



MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
APRIL 18, 2007
DODD HALL AUDITORIUM
3:35 P.M.

I. Regular Session

The regular session of the 2007-08 Faculty Senate was held on Wednesday, April 18, 2007. Faculty Senate President James Cobbe presided.

The following members attended the Senate meeting:

J. Ahlquist, M. Allen, I. Audirac, T. Baker, G. Bates, P. Beerli, S. Bellenot, R. Bruschweiler, G. Burnett, J. Cao, E. Chicken, J. Clendinning, J. Cobbe, E. Cormier, V. Costa, L. deHaven-Smith, I. Eberstein, L. Edwards, K. Erndl, J. Fiorito, S. Fiorito, A. Gaiser, K. Gelabert, J. Geringer, C. Greek, J. Hellweg, L. Hogan, C. Holmes, T. Houpt, L. Keller, A. Kercheval, W. Leparulo, S. Lewis, D. Lick, S. Losh, C. Luongo, C. Madsen, B. Maier-Katkin, T. Matherly, C. McCann, W. Mio, M. Mondello, D. Moore, R. Morris, A. Payer, R. Pekurny, R. Radach, D. Rice, V. Richard Auzenne, R. Roberts, H. Schmidt, R. Schwartz, L. Shepherd, J. Sickinger, J. Standley, O. Steinbock, E. Trowers, J. Turner, G. Tyson, C. Upchurch, E. Walker, Y. Wang, M. Wasko, T. Welsh, S. Wood.

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

T. Adams, C. Alamo, P. Aluffi, S. Beckman, G. Blakely, R. Blaufarb, B. Bower (J. Brooks), J. Bowers (A. Hodges), D. Cartes, F. Davis, B. Diskin, J. Dodge, J. Dorsey (E. Haymes), M. Frank, J. Gathegi, P. Gilmer, W. Hochwarter, P. Iatarola, G. Knight (P. Coats), B. Landing, T. Lee, N. Mazza (J. Hinterlong), V. Mesev, A. Mullis (E. Goldsmith), K. Myers, R. Neuman, D. Pompper, F. Rodriguez, J. Scholz, P. Ward, N. Warren, C. Weissert, W. Weissert, C. Wiebe, P. Young.

II. Faculty Senate Orientation

Let me begin by welcoming Senators to the first meeting of the 2007-08 FSU Faculty Senate, and thank you all for your willingness to serve your colleagues as faculty senators. I know that a number of you are new to the Senate, so before we move into our agenda I would like to take a few moments to speak briefly about the role of the Senate and our normal operating procedures. In the interests of conservation, we have not distributed a voluminous briefing packet this year, because everything we used to put in it is readily available on the Faculty Senate web page, easily accessible from the

Dean of the Faculties' page. I will just remind you that, in the words of the FSU Constitution:

The Faculty Senate shall be the basic legislative body of the University.

1. It shall formulate measures for the maintenance of a comprehensive educational policy and for the maximum utilization of the intellectual resources of the University.
2. It shall determine and define University-wide policies on academic matters, including Liberal Studies policy, admission, grading standards, and the requirements within which the several degrees may be granted.
3. As the elected body of the General Faculty, the Senate may also formulate its opinion upon any subject of interest to the University and adopt resolutions thereon.

Those words are worth reflection: they mean that you, as members of the Faculty Senate, are ultimately responsible for being the voice of the General Faculty, and also for ensuring the University's academic integrity and quality in terms of its students and their education here.

You have before you the Agenda for today's meeting. It has two items, numbers 3 and 4, which only occur once a year, at the first meeting in April. Otherwise, the form of the agenda never changes; after approval of minutes and agenda, we always have the report of the steering committee, usually delivered by its Vice-Chair, then reports of Standing Committees, when they either have something to report or an action they want the Senate to take; then any Special Order items, and then the self-explanatory items that follow.

We begin today with election of the Senate President. This election always takes place as the first substantive item of the April meeting, the first meeting of the new Senate, with nominations invited from the floor and then the election, presided over by the member who has been President of the old Senate. The President's term is co-terminus with the Senate's, so the new President takes over immediately following the election and I return to the back benches. The President of the Senate is automatically a Trustee of the University, and also serves on many other boards and committees by virtue of the office, including the Foundation Board, the Athletic Committee, and the Council of Deans. Being President of the Faculty Senate is, I assure you, both a great honor and at times a burden; at least occasionally, it is also interesting, although sometimes you acquire knowledge you would rather not have.

