

**Department Meeting**  
**Friday, January 12, 2018**  
**1:00 – 3:00 PM, Thomas Edison Campus, Building U, Room 106**

	Present	Absent	Excused
<b>Administration</b>			
Dr. Thomas Rath, Interim Dean	X		
<b>Department Chairs</b>			
Andrew Blitz	X		
Leroy Bugger	X		
Mary Conwell	X		
Dr. Richard Worch	X		
<b>Faculty</b>			
Jim Barrell	X		
Vincent Butler	X		
Alisa Callahan	X		
Dennis Fahey			
Matthew Hoffman	X		
Deborah Johnson	X		
George Kodsey			
Tim Lucas	X		
Michael Nisson	X		
Cynthia Wilson-Orndoff			
Jennifer Patterson	X		
Anita Rose	X		
William VanGlabek	X		

	Present	Absent	Excused
<b>Staff</b>			
Tom Carr	X		
Jill De Valk	X		
Lisa Dick	X		
Ivan Guerrero	X		
Steve Kelly	X		
Mark Morgan	X		
Al Nault	X		
David Sundby			X
<b>Other Staff</b>			
Adrian Kerr			
<b>Adjunct Faculty</b>			
Linda Hanwacker	X		
Sandi Towers	X		
<b>Guests</b>			
Mark Lupe			
Susan Marcy			

**Legal Update Presentation:** Dr. Rath, Interim Dean of the School of Business and Technology introduced Mark Lupe and Susan Marcy of FSW General Counsel. Susan spoke briefly about Workers Compensation stating that Valerie Miller is the point of contact at FSW. A report must be filed within seven days if an employee is injured or if anyone witnesses the incident such as a fall.

**Accessibility Standards:** FSW is making everything accessible including ATM, the website, and the Canvas learning management system. The gold standard is that everything should be accessible and if something is non-accessible, it is up to us to find a solution. IT was able to fix out public internet facing. Regarding ADA compliance, IT is the gatekeeper of the connection between eLearning and technology accessibility.

**Contracts:** General Counsel examines all contracts at FSW and commented that the trend is for vendors to shift the risk to the purchaser. Data security is a big issue including FERPA.

**First Amendment:** General Counsel attended a National Association of College and University Attorneys Conference where the First Amendment was discussed. Main points included free speech and inclusiveness

are clashing and that it is unlawful to restrict speech outside. Susan mentioned the religious group who demonstrate and attempt to engage people as they walk by on this campus. These groups have filed suit against public institutions and know how far they can go for monetary gain. One example given was the Richard Spencer appearance at the University of Florida. Another example was a YouTube video of an FGCU student following the religious group with bagpipes. Susan shared a handout explaining the bill of the Florida House of Representatives to take effect July 1, 2018 – “Campus Free Expression Act”. In the bill, the outdoor areas of campus of a public institution that accepts funding are considered public forums and they cannot designate any area of the campus as a free speech zone or create policies to restrict expressive activities to a particular area of campus.

Dr. Rath thanked Mark Lube and Susan Marcy for attending the meetings and informing SoBT of legal updates in higher education.

### **FSW/Department Business:**

- Office hours for Spring 2018 have been signed and posted to faculty offices. Pending office hours will be discussed with Dr. Rath next week.
- Reminder that Attendance Verification is due on January 17, 2018 for Full and Mini A terms
- Dr. Rath also mentioned that as a courtesy, please speak with him before communicating with a SoBT employee who is supervised by Dr. Rath.
- In the break-out meetings please discuss and work on the following:
  1. Textbook Adoptions – complete before January 31, 2018
  2. Program Mapping

