



FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE

**DRAFT**

MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
FEBRUARY 17, 2016  
DODD HALL AUDITORIUM  
3:35 P.M.

**I. Regular Session**

The regular session of the 2015-16 Faculty Senate was held on Wednesday, February 17, 2016. Faculty Senate President Susan Fiorito presided.

**The following members attended the Senate meeting:**

J. Adams, T. Adams, S. Aggarwal, M. Akiba, E. Alvarez, A. Askew, H. Bass, K. Bearor, B. Berg, B. Birmingham, M. Blaber, K. Brummel-Smith, M. Buchler, E. Chicken, R. Coleman, B. Cox, J. Dawkins, V. DeBrunner, P. Doan, K. Erndl, B. Fennema, J. Fiorito, S. Fiorito, J. Geringer, T. Graban, M. Gross, J. Hellweg, E. Hilinski, C. Hofacker, M. Horner, K. Howard, L. Jakubowski, T. Keller, A. Kercheval, E. Kim, S. Lewis, S. Losh, C. Madsen, C. Marzen, J. McNulty, M. Mesterton-Gibbons, U. Meyer-Base, D. Moore, R. Morris, P. Osteen, I. Padavic, E. Peters, V. Richard Auzenne, R. Rodenberg, N. Rogers, D. Rohlinger, E. Ryan, V. Salters, D. Slice, J. Standley, N. Stein, O. Steinbock, L. Stepina, M. Stewart, S. Stults, U. Sypher, J. Telotte, G. Tyson, S. Valisa, Col. M. Vanwert, D. Von Glahn, C. Wood, K. Yang, T. Zuehlke.

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

A. Abichou, E. Aldrovandi, C. Bolaños, J. Broome, J. Clark, A. Clarke, J. Cogle, M. Cui (K. McCormick), A. Darabi, J. Fadool, A. Figueroa, H. Flynn, J. Gabriel, R. Gainsford, K. Goldsby, K. Harper (C. Upchurch), K. Hires, D. Humphrey, J. Kesten, W. Landing, J. Larson, T. Mariano, K. McGinnis, O. Okoli, P. Rutkovsky, K. Salata, N. Stoltzfus, O. Vafek, E. Walker, C. Weissert, W. Weissert, D. Wilke, W. Wise.

**II. Approval of the Minutes**

The minutes of the January 20, 2016 meeting were approved as distributed.

**III. Approval of the Agenda**

The agenda was approved as distributed.

**IV. Report of the Steering Committee, Todd Adams**

Since the January 2016 Senate meeting, the Steering Committee has met three times. These included meetings with Provost Sally McRorie, Interim Vice President Janet Kistner, and Title IX Director Jennifer Broomfield.

We discussed the status of the FSU Strategic Plan with the Provost. A draft plan is now available on the FSU website. Forums were held yesterday and more will be held tomorrow with each one focusing on one of the four main goals. There will be additional forums after possible revisions and before finalizing the plan.

After hearing from Mary Coburn at the January Senate meeting about the food pantry maintained by the Dean of Students office, the steering committee decided to hold a food drive in association with today's Senate meeting. We thank you for supporting of our students in need. If you want to make any other contributions, canned and dried food can be delivered directly to the Dean of Students office.

We also met with Dean Nancy Marcus and GPC Chair Lee Stepina to discuss the two graduate policies being considered at today's Senate meeting.

We have been investigating using clickers for the next Steering Committee elections. The College of Education can provide us with enough clickers for all senators. We will use clickers from Turning Technologies that allow multiple answers (i.e. votes). We plan a test of the system for the March Senate meeting and to use it for elections in April. The goal will be to make the elections quicker and to avoid tallying hundreds of votes.

The steering committee participated in interviews for the new Faculty Senate Coordinator to fill the position opened when Melissa Crawford accepted the Faculty Administrator position within the VPFDA office. Melissa is not going far, but we will miss her around the Senate and thank her for her almost 13 years of service to keeping the Senate running smoothly. We are pleased that Andrea White has been appointed to fill the Faculty Senate Coordinator position. She will officially start March 14.

## **V. Reports of Standing Committees**

### **a. Undergraduate Policy Committee, Eric Chicken**

#### **i. Continuous Enrollment Policy (See addendum 1.)**

So we only have one policy here. It was actually brought up last semester but we didn't continue with it: Continuous Enrollment Policy. The only chance is to reword it to make students were aware that summer contented in continuous enrollment because many students felt that summers off did not count against the amount of time they were continually enrolled. You all have the policy available. Melissa sent it out. It's a minor change emphasizing that summer counts in the continuous enrollment window. Questions on it?

Fiorito: Ok. Would you like to make the motion on the policy?

Chicken: I would. Do you want me to read it? I won't read it. I move it as the chair of the UPC that we approve this policy as amended.

Fiorito: Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor of the Continuous Enrollment Policy change say, "Aye."

