1) **Call to Order.** Meeting called to order by Chair of the Faculty Senate, John Mattox.

2) **Chair’s Report.** Announced the Provost’s action to convene a new Textbook Policy Committee aimed at addressing problems related to the book rental program. Committee has already met, Chair along with Exec. Committee has appointed 4 faculty senate members are M. Barlow, T.VanCantfort, S. Han, and R. Klomegah. Listed topics were raised. Please pass any suggestions to the members or the Chair.

3) **Chancellor’s Remarks on budget and other concerns.** Regarding the budget scenario from the state and General Administration level. The good news is that the request to GA for a modest tuition and fee increase was approved. Request was targeted for technology and athletics ($16 technology, $37 athletics + $53.00). The revenue from the modest increase will be used to absorb additional costs of those and outstanding debt in the technology area in the form of rental agreements. We are waiting on developments in the “stimulus” package in specific categories aimed at repairs in academic structures, financial aid, etc. Also waiting on tax revenue picture, up or down. We know that there will be a decline in every category of revenue gain across the state. We are hopeful of a clearer picture sometime in May. There is no policy regarding employee “furlow” - this is not a popular topic. There is the anticipated growth in enrollment next year. The higher enrollment will bring an increase in requests for financial aid, to this effort up scale gift campaign and donations are eagerly being sought, personal speaking engagements toward this effort. Administration is committed to protecting jobs. In order to protect current positions at a 5% budget cut, we must look at a 20% cut in non-personnel costs. One example will be downscaling library hours. Other state agencies are in more drastic state of affairs. Economic projections suggest a downward path. Potential cuts will be made judicially and with the leadership of the Provost, Deans, and Department Chairs.

4) **Questions to the Chancellor.** Chair invited Chancellor to join the General Faculty meeting on March 24th for further update. Questions regarding Academic funding best directed to Office of the Provost.

Chancellor invited faculty to be proactive and assertive in approaching former alumni or potential donors. The current status of new program requests now at GA is believed to be moving forward. Provost Young cautioned that General Administration will be scrutinize low-productivity programs in view of any new requests. Faculty asked about energy cutting costs, Chancellor responded with some current initiatives such as turning off computers, etc. Primary focus was protecting employment.

5) **Adoption of the agenda.**

Chair called for a vote. Ayes have it by consensus to approve the agenda. Motion carries.

6) **Approval of Minutes 1/15/09.**

Chair called for a vote. Ayes have it by consensus to approve the minutes.

7) **Approval of the Charter of Faculty Governance.** Chair, M. Mongkuo and J. Breitzer. J. Breitzer addressed several issues regarding the Charter; restricting senators to being only full time faculty and whether representation should or should not include part-time faculty. Second change proposed addressed election of senators and the term “secret” ballot in the language regarding departmental elections. Dr. Joseph Johnson stated concern over the use of the term “secret”
ballot versus “written”; written reflecting a spirit of transparent and collegiality rather than rooted in paranoia and suspicion. The will of the Senate was to remove the word “secret ballot”. The phrase shall read “shall be elected in the department meeting” (no objections by present Committee members all in agreement). Article II deals with changing the definition of what a senator described and limited to a full-time, tenure track, tenured and full-time adjunct. Dr. Barlow asked for definition of a full-time adjunct. Dr. Johnson raised the philosophical input to the voting block during general faculty meetings, as general faculty, with implications of the advancement adjunct status. In that the role, evaluation and other adjunct related issues are currently undergoing refinement. Dr. Johnson suggested that the adjunct inclusion may be positioned as a potential voting block, a contradiction; this effort may be premature at this time and dangerous, along with the issue of academic rank privilege. Dr. Wilson-Jones added the issue of adjuncts have a voice in evaluation of tenured faculty. Governance Committee member, Dr. Radford-Curry offered that the inclusion of adjunct in the document was to provide an avenue by which adjunct faculty who constructively contribute to the academic body. Dr. Barlow, recalled that there was no vote called on the issue of the adjunct. Chair noted that the recorded minutes do not reflect the specific discussion. Committee Chair, Dr. Mongkuo appealed to the senate body to move forward and call for a vote on the current proposal. Dr. Breitzer replied that Charter should be return to committee to resolve the issue of “fulltime vs. part-time adjunct” representation.

MOTION: Prof. S. Martin, supported Breitzer’s suggestion to go back to committee for clarification, in time for March or April meeting and proposed motion to send the document back to committee. SECOND by Dr. Chet Dilday.

