



THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE

MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
JANUARY 18, 2012  
DODD HALL AUDITORIUM  
3:35 P.M.

**I. Regular Session**

The regular session of the 2011-12 Faculty Senate was held on Wednesday, January 18, 2012. Faculty Senate President Sandra Lewis presided.

The following members attended the Senate meeting:

J. Ahlquist, E. Aldrovandi, B. Altman, D. Armstrong, A. Askew, TJ Atwood, P. Beerli, E. Bernat, J. Bowers, T. Chapin, E. Chicken, J. Clendinning, J. Cobbe, R. Coleman, A. Darrow, J. Dawkins, L. DeBrunner, L. deHaven Smith, R. Dumm, I. Eberstein, C. Edrington, B. Ellingson, G. Erickson, K. Erndl, S. Fiorito, W. Francis, A. Gaiser, J. Geringer, M. Hanline, K. Harper, C. Hofacker, G. Houlihan, R. Horton-Ikard, J. Ilich-Ernst, B. Jackson, F. Jordan, T. Keller, Y. Kim, W. Landing, M. Leeser, S. Leitch, S. Lewis, J. Lickson, T. Lindbloom, L. Lyons, C. Madsen, R. Marrinan, M. Mascagni, T. McQuade, M. Mesterton-Gibbons, U. Meyer-Baese, W. Mio, D. Moore, V. Richard Auzenne, J. Saltiel, N. Schmidt, K. Schmitt, R. Schwartz, J. Sickinger, L. Spainhour, L. Stepina, B. Stults, G. Tenebaum, F. Tolson, J. Tull, G. Tyson, C. Upchurch, M. Uzendoski, S. Valisa, D. Von-Glahn.

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

J. Adams, S. Aggarwal (**X. Yuan**), E. Baumer, W. Carlson, D. Cooper, M. Craig, A. Darabi, J. Diaz, J. Doran, L. Edwards, A. Hirsch, M. Kapp, D. Latham (**M. Mardis**), R. Lee (**F. Heelin**), W. Logan, C. Lonigan, T. Ma, H. Mattoussi, B. Menchetti, R. Mizelle, A. Mullis (**C. Readdick**), J. Ohlin, J. O'Rourke, G. Rogachev, N. Stein, P. Steinberg, J. Standley, M. Teasley (**S. Tripodi**), E. Treharne, D. Tsilimingras, O. Vafek, W. Weissert (**A. Rowan**).

**II. Approval of the Minutes**

The minutes of the December 7, 2011 meeting were approved as distributed.

**III. Approval of the Agenda**

The agenda was approved with two additions, a special order to answer questions and concerns from the Faculty Senate regarding the email migration and a 'Big Ideas' follow up.

**IV. Report of the Steering Committee, S. Fiorito**

Since the last Faculty Senate meeting on December 7<sup>th</sup> the Faculty Senate Steering Committee (FSSC) has met twice and met once with both the President and the Provost.

The FSSC is continuing discussions and investigations into the quality of Gordon Rule courses and interdisciplinary courses and programs. Involving more faculty in Curriculum

department decisions regarding new courses and revisions of courses are also recurring themes at our meetings. The University curriculum committee with the help of Melissa Crawford is drafting a new course request form. Once new forms have been approved thorough the UCC and the faculty senate steering committee, they will be sent to the faculty senate for discussion and approval. If you have any curriculum concerns or would like to see particular revisions please let any UCC member aware of your concerns so that they can be addressed.

We would also like to reiterate that the FSSC strongly recommends that every department has a representative and functioning curriculum committee.

At our meeting with President Barron on December 15<sup>th</sup> we discussed Domestic partner benefits, the merit bonus process and asked if there were concerns or issues. The UFF is also in conversations with the President about future merit bonus procedures. The FSSC also confirmed with President Barron that the following Deans would be evaluated this spring: Education, Social Work, Music, Human Sciences, Medicine, and Nursing. Changes in the Promotion and Tenure process are being discussed with the UFF regarding a second and fourth year review rather than just a third year review prior to a tenure decision and obtaining five or six outside letters rather than four. The FSSC also asked President Barron about hazing at FSU and his response is that we need to be constantly vigilant and address any concerns immediately.

The FSSC also met with Provost Stokes on December 15<sup>th</sup> and she confirmed her and President Barron's support of reinstating Anthropology. Provost Stokes mentioned that she and President Barron were reviewing the committee reports on the Arts and Sciences College reorganization and the establishment of a Health Sciences College. We are looking forward to hearing more about the recommendations from these two committees.

The Provost reiterated her support for beginning a search this semester for a Dean of the Faculties. We look forward to hearing more about this very soon.