The next item is the election of the steering committee, which consists of seven members with staggered terms representing at least four Colleges, and which the senate President chairs. The steering committee meets weekly during the academic year, including monthly meetings with the University President and Provost; sets the agenda for the full Faculty Senate meetings; is the gatekeeper for proposals from other Senate committees; acts on behalf of the Senate between meetings; and advises the Senate President. It also proposes nominations for membership of Senate committees to the Senate, and proposes

the names of faculty candidates for membership on those University committees that it is requested or mandated to nominate members of, or that it thinks should have faculty representation. I would like to acknowledge publicly the wise counsel and strong support I have received from the steering committee membership the past two years as your President, and thank them for their service, which is very far from trivial in terms of the time and effort it requires.

The steering committee elects its vice-chair itself, and the vice-chair prepares and delivers the report of the steering committee at each full Senate meeting. This can be a delicate task, because the steering committee often discusses matters that are probably best left not publicized until later, if ever.

One of the items you will have received as you entered was a list of Senate standing committees, with an invitation to volunteer to serve on one of them, or nominate a colleague. The work of the faculty Senate is almost all in practice done by these standing committees, that then bring any actions that require full Senate approval to the full Senate, and report on their other activities to the full Senate at least once a year. Many of them are quite demanding of time and effort, but it is on these committees that one learns about the scope of faculty governance at Florida State University, and about the diversity and complexity of the University as a whole. Please, take a look at this, and choose one or more that interests you and return the form to Melissa.

My apologies to the old hands who knew all that, but the steering committee urged me to say it for the benefit of new members. Now, we can return to the agenda.

III. Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of the March 21, 2007 meeting were approved as distributed.

IV. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as distributed.

V. Election of the Faculty Senate President, J. Cobbe

Steering Committee Vice-Chairman Jayne M. Standlee was nominated and unanimously elected Faculty Senate President. Senator Clifford Madsen was also nominated but declined.

VI. Election of the Steering Committee, L. Edwards

There were no additional nominations from the floor of the Senate. There are three vacancies on the Steering Committee. The ballot for election consisted of: Valliere Richard Auzenne, Sandy Lewis, Penny Gilmer, Susan Fiorito, Andy Payer, Lois Shepherd, Ted Baker and Nick Mazza.

On the first ballot, voting was as follows: Valliere Richard Auzenne — 27, Sandy Lewis — 32, Penny Gilmer — 31, Susan Fiorito — 30, Andy Payer — 12, Lois Shepherd — 18, Ted Baker — 26 and Nick Mazza — 16. No one received a majority vote. Andy Payer and Nick Mazza received the lowest vote count and were eliminated.

On the second ballot, voting was as follows: Valliere Richard Auzenne — 29, Sandy Lewis — 39, Penny Gilmer — 39, Susan Fiorito — 36, Lois Shepherd — 14, and Ted Baker — 31. Sandy Lewis, Penny Gilmer and Susan Fiorito were elected.

All three members were elected on the second ballot so there was no need for a third ballot.

VII. Report of the Steering Committee, J. Standley

The Steering Committee offers the following resolution to the 2007-08 Senate:

“Whereas Jim Cobbe has diligently served for the past 2 years as President of the Faculty Senate, as the faculty representative on the Florida State University Board of Trustees, and in numerous faculty governance roles, be it resolved that the Senate express its profound appreciation and gratitude by rising in recognition and commendation.”

Let the record show that the recognition was unanimous and heartfelt.

Since the last Faculty Senate meeting, the Steering Committee has met 4 times and has met with the President and Provost once. Jim Cobbe also participated with the Trustees in one telephone conference call. At the end of that call Jim Smith proposed that the new chemistry building be named after Provost Abele and that motion passed.

