respond to those allegations in a timely manner. For assistance with the Academic Honor Policy, students should consult the Dean of Students Department and instructors should consult the Office of the ~~Dean of the Faculty~~ Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement.

If a student observes a violation of the Academic Honor Policy, he or she should report the incident to the instructor of the course. When an instructor believes that a student has violated the Academic Honor Policy in one of the instructor's classes, the instructor must first contact the Office of the ~~Dean of the Faculty~~ Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement to discover whether the student has a prior record of academic dishonesty in order to determine whether to proceed with a Step 1 agreement. The instructor must also inform the department chair or dean. (Teaching assistants must seek guidance from their supervising faculty member and adjunct instructors must seek guidance from their department chair.) However, faculty members or others who do not have administrative authority for enforcing the Academic Honor Policy should not be informed of the allegation, unless they have established a legitimate need to know. If pursuing a Step 1 Agreement is determined to be possible, the instructor shall discuss the evidence of academic dishonesty with the student and explore the possibility of a Step 1 Agreement. Four possible outcomes of this discussion may occur:

1. If the charge appears unsubstantiated, the instructor will drop the charge, destroy the documentation, and no record of academic dishonesty will be created. The instructor should make this decision using the “preponderance of the evidence” standard.
2. The student may accept responsibility for the violation and accept the academic sanction proposed by the instructor. In this case, ~~any the~~ agreement involving an academic penalty must be put in writing and signed by both parties on the “[Academic Honor Policy Step 1 Agreement](#)” form, which must then be sent to the Dean of Students Department. This agreement becomes a confidential student record of academic dishonesty and will be removed from the student’s file five years from the date of the final decision in the case. Any grade imposed as the result of an academic sanction will remain on the student’s transcript indefinitely and will not be subject to course drop or withdrawal.
3. The student may accept the responsibility for the violation, but contest the proposed academic sanction. In this circumstance, the ~~student-instructor~~ must submit the “[Academic Honor Policy Referral to Contest Sanction](#)” form along with supporting documentation to the Office of the ~~Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement~~ Dean of the Faculties. The student’s written statement must demonstrate specific reasons why the proposed sanction is extraordinarily disproportionate to the offense committed for any change to occur in the sanction. The ~~Dean of the Faculties~~ Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement (or designee) will review the submitted written documentation to determine whether the proposed sanction should be imposed. ~~The Vice President (or designee) Dean of the Faculties~~ may affirm or modify the sanction as appropriate. The decision that results from this review is final.
4. The student may deny responsibility. In this circumstance, the instructor submits the “[Academic Honor Policy Hearing Referral](#)” form along with supporting documentation to ~~the Dean of the Faculties~~ Office of the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement for an Academic Honor Policy Hearing. The student is issued a letter detailing the charges within ten class days of the receipt of the referral, and the schedule for the hearing will be set as soon as possible and within 90 days from the date of the letter. These timelines may be modified in unusual circumstances. Unless all parties agree, the hearing will not be held any sooner than 7 class days from the student’s receipt of the charge letter. The process then proceeds to Step 2.

If the student is found to have a prior record of academic dishonesty or the serious nature of the allegations merits a formal hearing, the instructor must refer the matter to Step 2 for an Academic Honor Policy Hearing by submitting the “[Academic Honor Policy Hearing Referral](#)” form and appropriate documentation to the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement ~~Dean of the Faculties~~.

Allegations of academic dishonesty involving a graduate student engaged in any phase of the preliminary or comprehensive examination, thesis, or dissertation will be treated as egregious and will be resolved through the Step 2 process, in which the major professor will serve as the “instructor” under the hearing procedures. The Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement ~~Dean of the Faculties~~ and the student’s academic dean, (as well as the Vice President for Research in cases involving grant-funded research), should be informed as soon as possible of all such allegations. The decision regarding whether to submit a hearing referral will be made by a committee consisting of the department chair and two faculty members appointed by the academic dean, one of whom should be the student’s committee member serving as the University representative (if one has been identified), excluding the major professor. In rendering its decision,

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

this committee should review all available information and consult with the major professor and the academic dean.

Step 2. Academic Honor Policy Hearing. A panel consisting of five members shall hear the case. The panel shall include: one faculty member appointed by the dean from the unit in which the academic work is conducted; one faculty member appointed by the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement~~Dean of the Faculties~~ who is not from that unit; and two students appointed through procedures established by the Dean of Students Department. The panel shall be chaired by the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement~~Dean of the Faculties~~ (or designee), who votes only in case of a tie.