**The motion passed.**

**b. Graduate Policy Committee, Lee Stepina****i. Provisional Student Policy – Revisions (See addendum 2.)**

You can see the changes that have been made in the Provisional Graduate Student Policy. The idea was to make it clearer so that students had a clear idea of how and what happens if they don't meet the provisions that the department has specified. Any questions? I move that the policy be approved.

Fiorito: So we have a motion. Is there a discussion? I think we've vetted this one as well pretty thoroughly. Hearing no discussion, let's go ahead and take a vote.

**The motion passed.**

**ii. Language of the Dissertation – New Policy (See addendum 3.)**

The second policy is a new policy concerning the language of the dissertation. This was brought up by Modern Languages and they are comfortable with the proposal as written. Any questions?

Man: Was there literally no policy about this before?

Stepina: Literally no policy. We did a search on what other universities' policies look like. A number of other ACC schools have policies but not all of them. Other questions?

J. Fiorito: Jack Fiorito, College of Business. Do you have an example of a dissertation that would be written in another language – maybe something from Modern Languages?

Stepina: Is someone here from Modern Languages?

[Inaudible comments]

Man: It's also a matter of professional preparation for the students who will be expected to publish not only English but in the language [inaudible] specialty.

Fiorito: Apparently this came up in the Graduate Office about a dissertation in Spanish, and the clearance person couldn't read it. So then they said, "Oh ok. We need a policy." There was also one in Mathematics, I believe, that had no English words in it. Those are two examples that Nancy gave us.

[Inaudible comments]

Stepina: Further discussion? I move we accept this policy.

Man: I'm just thinking Spanish [inaudible]. I'm just thinking maybe not all languages [inaudible].

Sypher: It's probably required to write it in that other language. It's just if they choose. I don't remember the number when we discussed it at the GPC but I

think Nancy told us how many times this happens and the number was very small. As far as I remember, it's not very common.

Man: [Inaudible] the sentence that says "all committee members must be completely fluent in the other language." So if they weren't. . .

Woman: Then that person would have to write in English.

Man: I'm just wondering if someone could comment and say if there were a PhD in Arabic who was familiar with, let's say, the history of Arabic-speaking countries [inaudible] understanding the context of the dissertation [inaudible] completely fluent.

Fiorito: I don't think that has come up yet, so I think that's why this policy [inaudible]. We can certainly revise the policy if we see that there are changes. There hasn't been a policy, and we've felt – particularly when Gary Tyson was Faculty Senate President – a lot of the things that we had been doing were just hearsay passed down because we've always done it that way. He charged all the Faculty Senate committees with actually writing a policy. For some of the things we do, there was no policy written for. This is one of the reasons why we are writing this policy down. Once we have a policy on the books and we see we need to change it, we can always come back and amend it. But this is to record it in English [inaudible]. So I think that's why we are doing that.

Slice: Dennis Slice, Scientific Computing. Is the reason for producing a non-English dissertation a necessity of the subject matter or for the convenience of the student?

[Inaudible talking]

Stepina: It's if there is a scholarly reason to have it another language.

[Inaudible talking]

Woman: I wonder if the language can be changed. The sentence with "completely fluent" is not really an official term for language proficiency. Probably "proficient" would be sufficient rather than "fluent." Fluent generally refers to speaking ability whereas proficiency refers to reading, speaking, etc. Usually I think the term is "proficiency" rather than "fluency."

Fiorito: So can we accept that as part of the amendment?

Stepina: Yes.

Fiorito: Any other discussion? Hearing none others, can we go ahead and take a vote.

**The motion passed.**

c. **Library Committee – Open Access, Alysia Roehrig, Gary Burnett, Devin Soper**

**See addendum 4** for the Library Committee’s presentation.

Roehrig: If you want to have more information brought to folks in your own departments, and I’ll invite them up now so they can help answer questions. Devin is happy to come and speak to your faculty. He’s come and spoke to my faculty. We’ll open it up now.

Fiorito: I just wanted you to know too that this has been vetted by the UFF and the Faculty Senate and also our legal wheel at FSU. So this has been vetted.

Man: [Inaudible]. I have two comments. First, on your first slide, part of the process that you didn’t discuss there, which is absolutely critical to the journals and publishers, is peer review. I’ve had faculty members say, “How many hours do you spend reviewing articles and also how much do you get paid for that?” I go: “Absolutely nothing.” So we are facilitating these publishers in key aspects of their business. That’s a lot of time and expertise that benefits them. The other is that both faculty in our department [inaudible] ninety percent.

Roehrig: One thing to point out is we’d still be doing reviews. We’d still be publishing if we chose in some of the same places. However we would just be making our work available in another way to people, which sort of bypasses us and gives us some push back with the publishers.

Brummel-Smith: Ken Brummel-Smith, College of Medicine. I have two questions. One is, you said it would be easier to search for. If I was to do a [inaudible] search for an article, would it show up there before? You said accepted but maybe not in print yet from the publisher of the journal we submit to.