Provost Stokes is in conversations with Dr. Bradley concerning interdisciplinary programs and courses and once she is up to speed on what has been done thus far on campus, a committee to review interdisciplinary issues, will be established. The FSSC is also pleased to see that the CRC is funding interdisciplinary research proposals for students and faculty across the university as we believe strongly in interdisciplinary programs, courses and research.

The Provost mentioned that in December three very strong candidates for the Dean of Engineering were on campus and decisions should be forthcoming on filling this position.

Initial discussions were introduced at the last FSSC meeting that dealt with the Worker's Rights Consortium, email migration problems, and fundraising. All of these conversations will be continued. Finally, we have a document that has been revised on shared governance that began with the Advisory Council of Faculty Senates. We will share this document with President Barron and Provost Stokes and hope to bring a version before this body for discussion and approval, very shortly.

**V. Reports of Standing Committees**

There were no reports from standing committees.

**VI. Special Order: The Great Give, C. Warren**

Lots of emails have come along in the last week or two and you'll receive a few more over the weekend. The reason for that is the Great Give, which is a 36 hour online campaign that is new and exciting that the University has never done before.

The Great Give is a 36 hr long online campaign where we're asking the entire FSU population- that means you all, Faculty and Staff, parents, friends, and students to support the University in a short 36 hour span.. The tagline for the Great Give is "a future supported by you" with the F S and U underlined to get the connection. Our goal is to raise over \$161,000 in 36 hours. I think it can be done. Why 161,000 dollars in 36 hours is on Jan 24 that was our 161<sup>st</sup> anniversary of being chartered by the State of FL. The great thing about this is even though the Foundation is supporting the initial the office of giving is undertaking the promotion of it, it benefits everyone and every college and program. We are excited that if you decide to support you can support any of the associations- the Boosters, the Ringling, all the colleges and programs. Right now you are anxious about all the emails and you went to the website [onefsu.edu/greatgive](http://onefsu.edu/greatgive) and there is just a countdown for Monday the 23<sup>rd</sup> at 9am when the counter comes on and it will end at 9pm Tuesday night. When you come on the website on Monday and the website is different, there will be a thermometer plot tracking our progress throughout the day. What's great about this is some of our faculties and deans and programs have taken it upon themselves to challenge their units to donate. ---- If you all from now until Monday could do a few things: talk about it, text it, facebook it, twitter it if you're on those social media channels and when people ask be supportive about it. It'd be great if you made a gift that day. I really do think it's going to be exciting and I think its going to show the potential we have for this campaign coming off a billion dollars. But I do think this is a nice soft, subtle way to get your community of faculty and staff to support in whatever is comfortable to you, and to give in multiple areas as well. So fingers crossed we'll be in Tallahassee Democrat and FSView.

Q: I didn't receive all the emails, is it possible to use the funds to go into the rhetorical style of how we receive our emails please? (I couldn't hear what he said, this is what I implied)

A: I think we discussed it by the CIO. The emails that were sent out to the community went to all faculty and staff members and then another email to students. If you did not receive them, by show of hands who didn't receive it? Okay, opportunity there. [One.fsu.edu/greatgive](http://One.fsu.edu/greatgive) for more info, I apologize if you didn't receive it. Tomorrow we'll be sending out another email to 300,000 people in our Foundation database. Whats funny about alumni is a lot of them think we have their email addresses and we don't, so we run into that. Some have also asked not to be a part of it, and then with gmail and yahoo they get stuck in spam sometimes. You should receive it, on Friday you should get a little teaser and Monday you should get one that says to give.

Q: Many of us as faculty already give to the foundation and counts towards our support, a previous university had a timed campaign and they had a list of everyone who didn't give and there was significant pressure from the deans and department heads for me to

contribute. Many of us contribute in other ways; the emails make it sound like this is a pretty high pressure campaign.

A: I certainly understand where you're coming from and by all means there should not give anyone pressure to give, to give more. It's by all means to engage our alumni and faculty and staff that's newer and I thought this was a subtler way since we haven't had a robust campaign in the past few years. This is good for faculty and staff to have a restricted fund or unrestricted fund, whether it's important to your faculty and staff or dean. Our top 40 funds will be listed on the drop down menu, only top 40 based on the gifts and number of giving on a yearly basis, but there is an option for other like something specific.

Q: Will they get reports back of what's been used or who donated?

A: No ma'am, that's a great question. No Dean is asked nor do we have any intention of giving them a list of who has not given. I can say there have been a few Deans that have asked if we can track to them, for example, if someone wants to know maybe a department had 80% participation rate.

Q: But that's exactly the info that can be used against other departments and that's exactly what happened before.

A: I assure you, I guess in that sense you are right, because they need the names to put in a raffle and make sure they're eligible to do the math of who has not given on the campaign.

Q: Have you pointed out that maybe other universities to make up more faculty and staff campaigns and given FL with its unique situation sets up for low morale than other places. IT seems like this type of campaign gives low morale for faculty and staff.