In Steering Committee meetings, we have discussed the following issues:

- The steering committee met with the new Interim Registrar, Kim Barber, to discuss FERPA, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, formerly known as the Buckley Amendment. The university is striving to assure that all faculty, instructors, and teaching assistants are aware of the requirements and implications of this law. We suggested a variety of ways to inform and update faculty on these issues. A briefing by Kim Barber will be provided as a priority for the Senate agenda in early fall. In the interim, there is information on the university web site, including a succinct list of faculty “don’ts” to avoid violations of FERPA. We suggest that you check this site regularly for updates.
- It was announced in the Council of Deans that Pat Hayward will be retiring in a few months and the administration is making plans for her many responsibilities to be assumed by other personnel. Some responsibilities will be assumed by other staff and some new staff will be added. The Steering Committee noted that Pat Hayward has had a major impact on critical areas of the university and has effectively balanced the work load of many people.

- We inquired and have been informed that the University is about ready to join the Worker Rights Coalition which was proposed by the Senate in 2001. There have been a number of legal and budgetary issues to be negotiated and resolved. We will continue monitoring the progress of this issue.
- Discussions with the President and Provost last Friday included the following:
 - We discussed the steering committee's plans for this summer to review the senate committee structure and issues of faculty input to university committees. We suggested that the administration also review the list of committees that it appoints and they agreed to do so. We and the administration committed to making a list of committees that are required by law, those that are active and integral to institutional function and well-being and those designated as other. These lists will be reviewed for necessity and redundancy.
 - We discussed the Employee recognition and awards functions for this year that will be conducted by Vice Presidential area of responsibility. The steering committee suggested that recognition through a university-wide function, as in previous years, might be more prestigious and the President said that administration would re-visit this issue.
 - We received a legislative update from the President. At this time both the Senate and House have budgetary issues that would benefit FSU and the hope is that some of those will emerge from conference committees that are meeting this week.
 - The Steering Committee complimented Provost Abele on his excellent editorial regarding the FSU-FAMU College of Engineering problems appearing this week in the Tallahassee Democrat. After this meeting, we also sent him a strong letter of support for his courage in elucidating critical issues that are in danger of being lost in the ongoing political discussions surrounding the joint College of Engineering.

With regard to the tragic violence and deaths at Virginia Tech this week, the Steering Committee moves that the following condolence message be sent from us to the Faculty Senate at Virginia Tech:

"The Faculty Senate at The Florida State University wishes to express its heartfelt sympathy for our colleagues and their students at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. This week's senseless shootings are a vivid reminder that attacks on professors and students anywhere are a threat to our culture's tradition of academic freedom. We mourn with you."

If you concur in sending this message, please rise to observe a respectful moment of silence for our colleagues at Virginia Tech University.

All rose and the motion passed unanimously.

The Steering Committee distributed proposed dates for Senate meetings for the next academic year. It is moved that the Senate approve those dates as distributed. The

dates are September 19, October 17, November 14, December 5, January 23, February 20, March 19 and April 16.

The motion passed unanimously.

VIII. Report of Standing Committees

a. Budget Advisory Committee, C. Madsen

The Senate Budget advisory committee is made up of Joe Beckham, Pam Coates, Eric Walker, Carol Darling, Jim Cobbe and myself. We meet regularly with the Vice President and read as much into it as we possibly can. We make our voices heard for the most part. None of us are timid and when we're asked we speak up and sometimes when we're not asked we speak up. This is a hard-working committee and it's very rare that any member misses one of those important university budget meetings.

Traditionally, this time of year is the time that we have the report on this committee for two reasons:

1. the legislative session is closer to letting us know what's going to happen this next go around
2. because this is technically the new senate of the next year, because anything that gets done now, coming out of the new conference committee, will of course affect us in the future.

Also, I ask Ralph Alvarez to always come and give his report. He very kindly does this. I do this for a number of reasons. Our budget is over a billion dollars, not counting lots of things- PECO, construction; this is a big, big business and a tremendously large enterprise. Besides that, Ralph's probably the only one who can knowledgably answer questions and I've never known him to dodge a question. So, the thing that I've tried to do is say that T.K. actually gave some of the report and you'll hear the rest from Ralph Alvarez and also any questions you might have.