Roehrig: What I read by that is that you can get ahold of the actual copy much more easily especially if you haven’t already had the requirements of putting it into something like PubMed but just googled it, right. Nowadays if you google it at home and you’re not on the FSU network, it says you have to pay \$30 or something. Right now it would be free.

Burnett: There are actually two parts to this. One is that if we are talking about Google and Google Scholar searches, it’ll show up more quickly and tend to have higher rankings. That’s not all together true but its close. The other thing is that if there is something already in PubMed and we just upload the metadata and links to PubMed or a second copy of it, there will be more hits in a Google search. This will not have an impact on searches in the very scholarly databases that we all have access to via the FSU libraries. It’s intended to make this stuff accessible not just to people here who already have access to all those databases but to others [inaudible].

Brummel-Smith: The second question that my faculty asked me to ask is: some journals do require signing copyright to them. It might be difficult for the faculty member to know which journal does which. Is there a sort of boilerplate form that one can use to submit this?

Soper: So there is a waiver option. All waivers will be granted on hundred percent of the time without need for justification. You literally just need to email the library with the title of the article and the journal in which it's going to be published and say can I request a waiver. You wouldn't be bound to make it available. Because you are exactly right there are about ten percent of academic publishers who prohibit this kind of thing. Some of them have even made them into the submission process. If you are from an open access policy institution you are required to request a waiver in order to submit your work. That's a small minority of publishers. Academic freedom was foremost in our minds when we were creating this policy. Speaking with the different groups about it we wanted to make sure there was a robust waiver option so that academic freedom is preserved.

Burnett: There is one other part to this that is worth mentioning. This particular policy does not focus on it. Devan and Micah Vandergrift at the library have already worked as faculty representatives in negotiations with publishers when these kinds of issues come up. So they are providing support to faculty who publish in those kinds of journals.

Roehrig: And I've helped with that so they even have templates where you can negotiate different terms if you'd like to.

Doan: Petra Doan, Urban and Regional Planning. So I think the question that I heard from Ken Brummel-Smith wasn't quite answered. How do we know which journals have which policies? This is not transparent. I've published in fifteen or twenty different journals. How do we figure this out? Is there a cheat sheet or a guide?

Soper: Unfortunately, these policies are changing all the time. I say "unfortunate" but maybe it's fortunate because many of them are going more progressive and accepting of this kind of practice. There is a database called SHERPA/RoMEO where you can check publishers' policies on self-archiving, which is what we are referring to with [inaudible] but not the final published version of the articles. So the library can check that for you. Just email us and say you are not so sure about this. That literally makes our day. We love to help faculty in the best way we can.

Burnett: They have a lot of experience reading many different publisher contracts. They know what kind of language to look for.

Woman: [Inaudible], School of Information. Just a point of clarification. We are wanting to take on the Harvard open access model?

Burnett: Yes. Very close. There are some minor changes.

Woman: Is that the model the University of Florida uses?

Soper: That's a good question. I'm not sure

Woman: We might want to know that as it certainly might help expedite any dealings with the legislature.

Soper: I'll look into that.

[Inaudible question].

Soper: There is good evidence to suggest-- We will observe all embargo periods. Most of these – like 80% of academic publishers I'm referring to who already permit this kind of thing – they permit it after a specified period of time after publication. This amount of time is intended to preserve the economic liability of their journals. Those embargo periods can range from 12-36 months. They are changing all the time. Again, there are databases we can check for every single faculty scholarship that is submitted through the repository to make sure the embargo period is observed. There's good evidence to suggest that this form of open access does not directly hinder the liability of the journals because of those embargo periods.

Burnett: Because there is a lot of evidence that it has a powerful and strong impact on citation accounts for articles from faculty. But people are not going to be signing the pre-print version that's in the archive. They are going to be using this as a discovery tool to find it and their citation will still be with the published journal article. It also has a beneficial effect on increasing the visibility of the journals and the impact of the journals.

Soper: Everything you submit under this policy will include a recommended citation of the published version on record as well as going to where the user can access that if they are part of our community and paid for access.

Burnett: The day is very quickly coming where academic libraries – and it's not just here at FSU, it's everywhere – are no longer going to be able to afford really extraordinary exorbitant databases such as Elsevier. Sooner or later they are going to be faced with the potential of radically decreasing the number of subscriptions for academic libraries. [Inaudible].

Roehrig: One last question.

Woman: [Inaudible]. I support the digital repository but I wanted to ask about a concern I know some of my colleagues will have. [Inaudible] With other open research repository. For example, [Inaudible].

Burnett: That's actually very easy to deal with. There are two ways. One is a second copy can be put here but probably more commonly what would be put in the digital repository is metadata with a link to that other disciplinary repository. It would lead people to the place where they would get the [inaudible].

Roehrig: We were under the impression that we had to wait a month, but we don't.