The hearing will be conducted in a non-adversarial manner with a clear focus on finding the facts within the academic context of the academic work. The student is presumed innocent going into the proceeding. After hearing all available and relevant information from the student and the instructor, the panel determines whether or not to find the student responsible for the alleged violation using the “preponderance of the evidence” standard. If the student is found responsible for the violation, the panel is informed about any prior record of academic honor policy violations and determines an academic sanction (and disciplinary sanction, if appropriate). In some cases, a Step 1 sanction may have been appropriately proposed prior to the convening of an Academic Honor Hearing. If the student is found responsible in these cases, the panel typically will impose a sanction no more severe than that which was proposed by the faculty member. The panel is required to provide a clear written justification for imposing a sanction more severe than the sanction proposed in Step 1.

The chair of the Academic Honor Policy hearing panel will report the decision to the student, the instructor, the instructor’s academic unit, the supervising faculty member of a teaching assistant or an adjunct instructor, the academic unit, the student’s dean, the Dean of Students Department, and the Registrar, if appropriate. If the student is found “responsible,” this outcome will be recorded with the Dean of Students Department and becomes a confidential student record of an Academic Honor Policy violation. Records in which suspension or a less severe sanction (including all academic sanctions) is imposed will be removed five years from the date of the final decision in the case. Any grade imposed as the result of an academic sanction will remain on the student’s transcript indefinitely and will not be subject to course drop or withdrawal. Records involving dismissal and expulsion will be retained permanently, except in cases where a dismissed student is readmitted. Those records will be removed five years from the date of the student’s readmission.

Sanctions

Step 1

This Step 1 procedure is implemented with first-offense allegations that do not involve egregious violations. The decision regarding whether an allegation is egregious is made by the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement~~Dean of the Faculties~~ (or designee) and the instructor. The criteria used by the instructor to determine the proposed academic penalty should include the seriousness and the frequency of the alleged violation. The instructor should consider the seriousness of the violation, the student’s circumstances, potential opportunities for learning, and consistency with past sanctions in determining a proposed sanction. The following sanctions are available in the Step 1 procedure.

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

1. additional academic work, including re-doing the assignment
2. a reduced grade (including “0” or “F”) for the assignment
3. a reduced grade (including “F”) for the course

Step 2

An Academic Honor Policy Hearing is held for all second offenses, for all first offenses that involve egregious violations of the Academic Honor Policy, for all offenses that involve simultaneous violations of the Student Conduct Code, and in all cases where the student denies responsibility for the alleged violation. The decision regarding whether an allegation is egregious is made by the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement/Dean of the Faculties (or designee) and the instructor. In some cases, a Step 1 sanction may have been appropriately proposed prior to the convening of an Academic Honor Policy Hearing. If the student is found responsible in these cases, the panel typically will impose a sanction no more severe than that which was proposed by the faculty member. The panel is required to provide a clear written justification for imposing a sanction more severe than the sanction proposed in Step 1. Students will not be penalized solely for exercising their right to request a Step 2 hearing. The following sanctions are available in Step 2 (see the Procedures section) and may be imposed singly or in combination:

1. additional academic work, including re-doing the assignment
2. a reduced grade (including “0” or “F”) for the assignment
3. a reduced grade (including “F”) for the course
- ~~4. Reprimand (written or verbal)~~
- ~~5.4. Educational Activities – attendance at educational programs, development of an academic plan with the assistance of the Academic Center for Excellence, participation in an Ethics Workshop, tutoring regarding proper citation practices, interviews-meetings with appropriate officials/faculty or administrators, planning and implementing educational programs, writing essays, or other educational activities. Fees may be charged to cover the cost of educational activities.~~
- ~~6.5. Restitution, letter of apology, or other restorative act~~
- ~~7. Conduct Probation – a period of time during which any further violation of the Academic Honor Policy may result in more serious sanctions being imposed. Some of the restrictions that may be placed on the student during the probationary period include, but are not limited to: participation in student activities or representation of the University on athletic teams or in other leadership positions.~~
- ~~8.6. Disciplinary Probation – a period of time during which any further violation of the Academic Honor Policy puts the student’s status with the University in jeopardy. If the student is found “responsible” for another violation during the period of Disciplinary Probation, serious consideration will be given to imposing a sanction of Suspension, Dismissal, or Expulsion. The restrictions that may be placed on the student’s activities during this time period are the same as those under Conduct Probation include, but are not limited to: participating in student activities; representing the University on athletic teams or in other leadership positions; and participating in practice for athletic or other competitions.~~
- ~~9.7. Suspension – Separation from the University for a specified period, not to exceed two years.~~
- ~~10.8. Dismissal – Separation from the University for an indefinite period of time.~~