A: And I appreciate that, by no means was that the intention. It first started, how can we get our young alumni to give? And coming online it was an easy transition for them, accessible and giving online is like social media. And then it was like let's not discriminate against just young alumni let's do all alumni, and then we realized we had so many opportunities with friends in Tallahassee and with the students and organizations that we decided let's just make this one robust campaign. It was by no means anything but fun and exciting in that quick sense of urgency.

One of the options you have is the promotion and tenure endowment fund. So if you feel so inclined that may be a place to put your money if you feel like you need to give.

## **VII. Special Order: Email Migration, M. Barrett**

Before we got too deep into it, I want to give a little background. This is been an initiative from the University and ITS for 2 years now and this transition was to get rid of 2 forms: one was very outdated and no one had put any effort into maintaining it or updating it. The other email system which had been the attempt of transition 5 years earlier had undergone a takeover by our competitor company and its future was very uncertain and it also lacked some features people wanted. Having 2 email systems made it difficult to interoperate and the names and addresses were different, inconsistent naming issues. Things were generally handled one on one and didn't cause much noise, but every day there were issues with the email system that interrupted the operability. So we needed to make a decision and our

office, like everyone here was going through a lot of retraction of budget over the year. This is part of the planned reduction--- by the university and we need to sustain those while we can. These things will help with hR staff efficiencies by having one system instead of two and decrease the software cost because of the reduced duplication between the two. So that was really the point.

What we did was set it out to look at the technology, and we quickly undated to the Microsoft system and the exchange because it's been out for a number of years, and they just came out with a new one called the 2012 version which gave new capabilities. But we really wanted the employee infrastructure to enhance our uses for the future like voice, video conferencing, instant messaging, integration of cell phones, and a lot of things we don't do today but provide a good use. It helps to be on a system that you can interoperate with and has the capabilities to do the things we want to do. Some of you may or may not know that we are replacing our funds to integrate this and offer a lot of new features. There are still some things we need to straighten out before we do that. To do this we have a long process internally first to migrate mail, migrate the different facets to try to keep the different things in place, all the things people have themselves that people do on their own. So we set out to work on that internally, work with the IT managers of different departments. We publicize this through mass emails, the Provost has emailed this info to hit as many targets as we could. Then we started sending target mail.

Now the actual conversion took place in multiple steps. we had some programs --- trying to get a wide variety of campus departments to try it out and see if it works and through the process got bugs so we fixed those along the way. IT got to the point where the clock was ticking and the end of the calendar year was approaching so we chose to migrate over the winter break to cause the least interruption between the academic process because between the semesters the university is shut down. What we didn't realize is the time is when researchers are doing a lot of activity and that's an angle we really hadn't thought of, and we tried to deal with those issues coming up. We knew it would be somewhat disruptive, we knew it wasn't going to be perfect that would be impossible. So when we started right around winter break, we assigned staff, had our help desk on call, and thought we had enough people there and we probably didn't in retrospect, that was where there were delays in getting back to people. But shortly after on Jan 3 we hit the ground running, started cataloguing the issues to see what was out there to see what different types of issues were out there. One big thing we missed was a group of retirees and this had to do with a conversion that took place years ago in the HR systems, that for various reasons didn't catch the proper status of faculty members. I think about 78 of our faculty that we hadn't reached out to because we didn't know that was their status. So we've tried to individually reach out to faculty that we can find so they knew A-we didn't lose the --- and we'll try to rectify that as soon as possible, and apologize for the cause of it. But beyond that there were a number of issues that were a result of the dual infrastructure like passwords, and things mismatched so some people couldn't log in. These are things behind the scenes that you couldn't tell what they were. There was a confusion of where the migrated mail was placed, because you have to make a decision with the mail you might already have because there were some people who might still use both systems, and the things that were migrated were put in a separate folder which some people didn't know about.

There was also some issues between faculty and staff and students who had dual roles at the University, maybe a student became a staff member and the transition of which email to use

if they had more than one. So those are the issues, there are also some issues of the service center being adept at solving those issues.

I think we had some issues about mail being forwarded too many times and rejected by other mail servers that were exceeding the number of attempts due to suspicious activity that various providers put in place so that was causing problems but we resolved that. We had attachment issues with some email clients on a day to day basis. The rest of it is just that it's different. Webmail had a different feel, there's a difference in the way the clients behave, the display name and email are different so people just have to get used to that. It is a reliable system as used by many, and it's not something that's going to go away any time soon so we have a good support structure for it.

What I wanted to do is open up for questions and concerns from you.