Fiorito: It's not a bylaws change. It's a policy so we can vote on it. So the actual policy that Alysia is going to make a motion for is the last two pages of the handout Melissa sent you.

[Inaudible comment]

Fiorito: I think we are ready to vote unless there is any disagreement.

Roehrig: I make a motion to approve the Open Access Policy.

Man: Second.

Fiorito: Any other discussion? This calls for a vote.

**The motion passed.**

**VI. Special Order: Safety and Security, Chief David Perry**

See addendum 5 for Chief Perry's presentation.

**VII. Special Order: Title IX, Renisha Gibbs**

See addendum 6 for Renisha Gibb's presentation.

**VIII. Old Business**

There were no items of old business.

**IX. New Business**

There were no items of new business.

**X. University Welfare**

**a. Resolution to Support State College of Florida Faculty, Joseph Hellweg**

I want to propose along with Michael Buchler today a resolution to support State College of Florida faculty. As many of you may know, last month the Board of Trustees voted I believe seven to one to discontinue continuing contracts of apparently various times and enforce one year contracts for all new State College of Florida faculty. This, to my mind and Michael's mind and the mind of many of you here, potentially undermines faculty freedom of speech and inquiry and undermines due process. There is no due process guaranteed with one year contracts. As I understand it, the Board of Trustees and administration of the State College of Florida do not have to justify their reasons for firing any employees. So you can see the kind of weight that the administration has over faculty. This undermines freedom of inquiry and freedom of speech and could even potentially cause problems for the university in new faculty and compromises the education of students. I believe the text of the resolution, the draft, was forwarded to you. There is a correction to make in the first line. The phrase at the very end of that line: "three year." That was a mistake. It's just rolling contracts. Apparently the contracts are for different lengths of time. So the draft resolution reads: "Whereas the State Board of Florida Board of Trustees recently voted to end continuing contracts for new faculty members and the college's three campuses and replace them with one year contracts and whereas this decision reveals a profound lack of understanding of high education, will substantially harm the State College of Florida, its students, and its dedicated faculty, and may serve as a precedent for decisions at other public Florida colleges and



universities and whereas continuing contacts are necessary for recruiting and retaining high quality faculty therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of Florida State University strongly supports the State College of Florida faculty both in their vote of no confidence for the Board of Trustees and in their efforts to appeal this ill-considered policy.” And I have to thank Michael Buchler for most of the wording for this. So can I make a motion? Or discussion I suppose.

Man: [inaudible] from Arts and Sciences. Do we know why this change was made by the Board of Trustees?

Hellweg: I can hazard a guess. I haven't been able to know exactly what the professions are of all the members of the Board of Trustees, but I'm going to quote from an article in *Inside Higher Ed* mentioning the thoughts of one of the members of the BOT, Carlos Beruff. And I quote: “A long time trustee and proponent of one-year contracts for all faculty said at the meeting at which this vote took place that ‘this country is based on the freedom of work’ and that the college could counter any hiring disadvantage by offering merit pay or bonuses to high performing employees.” So this seems to me that this is part of a larger movement in the country to follow a corporate model in education and, in fact, to run public universities as if they were private resources.

Man: [inaudible]. What does “ill-considered” mean?

Hellweg: I think “ill-considered” means that what happened with this vote is treating a public resource, like say water in Michigan these days, as a private commodity. And that people who work for the state and who dispense this resource of education should be held to account by the same criteria by which hiring and firing is administered in private corporations. So I think that is what that term refers to.

[Inaudible comment]

Hellweg: I think they did think about this. They tried this I can't remember exactly when. The attempt had been made before and there was a great outcry on campus and the vote was not taken. Finally they decided they were just going to go through with it. I think it sets a precedent. It gets a foot in the door to now say, “Look what we did at State College of Florida. And then what other low-lying fruit are on the tree that we can get at.” That is maybe a bit of a paranoid reading of this but I think such minor paranoia is merited given the general climate of attack on public institutions in America right now.

Fiorito: Joseph, before you answer any more questions, why don't we go ahead and make a motion and have a second and then we'll have a discussion.

Hellweg: So should I make a motion to vote in favor of the resolution?

Several voices: Second.

Fiorito: Dennis did. Ok. Discussion?

Man: When was this distributed to us and by whom?

Hellweg: I had talked with Michael Buchler and other members of UFF-FSU about potentially proposing a resolution on this last month. The executive committee of UFF-FSU recently passed a similar resolution like this. I found out about that and just slightly modified the language, sent it to Dr. Fiorito on Sunday night and it was distributed at the table.

Fiorito: It was not distributed by email. Melissa only got it yesterday. It is a hard copy out here. That is the only way it's been distributed.

Padavic: Irene Padavic, Sociology. I thought Alec Kercheval had a good point. I don't know why we need "ill-considered." I think it's just as powerful without an adjective.

Hellweg: It may have actually been well considered by them. Right? I see your point. Yes.

Kercheval: Alec Kercheval. I am supportive of the resolution but the wording where it says "whereas" seems to me like it would be better as [inaudible].

