

Office of Secretary to the Faculty

May 12, 1966

TO: The Faculty

I Faculty Senate Meeting

The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on Wednesday, May 18, 1966, at 4:10 p.m. in Longmire Auditorium. This will be the last regular meeting of this academic year.

II. The Steering Committee has approved the following agenda:

1. Election of Steering Committee members for 1967-1968.
2. Report of the Academic Affairs Committee  
(Professor Hull, Chairman):
  - a. For information-- the Academic Affairs Committee recommends that the Basic Studies Division be instructed to include the following list of courses in the University Catalogue and in other appropriate sources, said courses to be clearly identified as meeting the "literature" course requirements included in Area IV. Humanities portion of the Basic Studies Program adopted by the Senate at its December 1965 and March 1966 meetings:
    - Classical Civilization 211, 212, 305, 425 and 426
    - Czech 301, 302
    - English 215, 216, 317, 335, 336, 418, 435, 440 and 465.
    - French 201, 202, 301 and 302
    - German 201, 202, 301 and 302
    - Greek 212, 271, 272 and 326
    - Humanities 301 and 302
    - Italian 201, 202, 301 and 302
    - Latin 206, 305, 310, 356 and 357
    - Modern Languages 211 and 212
    - Portuguese 201, 202, 301 and 302
    - Religion 225 and 226
    - Spanish 201, 202, 301 and 302
  - b. For action-- the Academic Affairs Committee recommends that the adopted Basic Studies Program be amended to include the course entitled Philosophy 356: Development of Modern Philosophy in the list of approved courses in Area IV Humanities since this course was omitted from the original list by error alone.
  - c. For action-- the Academic Affairs Committee recommends that the regulations as stated in the General Catalogue (1965-66 Edition, pg. 24, par. B General Regulations) be amended to read as follows:

At least 60 semester hours of upper-division work must be earned at a senior institution. The last 30 hours must be earned in residence at this University.

Note: This change in wording is designed to preserve the residence requirement essentially as it now exists while still providing for acceptance of credit transfer from other institutions by students who complete such off campus courses after they have completed the first 65 hours toward their degree. As the regulations now read, a student with 90 hours earned at FSU but taking a summer course at another University between his junior and senior year would not be able to transfer credit for the summer course to FSU unless he was willing to complete another 60 hours at FSU.

3. Report of the Faculty Professional Relations Committee on the student evaluation of the faculty.

### III. General Information

Since the new Senate Members took office as of May 1, 1966, this is their first meeting.

Will everyone please sign the roll which will be at the front of the room.

## FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

May 18, 1966

### I. Regular Session

The Faculty Senate met in regular session in Longmire Auditorium at 4:10 p.m. on Wednesday, May 18, 1966. President Champion presided.

The following members were absent: B. J. Allen, B.F. Buie, Irvin Cole, Philip Cooke, E. T. Denmark, DeLos DeTar, Richard Fallon, Vernon Fox, Earl Frieden, Agnes Gregory, D. L. Guemple, Edward Hankin, Charles Hubbard, Maurice Litton, Victor Mamatey, Otis McBride, William Moody, H. J. Mottice, Willard Nelson, James Preu, John Riley, Wayne Schroëder, Earl R. Solomon, Robert Spivey, Avery Vaughn, Katherine Warren, Richard Wilson and Joseph Cushman.

After the word none had been corrected to non on page 1, line 30, the minutes for the meeting held Wednesday, April 20, 1966, were approved as corrected, recorded and circulated.

### II. Report of the Steering Committee

Dr. Malcolm Parsons, Chairman of the Steering Committee said that there would be a slight deviation from the published agenda. Dr. Parsons summarized what had been said at the April meeting of Faculty Senate relative to the Students' Faculty Evaluation; he said that David Giordano had requested permission to present an information report to the Faculty Senate and that the Senate had several choices relative to this request. Dr. Parsons moved that the Faculty Senate permit the student to make the report and then leave the meeting. The motion was seconded and passed.