*Meeting minutes interpreted and reported by Jill De Valk*

### **Paralegal Studies Breakout Meeting**

**In Attendance:** Mary Conwell, Matt Hoffman, Sandi Towers, Dr. Rath, Jill De Valk

- Dr. Towers mentioned that a publisher approached her to write a textbook for an overview of paralegal studies and she wondered if she could tailor it to our PLA 1003 Introduction to Paralegal Studies course. Professor Conwell stated that they discussed open source at one of the recent conferences she attended and a colleague said the “textbooks are a thing of the past”. Mary said that she hoped that by the academic year 2019-20, more of the paralegal studies courses would be using open sources.
- Mary also mentioned that Cengage Publishing has online access provided for all of their paralegal textbooks for \$119 perhaps to compete with the open source trend. Matt commented that you need to be careful with package deals like this because they may say you have access but there may be problems with this package deal. Sandi stated that with the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA), the publisher holds copyright and they may open source without the author’s approval.
- Professor Hoffman is in the process of designing the BUL 2241 Business Law course using open sources and no textbook. Each topic is a module which uses seminal cases for the student to read and provide discussion questions. The questions help to guide the student to understand the material and concept. For example, the contracts module would include the Statute of Frauds which would include a case to help teach the concept. Critical thinking was added to the module by asking if the case dynamics were different in a specific way, how would the case turn out? FSW Online would like to see power points or vocabulary quizzes added for substance. The quality matters standard should apply here. Dr. Rath commented that they would meet with eLearning staff and bring the rubric to prove that requirements are being met. We would like to develop other courses including Torts and Family Law this way:
  1. Watershed case
  2. Questions to guide understanding principles
  3. Assignments with rubrics

4. Critical Thinking – changing the facts of the case, how will this change the outcome of the case? Maybe the Wills, Trusts and Probate Administration course would not be developed this way because of the procedural requirements such as when writing a will, for example.

- **Textbook Adoptions** – For the 2018-19 academic year the same textbooks will be adopted except for Business Law which will not have a textbook.
- **Program Mapping** – The student learning outcomes are mapped to the state frameworks. Need to put all in a universal guiding document like Google Docs.  
For 2017-18, Paralegal Studies has 12 standards or frameworks.

**01.0 Demonstrate knowledge of the ethical and professional standards of the paralegal** – demonstrates the Intro to Paralegal Studies course.

01.01 Define a variety of legal terms and concepts relating to professionalism and the ethical responsibilities of the paralegal, including but not limited to Unauthorized Practice of Law

01.02 Contrast the duties and responsibilities of the legal team with those of the paralegal.

01.03 List four activities paralegals are prohibited from doing

01.04 Briefly outline the history and development of the occupation of paralegal.

01.05 Explain the role of the paralegal and the benefit he or she adds to the legal team, as well as the legal system as a whole.

01.06 List, discuss and apply the rules of professional responsibility in the legal profession, with special emphasis on client confidentiality

01.07 Describe methods for resolving ethical dilemmas within the legal environment or given a hypothetical case.

01.08 Discuss what constitutes legal malpractice and illustrate the discussion with examples of malpractice.

**All sub-points also demonstrate the PLA 1003 Introduction to Paralegal Studies course**

**02.0 Demonstrate ability to utilize legal research materials and apply knowledge in legal writing --**

**The student will be able to:**

Demonstrates Legal Research and Writing I & Legal Research and Writing II

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 PM

*Minutes interpreted and reported by Jill DeValk*

## **Public Safety Programs Breakout Meeting**

Start: 1:46pm

**In Attendance:** Richard Worch and Michael Nissan

### **Textbook Adoption:**

Discussed the current adoption of textbooks for the 2018/19 Academic Year. Publisher for current CJL 2100 Criminal Law course is expected to have a new edition available, consideration of adopting this edition being reviewed. All other courses' textbook materials for 2017/18 are acceptable for 2018/19 academic year.

### **Learning Outcomes:**

The verification of State Frameworks Learning Outcomes (LOs) linked to specific Public Safety degree required courses' Program Outcomes (POs) was conducted during the meeting.

- Development of gradable assignments required for New Learning Outcomes
- Syllabi adjustments needed where requirements or language changes occur in Learning Outcome(s) as they relate to Program Outcome(s).
- Will changes to Syllabi require FSW Curriculum Committee review?