Hellweg: I take your point. We can't read their minds. But I think when you read this vote in light of various attempts to minimize or attack overtly institutions that have historically been part of public education like tenure, I think we would stand on good ground to say that the decision reveals a profound lack of understanding for higher education.

Todd: I'm unhappy in saying this serves as a precedent for us.

Hellweg: It says, "May serve as a precedent for us."

Todd: Yah, but even suggesting it. Is there a reason why we need to suggest that it can serve as a precedent?

Hellweg: Well, again, I think if we are going to vote on a resolution we should explain what our concerns are for taking the step for voting for such a resolution. And again, and maybe this is just my reading of the situation, it seems there is a general climate of hostility toward public education and there is a general consensus along those who take a corporate model of incentives and rewards to justify undermining tenure.

Man: If they don't change the system, I don't like that we said this is a precedent. I'd rather come back later and say this does apply to us. [Inaudible].

Hellweg: That also reminds me of a divide and conquer strategy which I think folks like—

Man: I just don't think it's necessary.

Hellweg: And I'm just saying I see why it may not be necessary but I actually added that phrase because it concerns me. Let me just state—

Fiorito: Maybe, Joseph, because you have not had time to read this, if we can table this and let everyone send you their comments. Is this a time issue?

Hellweg: I don't think so but I think we want to pass the resolution as quickly as possible given that the vote was last month.

Slice: Slice. I might support this but I'm not going to support something I haven't seen. [Inaudible].

Hellweg: That's fine. I understand. Sure. Sure.

Man: [Inaudible]. College of Music. I would argue [inaudible]. I agree with Alec Kercheval that "ill-considered" is certainly unnecessary. I think it may serve as a precedent but what differentiates this proposal [inaudible]. Us standing in support of the faculty of the State College of Florida. Us sending a message to our own Board of Trustees that this is not acceptable. I think this creates [inaudible] with the faculty of the State College of Florida. So I would support the "serves as a precedent" clause. [Inaudible].

Man: Maybe the Board of Trustees should explain to use their motivation to us because if we don't educate the crowd [inaudible].

Fiorito: This is not FSU Trustees.

Hellweg: Let me just quote-

Woman: I would like to speak and support this entire motion with only the change of taking the words "ill-considerate" [Inaudible]. With no tenure. There has been a historic assault on tenure through these last few years of the Legislature [inaudible]. I think there is no question that this is an assault on tenure [inaudible]. Because of this history, I feel it is imperative that we support this faculty resolution.

Hellweg: May I quote once more from this article from *Inside Higher Ed*? Beruff went on to note that – this is Carlos Beruff, a member of the Board of Trustees, justify and explaining potentially his motives for this vote. He noted that "other Florida Colleges, the for-profit Full Sail University and the Private Ringling College of Art and Design, operate without tenure systems." So he is explicitly justifying the vote in a state institution based on the practice in private institutions. He's using the lack of tenure in private institutions justifying the lack of anything remotely close to tenure in a public institution. It seems to me that there is a pattern there that the next step could potentially be to justify the removal of something that resembles tenure in a public institution.

Fiorito: So I think we can entertain a motion to postpone or call for a question and have a vote. We are running out of time because we have some other guests here that we need to talk about with Kim Barber, the Registrar, and Janet Kistner. So, I would entertain either a motion to postpone or to call for the question.

Woman: I propose a motion that we postpone.

Man: Second.

Fiorito: We have to have a time certain on that. Do you want to say until the next Faculty Senate? Ok. Postpone to next Faculty Senate. Is the second still ok? All in favor?

**The motion to postpone passed.**

Fiorito: Please contact Joseph who will send this out to us through Melissa. We can revise.

Tyson: I'm unsure what you mean by the Board of Trustees for the State College. It's not the State College System? It appears to be the USF—

Hellweg: That's correct. It's the State College of Florida in Manatee-Sarasota.

Fiorito: So we'll get that clarified and bring it up at the March meeting to discuss. Joseph, that you so much. We'll give everyone time to look at it and discuss it.

**b. United Faculty of Florida, Matthew Lata**

This will just take a minute. It's been a very quiet month. We approved this resolution or something very similar to it at our last executive committee meeting. In the next couple of weeks I'll try to gather some more facts and post that on our webpage and explain some of our reasons for supporting it. Other than that, we look forward to the start of bargaining in the next ten days. We look forward to talking with the administration about some of the issues and concerns of both parties. We look forward to a robust discussion and hope to get a new contract ratified by the end of the academic year. That's the goal. In terms of what is happening across town at the legislature, not a whole lot is moved recently. There is still discussion about new retirement plans for new faculty. There is discussion and a bill starting to move about creating additional healthcare options that we want to be careful doesn't lead to the existing system. It hasn't gone anywhere yet. Guns on Campus is stalled in the Senate Judiciary Committee and we hope it stays there. Open carry – I guess we're not talking about Open Carry because it's still in the Senate Committee. A bill that has passed its first committee in both chambers – it is a bill that in the house version “reduce” and in the senate version “eliminate” certain fees for graduate assistants. We are looking at it this. I know in my case, my G.A.s pay 20% of their stipend in fees that is turned right back to the university. That is of some concern. The question, of course, is how to pay for it. Neither the senate bill specifically requires the university to pay for these fees or reimburse out of the existing funds. That is of course of some concern, but this bill is strongly supported by the GAU and it is something that we will be following as well because we do think it's a fairness issue. Other than that, I'll have a lot more to talk about next month.