### III. Students' Faculty Evaluation

The following report was read by David Giordano, the Student Chairman of the Faculty Evaluation Committee:

"First I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Faculty Senate for allowing me to address you. I would also like to thank you all individually for your help and cooperation during the duration of Faculty Evaluation.

"The evaluation questionnaire consisted of 18 questions. It was given to all undergraduate classes which consisted of 10 or more students. Four of these questions were designed to aid the committee in future research. Of the remaining 14 questions, the Joint Committee decided to publish the results of 8 of the questions, believing these would be beneficial to Students.

"Initially the committee decided to order 40,000 answer sheets and 10,000 questionnaires. Later we discovered that our estimate of the necessary answer sheets was incorrect. This was the main cause of the confusion during the evaluation.

"With the help of the Alpha Phi Omega Fraternity and the Freshman Flunkies, the 40,000 answer sheets were sorted, placed in envelopes and marked. Our list of instructors, class numbers and number of students in a class, was compiled from the Registrar's recap of classes for March 2nd.

"From 4 to 8:00 a.m. on March 28, three students and I distributed the 40,000 answer sheets and all 10,000 questionnaires. The answer sheets were brought to the department heads and questionnaires were placed in the classrooms.

"On Sunday, we ordered 10,000 additional answer sheets from IBM. On Wednesday, we received them and that evening they were counted and placed in the envelopes. Thursday morning, again between 4 and 8:00 a.m. Bill McCarron and I distributed these 10,000 answer sheets.

"We were still short of answer sheets, so I ordered 10,000 hand forms to be printed by duplication. These hand forms were distributed by Monday, April 4th.

"Because of our problems with the answer sheets, it was requested of the instructors that they allow the evaluation to continue for another week. Those that were able, complied with this request.

"Of 1600 sections, we reached all except 11. We have had 1305 (82%) sections returned to us. These returned answer sheets are in storeroom 94 in the University Union. Because we have been shorthanded, it has taken us longer than hoped to process these forms. Because of this, the results have not yet been sent to you.

"With the completion of the processing at hand, the question arises of how the publishing will be handled. The publications of Faculty Evaluation with which we are most familiar are those of Berkeley, UCLA, and other Universities of this type. The results of such Faculty Evaluation have generally been very subjective in nature, often produced in a spirit of vindictiveness, and of little value in achieving improved education. The difference between our evaluation and these others lies in the way the evaluation was conducted and the reasons behind the evaluation itself.

"Their programs are not, by any stretch of the imagination, done in a cooperative atmosphere or with constructive purpose in mind.

"Generally, these programs single out instructors and send examiners into these instructors classes, without the instructors permission, and evaluate him on that day by a set of criteria which they alone select. The evaluators gather later behind closed doors to write their critiques of the different instructors who they have examined.

"We have striven to give each instructor the opportunity to be evaluated. The instructors are evaluated by their entire class, who have been taught by them for the better part of a trimester, and evaluate them on their performance. Afterwards, the results are gathered and processed impartially by computers.

"Both faculty and students are allowed a voice in all of the aspects of the Evaluation--From the qualities rated to the procedure followed.

"Our program was conceived and drawn up by the suggestions of the joint Faculty-Student Committee and by individual suggestions from Faculty Members, Staff and Students.

"I believe we have set a precedent in the degree of interaction and cooperation between the Administration, Faculty and Students. This, I believe, has been the greatest single significance of the evaluation.

"I feel that our evaluation program is deliberate, purposeful and responsible. Therefore, after seriously considering all the aspects which are involved in the printing of the evaluation results, our committee feels that these results should be published. Also, because the students and instructors conducted the evaluation under the assumption that all the results were to be published, I must convey to the Faculty Senate that there is very strong feeling among the student body that the results of this evaluation are made available to students.

"We would hope that this publication venture could go forward with the endorsement of the faculty senate. If this would be done, it would mark a new beginning among student evaluations of faculty in this country. But- and this should be made very clear- there is a very strong possibility that the results of our evaluation will be published independently by the students if faculty endorsement is not forthcoming."