Thank you very much, Dr. Madsen. I'll give you a few numbers as we know them of April 13th. The legislative session ends May 4th, so we have two weeks left. To put it into perspective the State University System educational general budget is roughly 3.3 billion dollars. Within that we have a 500 million dollar budget for Florida State including the College of Medicine. This excludes contracts and grants, etc. There are a few things that the House and the Senate have agreed upon. One of those is the operating budget for the new buildings that are coming on-line. It's always important to get funding for the buildings that are coming on-line.

They have also agreed on a 5% tuition increase for undergraduate, in-state students. As you may know, the BOG did not recommend a tuition increase so it

will be interesting to see if that passes into the appropriations bill and if the governor denies it as far as a veto. Any other increases for other categories of students, primarily the out-of-state tuition fee and the graduate levels will fall under the authority of the Board of Trustees. And we are developing the tuition policy motion for the May 10-11 meeting of the Board of Trustees to consider. As you know, last year we passed on out of state tuition increases for both graduate and undergraduate students due to the high level of out-of state tuition that we have nationally by comparison.

As President Wetherell noted, there are a number of important issues that are funded at a certain level on one side and a certain level at the other. The enrollment issue is very important. The BOG request was \$151 million dollars. The House and Senate are only at \$79 million. So that's a bread and butter issue that's very important to us. The out of state/in state mix is another very important issue for the State University System. That's about \$15 million dollars and we would get \$6 million dollars and that should make up for drops in out of state students over the last few years. We used to make up such shortfall up within our SUS system. After the evolution we all got stuck with our own tuition budgets, so that's another important issue.

Regarding salary increases, as you heard the comments by President Wetherell, the only solid information we really have is the governor's recommendation of 2.44%. We'll probably not know anything until the last day because this is the way that these things happen. And it will be handled in administered funds so it does not detract from the SUS budget. A number of things that aren't on one side or the other will resolve by May 4th, including the matching program funding where we have about \$17 million dollars to be matched. So, those are some of the highlights.

The State's budget, you've probably read about, had a major adjustment March 12th regarding the recurring revenue picture for 2007-08. And the state actually reduced revenues. Recurring revenues were reduced by almost a billion dollars, which is a huge number compared to 2007-08 revenues. The state university system's request, which includes some tuition but not much, is almost \$600 million dollars by itself. You can compare that to the adjusted increase in new state dollars from 2006-07 to 2007-08 of between 500-800 million dollars. So, as the president said, we need strong support. We don't have a budget reduction in this year's budget and I want to let people know about that because we have not had a reduction in a few years. And as you also know there's a lot of non-recurring balance options. The good news long term is that for the following year, 2008-09, revenues should shoot right back up. So the future looks brighter for 2008-09.

Hopefully the pathways of excellence will work itself in there. That's almost \$12 million dollars for the university.

I believe this is a general overview. There are some other issues that have to be agreed to by the House and Senate. So there's (potential) for great things. How would I rate these potential good things and, through the session, will they continuing to grow and will we get significant additional dollars? We might be able to score it on a 1 to 10 scale by May 4th, I'm not sure right now Right now I'm saying I'd probably rate the outcome about 5. If other things are successful we might get to a 6 or greater. I look forward to the conclusion of the legislature.

b. Graduate Policy Committee, G. Bates

I've already made my annual report, but I will, I guess, remind you that what the graduate policy committee does is work in 3 areas. It's a large and very active committee. We have 23, I think, members across the university. And we basically do three things. One, we're actively involved in reviewing graduate programs throughout the university, doctoral and masters programs. We've completed 11 or 12 reviews this year, all in the College of Social Sciences. We have one left to do next Monday - Public Administration. We also consider new program proposals and there's been a flurry of masters programs coming through, one doctoral program beginning to work its way into the system, a proposal. So, we've been quite busy doing that. And the College of Music just, at least at the GPC level, we've been doing that process this month with the approval of a new master's program. And then the third thing we do is discuss issues of graduate academic policy that affect university-wide programs. And we have had a number of discussions of that sort this year. One very important and ongoing discussion is graduate faculty stats and doctoral director stats and we hope to have something to bring you about that next year. We haven't completed our thinking on this issue, but there's a subcommittee producing a report on it.