**c. Road Scholars, Dennis Moore**

Monday, March 21<sup>st</sup> the Faculty Senate's Road's Scholars Committee is bringing our fourth speaker this year. I thought I'd ask you ahead of time for support of hosting [inaudible] in the scientific community will do for this faculty member from Virginia Tech. Again, that's Monday March 21<sup>st</sup>. There will be one more in April. [Inaudible].

**XI. Announcements by Deans and Other Administrative Officers****a. Dr. Janet Kistner, Interim Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement**

Susan asked me to come and say a few words about the Final Exam Policy, a very popular topic. I did mention at the Council of Deans meeting yesterday that we seem to have some erosion in the enforcement or application of the Final Exam Policy. I know you all know it, but just to hit the highlights, you are not required to give a final exam in your undergraduate classes. That is certainly discretionary. If you do give a final exam, it must be at the scheduled time in final exam week. If you don't give a final exam, you may not give any unit or end of piece exam in the last week of classes. That's probably where the biggest violation is occurring. Just to remind you, this is your policy – a Faculty Senate policy. It's not top-down. This is you. I don't remember what it dates back to but it's been in effect for a very long time. It came about because we are looking out for our students. We don't want our students so overwhelmed in the last week of classes with lots of end of course projects and on-top of that end of course exams. That's why we have a final exam week. It's there for all the right reasons. I've certainly heard a few cases every year about students who are truly overwhelmed during that last week of classes. That's what we hear a lot is that final exams are being given during that week when they should not be. I'm also hearing from faculty who don't want to be named certainly, "I'm the only one who is doing it in my department. I am the only one following the policy. It makes me look terrible. My student evaluations are going to go down." So you're not supporting your colleagues when we don't enforce that policy as well. I may be preaching to the choir since this is your policy, but Susan wanted me to come talk about it, and when I talked about it with the deans I saw a few heads go down. I'd be happy to take any questions of any sort that you have but I've been thinking about it more and I think, at the very least, what I want to do is send from my office to all the deans and chairs a reminder of the policy, the spirit of why we have it, and the fact that it's not an option. It's our policy and if you violate it, that's a problem. It does fall to the chairs and deans to make sure we are enforcing that policy fairly with everyone.

Sypher: As with many policies, there is no consequence to faculty members. The consequence is to the students, right? There is no consequence to the faculty member. It's very easy to violate it and get away with it. I'm not saying we should install some kind of punishment system but I think that's one of the reasons why this and other policies are not followed. They are not the ones who are suffering. So maybe in your memo to the chairs you could point that out so they can develop some departmental way of handling that or dealing with that.

Fiorito: The Faculty Senate Steering Committee is going to talk about this since it is A Faculty Senate policy. Once Dr. Kistner sends this out, if you have any concerns, write to your Faculty Senate Steering Committee members or myself and we'll gather that information and if it needs to be revised, we'll revise the policy. I think that is certainly possible since it is ours.

Lata: This actually doesn't relate to this matter, but we received yesterday word that – and I'm speaking for the Union – in the spring of 2017, our spring break will be a week later to be correlated with the Leon County Public School System. [Inaudible]. I know, though, that for the College of Music, we schedule our ensemble

performances and spaces more than two years out sometimes, so it's causing some consternation and a lot of tap dancing.

Kistner: I appreciate that. Where we are right now is that Calendar Committee voted in favor of making this adjustment and it still has to go to the Board of Trustees who approve the calendar, but I anticipate that they will approve it. As you probably know, there has been really strong support for this among faculty and staff who for many years there has been a strong request to do this. But I hear what you're saying that when you do it for the following year, there is for some groups a concern. It is my understanding that the Provost has talked with your Dean. I think it is probably Music that is impacted by it because of scheduling events once and two years out. I can't say that no one else is affected by it. It is still an issue. Did you want to add anything to that?

[Inaudible comment]

Kistner: It really makes us family friendly. It's hard for folks to juggle. It's good for faculty and staff. It's good for the University. We're trying to work with the groups including those scheduling events to try and make this work out. But I am aware of that one.

**b. Dr. Kim Barber, University Registrar**

Fiorito: Now the long awaited Kim Barber, who so many of you have questions for at the last Faculty Senate meeting. Now she's here and can answer all of your questions. Whatever you have to ask. Anything.