Dr. Dorothy Hoffman presented and moved the acceptance of the following report by the Faculty Professional Relations Committee:

REPORT OF THE FACULTY PROFESSIONAL RELATIONS  
COMMITTEE TO THE FACULTY SENATE ON SUBJECT OF  
STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY

"By action of the Faculty Senate on April 20, 1966, the Faculty Professional Relations Committee was instructed to consider the subject of Student evaluation of Faculty and to report to the Senate at its next meeting.

"It is the judgment of the Faculty Professional Relations Committee that the 1965-66 evaluation was subject to so many defects in instrumentation and coverage that the results will be of such questionable validity and such low reliability that publication of the results would serve no constructive purpose and may indeed be destructive of the goals sought by the students and administration. The Committee recommends that the Senate recommend to the Student Government that there be no publication of the 1965-66 student evaluations.

"The FPR Committee also recommends that evaluation of faculty members by students should be done either under student auspices alone without any controls by University officials, or in a professional manner with authorization by the Faculty speaking through its Senate."

The motion was seconded. Dr. Seymour Hess moved to amend the motion by changing the word accept to receive. The motion was seconded and passed. The original motion as amended was passed.

Dr. Sara Herndon asked for clarification of the report.

Dr. Hoffman said that there had been partial coverage of many classes because of insufficient answer sheets; that some faculty members put the answer sheets in the waste basket; others tore them up; in one instant the faculty member solicited a good rating. Therefore, the Faculty Professional Relations Committee did not think that the evaluation had been administered in a professional manner because there was not complete coverage under uniform conditions.

Dr. Paul Piccard said that there were two questions involved, namely, (1) what to do in the future (2) what to do with this year's evaluation; he requested that the Chair rule to separate the two issues. The Chair so ruled.

Dr. Kellogg Hunt moved that evaluation of faculty members by students should be done in a professional manner with the University taking full responsibility, and with authorization by the Faculty speaking through its Senate. The motion was seconded.

Dr. Vincent Thursby said that he would like to defer action on the motion until he had an opportunity to talk with his constituents. He moved to table the motion. The motion was seconded and defeated.

Dr. Eugene Kaelin questioned the wisdom of destroying that

which is good in the present system. Dr. Paul Piccard said that his interpretation of a "professional manner" implied student participation, academic freedom, faculty-administration-student cooperation, etc.

Dr. Martin Roeder moved to amend Dr. Hunts motion by inserting after by students the words "if done at all". The motion was seconded and defeated.

Dr. Hunt's motion was passed.

Dr. George Lensen requested that graduate courses and small courses be included in the future.

Dr. Malcolm Parson said that the Senate should act upon the second issue and that is what to do with the current evaluation.

Dr. Dorothy Hoffman moved that the Faculty Senate recommend to the Student Government that there be no publication of the 1965-66 student evaluations. The motion was seconded.

Dr. Martin Roeder moved to substitute the following motion: that the Faculty Senate make no recommendation to the Student Government relative to the publication of the 1965-66 student evaluations. The motion was seconded.

Dr. Malcolm Parsons moved the privilege of the floor to non-members. The motion was seconded and passed.

The discussion covered the financial ability of the students to publish the results of the evaluation; whether the students would do it without approval; should the Faculty Senate abdicate by doing nothing; and the strong feelings among students and faculty relative to the issue of publication. The substitute motion passed.