We have an action item that evolved out of one of these discussions, which was, you have a sheet describing the action item. The issue has to do with the policy regarding who may be the representative at large, that is the representative of university faculty on doctoral committees. And in 2004 the Senate approved a modification of the previous wording describing the university representative. And since 2004 the wording has been "the supervisory committee will consist of a minimum of three members of the graduate faculty of doctoral director status, one of whom is a representative at large of the graduate faculty drawn from outside the student's department and degree program." And the part that had changed in 2004 was that we added "department *and* degree program" whereas before it had been just outside the department. And the reason for doing that was to take into account our interdisciplinary programs which exist outside of departments. And the representative at large should be not a member of the program itself of the department. We did not realize when we made this change, in fact somehow it slipped through until we pointed out last fall that the College of Business has a problem with this policy. The college of business has multiple, it has a single doctoral program, but it has multiple departments. In fact, the

departments function as autonomous units, that is they run their own graduate program. But all the graduate students in the college get the same degree, it's a degree in, a doctorate in Business Administration, I believe.

*The program is *business*, but there are different majors.

And there are different majors within it. So the students are admitted into the departments and they function as independent entities but there's only one doctoral program and everyone in the college has DDS in its umbrella doctoral program. So, based on our current policy, all doctoral students within the College of Business would have to find somebody else outside their college to be their representative at large on their committees and that's not the intention when we passed this original proposal. So what we're asking is that we would modify our wording such that, if you look at the fourth paragraph, "The supervisory committee will consist of a minimum of three members of the graduate faculty of a doctoral director status, one of whom is the representative of the graduate faculty drawn from outside of the student's department, however, for all interdisciplinary programs the supervisory committee will consist of a minimum of three members of the graduate faculty who will have doctoral director status, one of whom is representative of the graduate faculty drawn from outside the student's department and degree program."

*So, there is a motion on the floor that comes from the GPC. It does not need a second because it comes from one of our committees and is a slight nuance of wording to fit the diversity within the university to include issues within the college of Business. Is there discussion of the motion?

*Question about the minimum requirement

Yes, that's the minimum requirement. Most units have more.

*Other discussion? Yes.

*I think that we would probably then open the door to each department and college deciding how they wanted to do that, which is not the intent. I think there have been many dialogues between GPC and the steering committee and that the best way to resolve it was the wording that was selected even though it is a bit...

We're describing programs that students go through a home department and they enter the program, and the potential is that if you had the older wording you could have a faculty member that is outside the department but still in their program, which we want to avoid.

Their situation [Business] really is different because these are independent departments, independent programs. They happen to have the same name on the degree.

The faculty have to be outside those faculties that are members of that degree program. And it is a potential problem, I mean, that's why these policies become so difficult to crack because of all these complications, but in GFDI there may not be a defined, set faculty, which is a potential problem. And likewise, in Humanities there is that potential problem because there isn't that precise, defined faculty, however, at least in discussions with Chair of the new humanities department, David Johnson, we feel that we are in safe ground with this policy. We will have process to identify who are faculty, or regular members of the Humanities program. But you know, to write a policy that fits everything-it's going to become worse and worse.

The motion passes unanimously.

IX. Old Business

There were no items of new business.

X. New Business

There were no items of new business.

XI. University Welfare

a. Updates on Bargaining and Related Matters, J. Fiorito

Good afternoon, and a special welcome to new Senators, who are about to find that one of the perks of office is to suffer through regular reports on collective bargaining and related matters. I've been giving these reports for more than four years now. I actually spent about 45 days as "past president" recently and thought today's report might be my last (on behalf of our president-elect, Mark Cooper). But Professor Cooper, former Senator and former Senate Steering Committee member, is one of FSU's latest "martyrs to market inequity." He is leaving FSU for another academic position at a considerably higher salary, and he will be missed. Our UFF-FSU Chapter Executive Council decided that the best option under the circumstances was to appoint me to complete his term.

We've had two bargaining sessions since our last Senate meeting. A major topic has been intellectual property (Article 18 of the CBA), and it's been a bit of a "long and winding road" to borrow the Beatles' song title. We are making progress. We've begun discussions on childcare and domestic partner health care benefits as well. Both of these issues would directly affect minorities of the faculty bargaining unit, but both are important to make FSU a better place to work. A recent survey report from the College and University Personnel Association shows that 40% of responding schools offer domestic partner health care benefits. UF and FIU have found ways to do this, and USF and its UFF chapter are working on it. We are hopeful that FSU can find a way to make it work too. We'll begin to discuss salaries as soon as the legislative session

concludes, with an intensified negotiating schedule of weekly meetings. Faculty Senators are most welcome at these public meetings, and I think you would find them interesting. If you contact me (jfiorito@fsu.edu), I'll be glad to provide details on dates, times, and location.