Woman: I'm with the School of Information and we teach online. Our classes are generally six to ten Monday-Thursdays. Inevitably one of us is teaching in the evening after the mechanism for first-day attendance has shut down. I'm just perplexed as to why we can't hold it off one more day knowing there is someone who is teaching after it closes. This is not an anomaly. This happens every semester.

Barber: So I have some questions to make sure I understand where you are coming from. So when you say the first-day nonattendance, are you talking about the tool within Blackboard where you are telling your online students--?

Woman: Yes. Well, no. The tool that faculty are provided.

Barber: Through the attendance rooster?

Woman: Yes. There is a tool that the faculty are told to use to indicate first-class attendance and give a report on who and who has not attended class. That tool shuts down for many of us who teach the last day the first day of class from six to ten.

Barber: That tool is actually open till midnight the fourth day of classes. So if you are teaching Monday through Thursday--

Sypher: Well we always have classes on the fifth day no matter what semester. If you start on a Wednesday, there is a Tuesday-only class. If we start on a Monday, there is

a Friday-only class. So those people have no way of submitting their first-day attendance because you can't do it anymore after the fourth day is over.

Woman: Truly I am not [inaudible]. This is something many of us are dealing with.

Barber: No, I'm not denying that at all. The drop/add period is four days, so for those classes, and to your point, that meet outside of whatever that fourth day is, whether it's a Friday – we have Saturday and Sunday classes – so whenever those meet, drop/add ends after the fourth day and that tool does shut down, but faculty can either make reports through their departments or they can email the Registrar's Office directly. Frequently they do because I personally stay up till midnight on the fourth day of classes and monitor the emails and I know we get them all in on the fifth day or whatever day that falls on.

Sypher: Well, why can't they open it on the fifth day?

Woman: I guess that's the follow up question. Why doesn't drop/add end--?

Woman: [Inaudible] There are serious practical issues with classes that can't fill a cap which drop/add ends. I think the larger question is can you explain why drop/add is on the fourth day. [Inaudible] lots of support for having five days of drop/add so that no class meets after drop/add is over. Can you talk to us about that?

Barber: I can address those points. So let me say that spring is typically the semester where we hit this weird start date, and if you want me to go through all the calendar stuff at five o'clock, I'd be happy to do that for you. But, suffice to say there are rules that dictate when we start the university. Summers and falls we can typically start on a Monday. If we were to extend drop/add to five days, so Monday-Friday, then we would still have some – very small albeit, classes that meet on Saturdays and Sundays. So one of the things that this body would have to consider it, do you truly only need five days, which would put some of those outliers in the same position they are still in, or do you mean really a full set of seven days, a full week? That is something to be thinking about as I explain to you the other considerations that would come in to play if we move this date. The single biggest thing is over three quarters of our student population of undergraduate and graduate receive federal financial aid of some type. If we move out the drop/add period, we cannot award that aid until drop/add closes. So in this case, typically, when drop/add closes – pick a semester. It doesn't matter. This holds true for all of them – from the point of time at midnight when drop/add closes, the financial aid processes – and there are many – kick off and start running. It take a minimum of two days for those to complete. Then we either have to cut checks and mail them to a small number of students. There are still a significant number that get physical checks but most of them do direct deposit. What ends up happening at the end of the financial aid process is that Student Business Services prepares a banking file like our paychecks that is sent out. That doesn't hit students' accounts until one to two days after that and those are on business days. The problem that you run into is that you are looking at a minimum after drop/add of three days that students can get financial aid if they are financial aid recipients. Depending on the semester in question – if you took fall and when Labor Day falls, if you took this semester and tacked those days on through Tuesday – we won't start the federal financial aid processes Wednesday, Thursday, the file

would not be send to the banks till Friday morning sometime. Students might get their aid over the weekend but probably not depending on the bank in question. So now you are looking at students who came back here right after January and have gone two or two and a half, possibly three weeks without financial aid, food, room and board, whatever. So can we do it? Yes, we can do it, but it has to be a very carefully discussed change because the ramifications are significant for our student body. If the real challenge is faculty being able to submit attendance or being able to fill courses, I would rather really partner with a small groups of Senators sand work with them to try and achieve something instead of debating it on Senate floor – no offense intended – to try and figure out what we can do to mitigate the challenges you all are facing and your departments are facing without putting our student body – and we’re talking over 30,000 of them, in this situation. Because for some of these students, this is a real hardship for them. So those are the offsetting considerations.

Woman: I appreciate very much understanding better what the constraints are and I do think it would be valuable [inaudible] whether that one extra day gets the majority of classes in. One other question I have for you that at least from my constituency could possibly matter is whether we are close to being able to access to waitlists as part of the registration process. Because that would mediate at least some of the problems we are having with our classes that are compromises by drop/add ending before some of these classes meet.