Discussion commenced on the broad definition of full-time vs. part-time adjunct. Faculty Senate Chair called for a voice vote on the motion the floor. The number of votes by voice indicated a split. Chair called for a show of hands on the motion. Hands were called and counted.

**VOTE:** IN FAVOR 20     OPPOSED: 8.

Motion carries in favor of sending the Proposed Charter of Faculty Governance back to committee.

Dr. Radford-Curry requested to raise further question regarding other sections. Faculty Senate Chair suggested to refer further questions to the committee.

8) **Approval of the revised PTR (Post-Tenure Review) Policy Document.**

Concerns by Dr. Wilson-Jones from the School of Education regarding clarity of annual review and the post-tenure review. Provost Young replied that the annual review sought to dovetail and coincide with both PTR and RTP (Reappointment, Tenure, & Promotion) policy. Dr. J. Johnson pointed out the need to consider PTR policy for a faculty member who may have shifted from an administrative to an instructional role. The old policy did make some allowance. The Provost replied that in truth, the new policy does not really address this, and that he will revise language to address PTR for administrators reversion to faculty. Additionally, Dr. Mongkuo suggested to the Provost that all departments make public and publish criteria for faculty advancement. The Provost supported this as well as the Senate.

Chair called for a vote.

**APPROVED unanimously: Revised PTR Policy is approved.**

Provost expressed appreciation for the support of faculty in a timely consideration of this given a March 1st deadline for the submission of a draft of this policy to UNC GA. The Chair acknowledged the work of the Senate’s Faculty Evaluation and Development Committee on this policy and asked for the committee chair, Dr. M. Orban, and members to stand and be recognized.

9) **Senate Resolution on RTP (Reappointment, Tenure, & Promotion) Policy**

Dr. M. Orban provided an overview. The Chair noted that the current RTP policy was enacted by the Bryan administration in 2007, and that it was enacted without full faculty participation. The
Senate Resolution approves the Provost’s revisions, but specifies that the Faculty Evaluation and Development Committee shall review the RTP policy, and make suggestions to the senate for additional revision a year from now. Dr. M. Barlow asked if this is the document which contains narrative related to minimum requirements for tenure. The Provost replied that the current minimum requirements date back to the 1990’s, and were passed by the Faculty Senate at that time, and are now a component of RTP policy. Those guidelines are not contained in the RTP policy document itself. Prof. S. Martin, responded that these guidelines drove the narrative of the new faculty annual evaluation instrument. Provost Young noted that the mandate to make changes to the policy have come directly from the Board of Governors. There remains a lot of work required to refine RTP policy at FSU.

Chair called for a vote.

APPROVED unanimously: Senate Resolution of 2/19/09 Carries.

10) Governance Committee Report. Chair, J. Mattox, offered that in lieu of a report from Committee as a result of the earlier agenda discussion of committee activities, including renewed discussion of the Charter issues, the remaining time be given to Prof. S. Martin and the Comprehensive Evaluation Task Force. Dr. Radford-Curry offered a concern that new officers should be elected after discussion of the Charter of Faculty Governance requiring a 2/3 vote of the faculty.

Motion: Dr. Radford-Curry, Second: S. Martin. Proposed a called Senate meeting be held on March 5th for the purpose to consider discussion and full airing of the Governance and the Comprehensive Evaluation Task Force. Chair called for a vote. Ayes have it by consensus.

Motion carries to hold a called Senate meeting on March 5th, 2009 at 2 pm. [The Chair cancelled this meeting on 3/2 because the Senate Academic Affairs Committee was scheduled to meet at the same time and their agenda also included this topic.]

11) Academic Affairs Committee Report.
   a) Approval of the creation of CRJC 690 and CRJC 691. APPROVED.
   b) Approval of the creation of BTCH 320. APPROVED.
   c) Intent to plan a BA in Theatre. APPROVED.

12) Report from the Comprehensive Evaluation Task Force. Address by Chair of the Comprehensive Evaluation Task Force, Prof. S. Martin, offered a brief overview of the current status of the document. The document appendix is the narrative acknowledges the broad participation of faculty that have contributed in the pilot test and revisions. The committee was divided on a beta test next year. Dr. M. Barlow asked question regarding about policy regarding granting tenure to Assistant Professor. Provost responded that working toward clarity of expectations. The current faculty driven instrument in the context of the yearly evaluation would be very effective. Dr. Mongkuo inquired about the quantity of books mentioned. Dr. D. Autrey, inquired about the appeal process. Chair reminded senate of the March 5 upcoming meeting and to bring concerns to that meeting.

13) Meeting Adjourned.

Minutes recorded by Socorro Hernandez-Hinek