Consultations are another thing that our UFF-FSU Chapter does (Article 2), roughly once a month. We have President Consultations in which the Provost represents the President, and Provost Consultations in which the Dean of the Faculties leads the administration delegation. Tomorrow we have a President Consultation so we'll meet with the Provost – I know that sounds confusing. Just to give a few examples of consultation topics, our agenda for tomorrow includes confidentiality forms some faculty have been asked to sign, administration progress in reviewing the Senate's non-tenure track faculty report and the joint study committee's market equity report, and implementation of contract provisions, such as those on performance evaluation.

We're currently conducting a web-based "micro-poll" focused on childcare but with more general items on "climate" and performance ratings. Please urge your colleagues to participate. A better response rate helps us better represent faculty views.

Thank you for your attention. I'll be happy to take any questions.

XII. Announcements by Deans and Other Administrative Officers

There were no announcements by Deans and Other Administrative Officers.

XIII. Announcements by Provost Abele

The Provost was in attendance but did not have any announcements.

XIV. Announcements by President Wetherell

First of all, thank you for letting me come by again. I hope all of you have a relaxing summer. I understand this will be the last official faculty senate meeting for a while. I hope all of you will travel safely and we look forward to seeing you back. It's hard to say anything without thinking about Virginia Tech right now. No matter how good of a year you've had, that just puts a damper on everything. A couple of things to keep in mind that you might not know, as Jane pointed out we are going to do the candlelight vigil tonight. We'll be lighting the torch on Unconquered and doing all kinds of things. Flags are at half-staff, Student Government has done a resolution, our Board of Trustees has sent letters. That is all nice and helpful, but also it's a little bit like a death in the family. Right now they're overwhelmed with support and help, but sometime in the future they're going to have to get down to some real issues. We have volunteers and police officers to go up, counselors to go up, and spend a considerable amount of time, potentially this summer, and use assignment times if we have to [in order] to do that.

On campus, what we have done is looked at that situation and you want to believe that, one, it would never happen here, but two, that we would have resolved this in one shape, way or form. We did set up a committee which has Mary Coburn and David Perry co-chairing it to look at all of our disaster planning processes. Ironically, in case you're not aware of it, in September we held a mock-shooting on campus and had the police, our local FSU police and FSU police responded to that particular mock-event; it was over in the residence hall, and went over these mock procedures. We envisioned that no one would kill in that mock decision, that we got the shooter and we never envisioned that someone would be left to walk across campus and do something else, but we have tried to do a few of those things. Some of the things that we've come to realize that we need to do is have a way to communicate with mass amounts of people at a given time. We do have in place right now and have had the ability to shut down campus at a moment's notice, so to speak. Every police officer is assigned to a specific location and would be directed in some point in time to go to that location and prohibit anyone from coming through that location. That doesn't stop people obviously from walking back and forth and doing things, but that ability does exist. Or in the mock shooting we did, we found out that frankly we needed to shut down portions of the campus rather than the whole campus and focus the resources of the campus on that particular area where the problem is occurring. So, we've got that in place. We're looking at some other issues, specifically if you weren't aware of it, we're installing and are literally right now installing, prior to any of this happening, a siren system on campus that we could blow the siren to say that a tornado is coming, or whatever is happening. That process will go forward and once it's implemented we will obviously put it in the orientation process, the faculty handbooks, to the information system of the university- when the siren sounds do something. Now, one of the other things that we've now looked at is making that a voice system where you could literally broadcast a message of some nature. My brilliant idea is that, one of those things, we always put them in, and the rats eat the wires or something and you turn it on and it never works, is to create possibly a bell system or something like that, a bell-tower concept to make sure it works. But that system will be in place some time this summer. We're looking at the blue lights on campus and if you push that blue light, it lights up at the police station that there's a problem at site 21, or whatever. We're trying to figure out if we could bring voice the other way, where you could use those blue lights as also an information center to notify people to do something, depending on what the nature of the emergency is.