End: 2:49pm

*Meeting minutes interpreted and reported by Albert Nault*

## **Business and Accounting Break-Out Meeting Minutes** submitted by Lisa Dick

**Attendees:** Timothy Lucas, Jennifer Patterson, Alisa Callahan, William Van Glabek, Anita Rose, Leroy Bugger

### **Proceedings:**

Professor Van Glabek reported that the bookstore is now stocking the store alphabetically by author. Discussion followed with agreement that this system would not work and it is part of the reason why students are getting the incorrect book for classes. Professor Van Glabek also reported that the font size is too small on the cards posted on the shelves with the books.

Professor Bugger thanked Professor Callahan for building the Google Docs sheet that is being used for mapping frameworks.

Those attending began working together on their individual laptops in the Google Docs sheet to finish frameworks' mapping for the BAMA, Accounting Technology, and SMAN degrees. They reviewed syllabi when necessary to find appropriate references and conducted a detailed discussion including what SACCS is looking for to connect to assessments.

### **Computer Programming/Networking - Breakout session minutes**

In attendance: Andy Blitz, Vincent Butler, Deborah Johnson, Linda Hanwacker, Jim Barrell, Steven Kelly and Mark Morgan

Items discussed –

- **CGS 1100/CGS 2108**

Issue is both courses are identical except CGS 2108 has a bit of flowcharting to the course curriculum. At issue is a programming student who has to take CGS 2108 switches into a business major and now has to take CGS 1100 which is essentially re-taking the CGS 2108 course.

Dr. Rath presented to the group that if the student requests a credit review for the CGS 1100 course, the question going to be asked is why do we have both CGS 1100 and CGS 2108. And that this group really needs to address that the courses are so similar and there really needs to be changes made to distinguish the courses.

A lengthy discussion followed by the group members from in house tests, to additional assignments for CGS 2108, to using different textbooks in the courses to strike a difference. The discussion ended with no real resolution to the issue except for Professor Blitz suggesting that since this happens so infrequent, that the courses should remain and it handled on a case by case basis through the credit review process.

- **Institutional Effectiveness**

The majority of the meeting was devoted to institutional effectiveness and Professor Blitz stated that most of the coursework has been updated with the exception of those courses in the programming area. Professor Blitz brought up various courses in CANVAS and demonstrated to the group the courses that have been done and the assessments added and which courses remain.

Professor Barrell stated that he has been working on adding those assessments to the programming courses, but has not received any feedback from Professor Blitz on them. Professor Barrell thought that COP 1000 was done, but Professor Blitz disagreed and then there was some discussion about the assessment requirements keep changing and definite frustration in the group. Professor Blitz stated that he would take a look at what was submitted and work with Professor Barrell to identify the changes needed.

Professor Blitz also wanted the group to commit to getting these courses completed and the group agreed to do a weekly email exchange/review on the assessment changes and the goal is to get all of the courses updated by the end of the spring term.

Additional Items discussed –

- E-learning

Professor Blitz brought up to the group his frustrations with the E-learning department and their lack of support. And mentioned that ever since Dobbins left, support has been less and less from the staff there.

- Withdraws

Professor Blitz led the group in a lengthy discussion in the area of professors being allowed to withdraw students from their courses. And after a rousing discussion with everyone chiming in about students who do not show for class, Professor Blitz sought and received the group's approval to continue to pursue the possibility of allowing them to do a withdraw.

- Class size

Also discussed was class sizes and the question posed... how large of a class is too large? Because it seems that some courses run and others get cancelled and all have different minimum number of students. And so Professor Blitz intends to get further clarification on the setting of required students for a course to avoid cancellations.

Meeting was adjourned at 4 pm.

1                   A bill to be entitled  
 2           An act relating to free expression on campus;  
 3           providing a short title; creating s. 1004.097, F.S.;  
 4           providing definitions; providing applicability;  
 5           authorizing a public institution of higher education  
 6           to create and enforce certain restrictions relating to  
 7           expressive activities on campus; providing for a cause  
 8           of action against a public institution of higher  
 9           education for violations of the act; providing for  
 10          damages; providing a statute of limitations; providing  
 11          an effective date.