#### IV. Election of the Steering Committee

The following members were elected to the Steering Committee for a term of two years:

Richard Fallon  
Malcolm Parsons  
Robert Spivey  
Thomas Wright

#### V. Courses Which Will Meet Literature Requirement for Humanities Area

Dr. Robert Hull, Chairman of Academic Affairs Committee, presented for information the following:

The Academic Affairs Committee recommends that the

Basic Studies Division be instructed to include the following list of courses in the University Catalogue and in other appropriate sources, said courses to be clearly identified as meeting the "literature" course requirements included in Area IV. Humanities portion of the Basic Studies Program adopted by the Senate at its December 1965 and March 1966 Meetings:

Classical Civilization 211, 212, 305, 425 and 426  
Czech 301 and 302  
English 215, 216, 317, 335, 336, 418, 435, 440 and 465  
French 201, 202, 301 and 302  
German 201, 202, 301 and 302  
Humanities 301 and 302  
Italian 201, 202, 301 and 302  
Latin 206, 305, 310, 356 and 357  
Modern Languages 211 and 212  
Portuguese 201, 202, 301 and 302  
Religion 225 and 226  
Spanish 201, 202, 301 and 302

Dr. George Lensen asked why Chinese was not included on the list. Dr. Hull said that the list had been approved by the Humanities Area Committee and suggested that Dr. Lensen submit a request for the addition of Chinese to the Humanities Area Committee.

VI. Amendment to the Adopted Basic Studies Program

Dr. Robert Hull, Chairman of the Academic Affairs Committee, moved that the adopted Basic Studies Program be amended to include the course entitled Philosophy 356 (Development of Modern Philosophy) in the list of approved courses in Area IV (Humanities) since this course was omitted from the original list by error alone. The motion was seconded and passed.

VII. Final 60 Semester Hours of Work

Dr. Robert Hull, Chairman of the Academic Affairs Committee, moved that regulations as stated in the General Catalogue (1965-66 Edition, pg. 24, par. B General Regulations) be amended to read as follows:

At least 60 semester hours of upper-division work must be earned at a senior institution. The last 30 hours must be earned in residence at this University. This change in wording is designed to preserve the residence requirement essentially as it now exists while still providing for acceptance of credit transfer from other institutions by students who completed the first 65 hours toward their degree. As the regulations now read, student with 90 hours earned at FSU but taking a summer course at another University between his junior and senior year would not be able to transfer credit for the summer course to FSU unless he was willing to complete another 60 hours at FSU.



The motion was seconded.

Dr. Dittmer said that he had received another recommendation relative to the same subject and because the problem is rather involved, he had planned to take the problem to the Council of Deans and then to the Academic Affairs Committee.

Dr. Seymour Hess moved to table the motion until the next regular meeting of Faculty Senate. The motion to table was seconded and passed.

VIII. Announcements

1. President Champion said that the Advisory Committee for selecting a new Vice President for Academic Affairs had several meetings and he hopes to be able to announce within the near future the new Vice President for Academic Affairs.
2. President Champion said that action had been taken at the last Board of Regents meeting to lease eight acres of land to the Faculty Club.
3. The President said that information on Tax Sheltered Annuities would soon be disseminated to the faculty.
4. A Committee has been appointed to advise the President on faculty salaries and fringe benefits.

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Hilda E. Tinney  
Secretary to the Faculty

lb

NEW COURSES

ECEn 560 History of Philosophy of Rehabilitation (3).  
Emphasis will be placed on Rehabilitation as a concept of intergrated services, understanding of objectives and organization of Rehabilitation.

ECEn 561 The Rehabilitation Process (3).  
This course will provide a step by step orientation to the job of Rehabilitation counseling, case finding, handling of referrals, eligibility, etc.

ECEn 562 Medical Information for Rehabilitation Counselors (3).  
Course provides medical information and introduces students to medical terminology. Provides knowledge of etiology, prognosis and effects of disabling conditions.

ECEn 563 Rehabilitation-Case Studies (3).  
Rehabilitation Case Studies-Critical analysis of case records of wide variety of disability, social and vocational problems. Study of the application of Rehabilitation Services to these problems.

ECEn 564 Occupational Information and Placement Techniques (3).  
This course will present materials and methods for securing occupational information and techniques for securing employment for handicapped persons.

ECEn 565 Practicum in Community Resources (3).  
The purpose of this course is to give students practical experience in the use of community resources in meeting the Rehabilitation needs of handicapped persons.