Anyway, we will look at all of our procedures internally, and in particular our residence halls, we've already had our housing office talk to students. In case you didn't see ABC news last night, the local channel, a reporter went around to FSU, TCC and FAMU and wanted to find out how easy it was to get into a given building or location and basically walked into every dormitory room on campus, TCC doesn't have dorms, and one of our virtues, our vices, our students are so friendly and helpful if you walk up to the main door they say, "Well, here come on in." That's not what we're trying to accomplish on this matter. So, we are looking at all of these procedures and processes in this. There will be faculty representation on that committee; there will be student representation to the government. I mean, in all honesty, I think we have to be somewhat honest with

ourselves that we are a university. We have 400 and something acres here, acreage in Panama City, acreage in Innovation Park, acreage in five foreign countries and everywhere else, so the plan for those individual places may be somewhat different, but still, shutting down FSU versus Leon High School is a totally different issue and we don't want to overreact and change the culture that we've tried to commit to create, which is being a friendly campus. So, we understand that and we're trying to work through it and with some time we may hopefully make a few better decisions than reacting at this time when emotions are so high. So that's the best that I can tell you on security, Virginia Tech, etc. It is a terrible thing to have to deal with; there's no way you can make it easy. But, this past weekend we lost a student to a DUI over in Panama City, and as terrible as that catastrophe was at Virginia Tech, for that family in Panama City last weekend, it was the same thing. Any time you lose students, lose faculty it is a tough deal. But we are looking at it. Overall, we believe that our process and our security internally is pretty darn good. Now, how do you prepare yourself for a Virginia Tech or a 9-11? I'm not sure we're totally able to do that at this time and in hindsight we would probably think differently, but we'll see.

The legislative process, they have passed both of their prospective bills. They are in a conference mode. We are in communication with them about our issues. Our main 3 issues are:

1. To fully fund enrollment. That includes an in-state, out-of-state mix to full fund enrollment
2. Faculty Salaries
3. Our pathways of excellence program

Those happen to be, notwithstanding pathways of excellence, the priorities of the BOG and I think the priorities of the two prospective houses. Now how that will come out in the whole process, I'm not sure. I was pretty optimistic going in. I got more pessimistic as I went through it and last week I've become more optimistic, so you ride the rollercoaster down there. At this moment in time, in either the house or the Senate budget, every issue that we want to have addressed is addressed in some way, shape or form. That hasn't happened in 8 years. That's a good sign in my mind. I think that when it all comes out we will be okay. I'll just be honest with you. I think we're going to be okay. Our PECO list and our construction list is pretty much paired up where we want it to be and we're fairly comfortable in that regard. There are some bumps in the road that we'll go through, but we'll get there. We've had some very interesting discussion with the Legislature on enrollment and behind closed doors they understand our position. Whether they will have the ability to do that in public or not, I doubt it, but we have notified them of what we've done in enrollment here. Larry's coming up and he may want to be more specific, but we will meet our enrollment plan, we will be within the quarter and we probably took about 1,400 students less than we normally take this year. We will not say that publicly, but anyway, we will go from there. Also, we will have a board of trustees meeting in about a month to set the budget and etc. One of the things that we've taken up at the board meeting is that this fall we will announce our new Capital Campaign/ Foundation Plan, whatever you want to call it.