12  
 13 Be It Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

14  
 15           Section 1. This act may be cited as the "Campus Free  
 16 Expression Act."

17           Section 2. Section 1004.097, Florida Statutes, is created  
 18 to read:

19           1004.097 Free expression on campus.—

20           (1) DEFINITIONS.—

21           (a) "Free speech zone" means a designated area on a public  
 22 institution of higher education's campus for the purpose of  
 23 political protesting.

24           (b) "Outdoor areas of campus" means generally accessible  
 25 areas of the campus where members of the campus community are

26 commonly allowed, including grassy areas, walkways, or other  
 27 similar common areas. The term does not include outdoor areas  
 28 where access is restricted.

29 (c) "Public institution of higher education" means any  
 30 public technical center, state college, state university, law  
 31 school, medical school, dental school, or other Florida College  
 32 System institution as defined in s. 1000.21.

33 (2) RIGHT TO FREE SPEECH ACTIVITIES.—

34 (a) Expressive activities protected under this section  
 35 include, but are not limited to, any lawful verbal or written  
 36 means by which an individual may communicate ideas to others,  
 37 including all forms of peaceful assembly, protests, speeches,  
 38 and guest speakers; distributing literature; carrying signs;  
 39 circulating petitions; and the recording and publication,  
 40 including Internet publication, of video or audio recorded in  
 41 outdoor areas of campus of public institutions of higher  
 42 education.

43 (b) A person who wishes to engage in an expressive  
 44 activity in the outdoor areas of campus of a public institution  
 45 of higher education may do so freely, spontaneously, and  
 46 contemporaneously as long as the person's conduct is lawful and  
 47 does not materially and substantially disrupt the functioning of  
 48 the public institution of higher education.

49 (c) The outdoor areas of campus of a public institution of  
 50 higher education that accept federal funding are considered

51 traditional public forums. A public institution of higher  
 52 education may create and enforce restrictions that are  
 53 reasonable and content-neutral on time, place, and manner of  
 54 expression and that are narrowly tailored to a significant  
 55 institutional interest. Restrictions must be clear, published,  
 56 and provide for ample alternative means of expression.

57 (d) A public institution of higher education may not  
 58 designate any area of campus as a free speech zone or otherwise  
 59 create policies restricting expressive activities to a  
 60 particular area of campus.

61 (e) Students, faculty, or staff of a public institution of  
 62 higher education may not materially disrupt previously scheduled  
 63 or reserved activities on campus occurring at the same time.

64 (3) CAUSE OF ACTION; DAMAGES.-

65 (a) The Attorney General or a person whose expressive  
 66 rights are violated by an action prohibited under this section  
 67 may bring an action in a court of competent jurisdiction to  
 68 recover compensatory damages, reasonable court costs, and  
 69 attorney fees.

70 (b) If the court finds that a violation of this section  
 71 occurred, the court shall award the aggrieved party a minimum of  
 72 \$500 for the initial violation plus an additional \$50 for each  
 73 day the violation remains ongoing starting the day after the  
 74 date the complaint is served on the public institution of higher  
 75 education.



76        (c) Excluding reasonable court costs and attorney fees,  
 77        the total compensatory damages available to a plaintiff in a  
 78        case arising from a single violation of this section may not  
 79        exceed \$100,000. If there are multiple plaintiffs, the court  
 80        shall divide the damages equally among the plaintiffs until the  
 81        maximum award is exhausted.

82        (4) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.-A person aggrieved by a  
 83        violation of this section must bring suit no later than 1 year  
 84        after the date the cause of action accrues. For the purpose of  
 85        calculating the 1-year limitation period, each day that a  
 86        violation of this section persists or each day that a policy in  
 87        violation of this section remains in effect constitutes a new  
 88        violation and, therefore, a new day that the cause of action  
 89        accrues.

90        Section 3. This act shall take effect July 1, 2018.