Dismissal is considered a final sanction, but readmission is possible in some cases under documented exceptional circumstances. No consideration will be given to readmitting a

dismissed student within the first three years after a dismissal is imposed. Dismissal is noted on the student transcript.

44.9. Expulsion – Separation from the University without the possibility of readmission. Expulsion is noted on the student transcript.

42-10. Withholding of diplomas, transcripts, or other records for a specified period of time.

43-11. Suspension of degree, in cases where an offense is discovered after the degree is posted.

44-12. Revocation of degree, in cases where an offense is discovered after the degree is posted.

Appeals

Decisions of the Academic Honor Policy Hearing Panel may be appealed to the Academic Honor Policy Appeal Committee, a standing four-member committee composed of two faculty members appointed by the President and two students appointed by the Vice President for Student Affairs. The chair will be appointed annually by the President, and members will serve two-year renewable terms. In case of a tie vote regarding a case, the committee will submit a written report to the Provost, who will then make the final determination.

On appeal, the burden of proof shifts to the student to prove that an error has occurred. The only recognized grounds for appeal are:

1. Due process errors involving violations of a student's rights that substantially affected the outcome of the initial hearing.
2. Demonstrated prejudice against the charged student by any panel member. Such prejudice must be evidenced by a conflict of interest, bias, pressure, or influence that precluded a fair and impartial hearing.
3. New information that was not available at the time of the original hearing.
4. A sanction that is extraordinarily disproportionate to the offense committed.
5. The preponderance of the evidence presented at the hearing does not support a finding of responsible. Appeals based on this consideration will be limited to a review of the record of the initial hearing. and the student will not be invited to appear before the Appeal Committee.

The procedures followed during the appeals process are:

1. The student should file a written letter of appeal to the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement~~Dean of the Faculties~~ within 10 class days after being notified of the Academic Honor Policy Hearing Panel decision. This letter should outline the grounds for the appeal (see 1-5 above) and should provide supporting facts and relevant documentation.
2. The Academic Honor Policy Appeal Committee will review this letter of appeal and will hear the student and any witnesses called by the student, except in appeals based on consideration #5 above. The committee may also gather any additional information it deems necessary to make a determination in the case. The instructor is not typically involved in the appellate process.
3. The Appeals Committee may affirm, modify, or reverse the initial panel decision, or it may order a new hearing to be held. This decision becomes final agency action when it is

approved by the Provost. In cases where the student is found responsible, the decision becomes a confidential student record of academic dishonesty.

4. Appellate decisions are communicated in writing to the student, the instructor, the instructor's academic unit, the supervising faculty member of a teaching assistant or an adjunct instructor, the Office of the ~~Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement, Dean of the Faculties, the student's academic dean,~~ and the Dean of Students Department, and the Registrar, if necessary, within 30 class days of the appellate hearing.

Academic Honor Policy Committee

An Academic Honor Policy Committee shall be appointed by the University President. The Committee will include ~~three~~ three faculty members, selected from a list of six names provided by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee; ~~and~~ three students, selected from a list of six names provided by the Student Senate. The Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement~~Dean of the Faculties~~ or designee and the Dean of Students or designee shall serve *ex officio*. Faculty members will serve three-year staggered terms, and students will serve one-year terms. The committee will meet at least once a semester. It will monitor the operation and effectiveness of the Academic Honor Policy, work with the Faculty Senate and the Student Senate to educate all members of the community regarding academic integrity, and make recommendations for changes to the policy.

Amendment Procedures

Amendments to the Academic Honor Policy may be initiated by the Academic Honor Policy Committee, the Faculty Senate, the Student Senate, and/or the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Amendments to the policy must be approved by both the Faculty Senate and the Student Senate.