They do not want me to say how much it is and I refuse to get into the numbers game like we did before, but it will be significant. Quite frankly, it's already begun because the Boosters have begun their portion to endow athletic scholarships. But one of the things we learned in this last Capital Campaign, is that if you start chasing a number and the number becomes more important than the issues when you're done, while you may be happy and brag about the fact that you got your number, when you look internally to the Faculty, the Deans, etc. you scratch your head and say, "Why did we do all that work for so little of whatever it is that I got?" So, we have decided that we need to develop a strategic plan as we talk to donors and say "This is what we want Florida State to look like 20 years from now. This is how we're going to get there and this is how your donation is going to help us." We've gotten the Foundation to buy into that; the Provost has gotten the Deans to buy into that, so by this fall when we announce that we've formed a committee, they're going to sit down with the deans and build that plan from the bottom up and so when we say that we're going to raise a billion dollars, or whatever that it may be, it's going to be compartmentalized. It may be some for graduate assistance, some for professorships, some for scholarships, some for whatever it happens to be and then as the Foundation people go out and solicit donors, we try to solicit in those areas where we have priorities and specific plans. Clearly we have established what we are and if somebody decides to give us some money for something else that isn't in that plan, we will take their money. I will be upfront and honest with that. But we will try, at least, to interest people in areas that we'll be able to use those dollars where you as a faculty member or the dean can say, "Well, this is worth my effort to go on the road because I'm going to get a share out of it." I'd encourage you to be involved. In my normal root of impatience I want to see it done sooner rather than later. We'll probably finalize it right after the first of next year, but we'll certainly have it done preliminarily this fall and we will begin at least announcing the campaign and starting down that road. We have made some changes in the Foundation in the way it's going to work. You'll see them occur this summer, and by the time we return we'll probably move the Alumni Association into or under the Foundation. The idea being that we need an Alumni Association that is not committed to raising money, but raising friends. If we do not know the names of people, if we don't know how to keep up with alums, etc, we want them spending their time and effort there and we want the Foundations, the deans doing those solicitations. So, we'll do some 1) restructuring of the finance, 2) restructuring of their whole reporting system and trying to get them into the friend building business in the Alumni Association and saying that being to contact 250,000 alums is more important than whether or not you raise 250,000 dollars. Now that's a little bit different than the way that Florida State has done things in the past and there will probably a few people with some heartburn over that, but I think that they'll be over that by the fall, or they won't be here, so you won't have to deal with that. I think that everyone can understand that, how important it is. We created a new accounting system in both the Foundation, the Boosters and the Alumni to keep up with donors. We haven't done a particularly good job of working with people who have given money. I have a little scholarship down in Flagler college and every semester I get a letter from that student and a picture from that student and I'm sure that somebody writes it for them, and I'm sure she types it or does it in her own handwriting and I'm sure someone gives her the stamp, but at least I get it. We really don't have ways to

keep track of that. And sometimes if you give to the Boosters, the Foundation or the Alumni don't know. We've consolidated all of that data and hopefully we'll be able to know who "John Doe" is, what his/her interests are, who's going to solicit them and we'll hopefully be able to go talk to them with a message they want to hear rather than us fumbling around trying to figure out what that message is. So, we're pretty excited about that. We think that's going to work out pretty well.

Pathways is on schedule. Ross is finalizing the next series of clusters and then in the fall we'll start with our third year of clusters. I believe that under any circumstances that we will have the funds to do that and we will be on track to hire all of the existing faculty that leave or new positions that come on board as well as the commitments we made to the 200 out of pathways. I also believe that one of those clusters next year will be a non-stemmed cluster, so don't get panicked over that. One piece of advice on the construction schedule, we will in the next few weeks be bulldozing Fort Apache and starting a new Center for Professional Development. That will have some impact for about 18 months until that facility is built as our ability to do postings of conferences, etc. It doesn't mean that we will be totally out of the business, but we will have to re-do where we place people and do things like that. Hopefully when that is done we'll be able to do a much better job in that process.

*Any questions?

That's about all. I'll be glad to answer any questions if I can. Jack?

*Question about faculty salaries.

Well, those are our top priorities. I'm referring to a couple of different things. We would like to see faculty salaries to be in administered funds and not be within an individual university's budget account so we have those dollars above. We would like to see that 2.4 number be higher, in all honesty. The other thing is we'd like as much flexibility on that 2-point number to individual campuses so that you and your negotiating and us and ours can work that out to however we need to do it. We'd also like to see some extra money for special use, merit pay, whatever you'd like to call it. So any or all of those are on the table in our minds. And that could be, the legislature is going to look at a variety of different pots, it could be Economic Development money, incentives for faculty that do something to bring us business. It could be non-recurring, we would prefer recurring where we could build it in the base, but if we can go ahead and get it as non-recurring, we'll take that too. We don't care how we get it, we just like it. Anybody else?

Thank you. I appreciate it.

XV. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Melissa Crawford

Melissa Crawford, Faculty Senate Coordinator