Barber: The system we have brought up in the last couple of years does allow for waitlisting. It is not something that the University has as a body – I know some of the individual department do it manually or through other internal processes – so it is something that we can definitely look at. Some of the considerations without remembering all of them is how does that apply across an institution? Who wants to participate and who doesn’t? I do know from following some of the discussion boards nationally and internationally with other institutions who use Campus Solutions, there are some challenges with waitlist. Like with everything there is never the one, perfect-size solution. I think it would behoove us as an institution to really talk through some of those and decide, if we were to bring that up, what does that look like. I can tell you as I stand here, when we were working on the project, because we didn’t have waitlists, I didn’t pay a lot of attention to the consultant. I was more concerned about getting transcripts and registering students. We would probably have to bring some help in. I would say that from the standpoint of there is a prioritization thing within systems. I can’t just flip a switch and turn it on and have it work. It would be one of those we have to step in judicially. One of the things I’ve heard nationally is that students think that if they put themselves on a waitlist, they’ve registered for a class. There’s a lot of confusion whether or not. And then the other part that I’ve heard from colleges around the country is that departments that want to control the way students enroll off those waitlists into those classes, have run into problems where the waitlist typically prioritizes “first-in, first-out.” And you may have that graduating senior or that special student or it’s a permission-only class but they want to use a waitlist to manage it. There are things like that we have to really consider given the fact that we have no real template to say here is how we are doing it or here is how we’ve done it that has sort of been tested institutionally. But it’s definitely something that we can look at.



Jonathan: I appreciate your comments. But I don't want to lose sight of the fact that the situation at hand also creates hardship on departments going from electronic systems to paper. It creates havoc in my department. [Inaudible]. Also what happens – and this is kind of interesting – if we have a four day window and we drop a student on the first day of class because they don't show up, if they are sharp they will re-register themselves. That causes a problem because they didn't take the first class and maybe a state employee or military veteran who is on the waitlist hoping to get in after add/drop ends doesn't make it. So the idea of having an add/drop where we drop first day non-attendees is a good idea but if it's not executed as I understand it to meet its purpose which is: if you don't show up, you get dropped. Not you get dropped but by the way you can just add yourself fifteen minutes after the fact.

Barber: I understand what you are saying, and let me back up and give you a little history behind the first-day nonattendance policy. It is to keep us compliant with a federal financial aid rule that says we cannot award financial aid for students who are not attending. When it was adopted by the University following an audit of some significance we had to come up with a mechanism and we tried to make it easier for faculty by providing this online tool recognizing that with an institution our size and with the complexity of online classes and classes on the weekends, we cannot address everything. There was much discussion about if a student was dropped for nonattendance, does that mean they are banned from that class never to darken its door again that semester. The decision was made at the time, no, we do not want to do that because we don't know if the student was dropped by accident, had they already reached out to the faculty member, is there extenuating circumstances. Then you start getting to the progression of the degree, time to completion, and those sorts of things. The intent was to really focus on: take attendance in that first class, so that from a financial aid point we can say we dropped them out because they did not attend, recognizing that if a student adds themselves back in, that that is possible and allowed. Because the implications if you were to go the other direction, at the time the policy was implemented, the long term consequences were not ones that the University wanted to accept at that time. If the Senate wants to revisit that, we can do that. There are lots of nuanced complexities that I'd be happy to share either with the Senate as a whole or a small group because there are lots of moving parts, and trying to get a full understanding of that is critical for you all as a body to understand what it is you are deliberating on the possible ramifications of the decisions that would be made and the unintended consequences that only reveal themselves after the fact. I'm not against anything you guys are saying, I'm just saying it's one of those things where we have to be judicious if we change things because there are lots of things that hinge on "drop/add has ended" and now other things kick off. As an institution, we have to understand that because they are not all in my office. There is Financial Aid and Student Business Services, there's state reporting and federal reporting. There are lots of things that trip after drop/add closes for us.

Fiorito: This will be the last question. You can certainly ask questions to Kim after the meeting is over and the other thing is we can have Kim back. If there are issues that you want to hear from the registrar, Kim, can we have you back?

Barber: Always.

Woman: All I wanted to say was again thank you for the clarification. [Inaudible]. If you needed a mandate to look into this, you got it. Please take it up.

Barber: If you all will formulate some group that could meet with me, I would be happy to talk through this and see what we can do to work with you all to alleviate some of the first day attendance things assuming we don't move the drop/add out longer. I'm not saying we can't look at that, I'm just saying—

Woman. [Inaudible]. A waitlist would prevent [inaudible].

Fiorito: Why don't you send me an email if you are interested in being on a committee? This is service. Some of you who want all these changes but don't want to serve on any committee, now is your opportunity to fess up and serve on a committee and work with Kim. Please let me know. We'd be glad to establish an ad hoc committee to address the issues.

**XII. Announcements by Interim Provost McRorie**

Provost McRorie did not have any announcements.

**XIII. Announcements by President Thrasher**

President Thrasher was not in attendance.

**XIV. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.



Melissa Crawford  
Faculty Senate Coordinator