Q: Major problems I saw had to do with lack of notification. I got 2 emails: one at the beginning of Dec and 1 essentially 15 mins before the migration. It was a major change because we couldn't access anything on the server. Fortunately it didn't affect me--- but you lost track of all your emails in the inbox. Not only is that a research issue but for ---and graduate fellowship that ability was lost ... The other issue was last week and the lack of emails when you had the phishing problem. You couldn't send emails because people looking at emails. We never got any notification from the system that there was an issue and I think that was the problem. You have notification that there was an issue and --- there was an emergency and I think that's a major issue.

A: Thanks for those. The first point you're correct, we can't communicate too much what we thought was enough warning and it wasn't so I apologize for that. The second item, the phishing thing occurred last weekend and we got late notification of it ourselves but we're working with Microsoft on how they blacklist and what the reality is. To try to figure out what was going on.

Q: With the password thing, I couldn't find it. --- IT should've been a very easy thing like sending out a general notification through the campus email. It was difficult with the password reset, it was a process with me and it wasn't at the top level of the website, and there was still the outstanding issue of why students and alumni need it.

A: That's really on our fact with the service and the students housed in gmail, it's a non-guaranteed service not backed up the way we do. There's not stability. We just went live with the emails and it doesn't limit the system like the email does so that's all something with dollars and cents. So I encourage anyone who feels they don't have adequate space in a compartment basis to let us know a better target to look for so we can try to find that right level. The student system was just there, we didn't pick it, it was assigned our way and with students we were looking for back storage for their homework and assignments to prevent loss, and the email was just another piece added on to it. But it was more about applications and storage for students. – I wanted to give the faculty staff what they had before with the ability to expand in the future, but students just got an arbitrary amount that Microsoft happened to give them by default.

Q: I'm curious to know how many faculty members have declared or count for inactive. And I'd really like to know whether that designation is something that you do or if it's an automatic way or burden that the email at fsu or the – at admin dot fsu. I never heard about

it but I heard it was someone that left years ago and I've certainly been using it without the point that someone or some system designated as inactive.

A: (Inaudible.)

Q: The graduate students want to know what's happening with their emails because they're students and work here as TAs, are they going to be required, the old email of at fsu dot edu going to change to my.fsu.edu for grad students? They have both emails... depending on the context of their appointment.

A: So they should just tell people that their emails haven't changed. They have both.

Q: So grad students that are TAs emails don't change? (No they have 2 email addresses) I thought the whole email address list had to be redone which took a great deal of time with people not getting emails because they were sent to the old instead of new.

A: I were receiving emails to the @fsu until you were added to the new exchange system. So If there was a break in their appointment between fall and spring then there was a grace period . It was designed for the break between the appointment of the fall and spring. --- it might be safer to leave the @fsu. Grace period of 180 days but I'll check.

Q: But if you have a recommendation should they forward things from FSU.edu to my.fsu.edu?

A: That's an option for them to separate their employee life to student and academic life. It is a safer guess.

### **VIII. Special Order: Big Ideas Follow-up, T. Jennings**

I joined the university in Sept of 2010, and just to give you a sense of what you inherited in the VP of the university advancement, I thought I'd spend a few mins putting my background into the advancement of this job. Advancement is a word that means fundraising plus alumni constituent relations. And so my general job is to be a president of the FSU foundation and oversee the Alumni Association and the Seminole Boosters and to bring those organizations together so they work together for a billion dollar plus comprehensive capitol campaign in fundraising through the university. So it's a lot of fun because I get to meet a lot of these interesting people most of whom love the institution.

I started out as a first generation college student in Delaware, I went to James Madison which is a public university and stayed for a masters of counseling and was on the track to be Dean of Students for a while. I had a couple of jobs- at Davidson I was director of student housing for a while, made a transition when I started working at UVA when my advisor was --- who had graduated from FL State and came to UVA as the first team of women. And she was tough, from a FSU alumni and she won all the teaching awards at UVA and deserved them all. From there I transitioned to fundraising with Washington University in VA and ten years there when I left I was director of development. And when I finished there I was recruited by UVA to come back to be Chief officer of College of Arts and Sciences which there is about 2/3 of university and also includes the arts and economics and politics. Later in my time there I started fundraising things in other departments, so I've

gotten the sampling of different parts of the university in my fundraising over 20 years. I was lucky enough to be recruited here... and I've learned my way around here.

Before I arrived the president had created this position to oversee the 3 big organizations and realized they needed someone with professional fundraising to bring some clarity and togetherness and they had their own histories over time. The President also commissioned an analysis of those organizations that hired one of the top fundraising in the country with the booster's foundation, alumni and Ringling and how to improve the fundraising. So I got that as sort of a gift when I came in.

Under the leadership of Scott there was a sense that it had turned and there was new fundraising developing there at the program and board level. They discovered the Boosters had long continuous leadership, and it been created from scratch and with that continuity it had developed a level of autonomy that were not inconsistent between what I had seen at VA and other places. But I had seen that most athletic orgs don't deal with real estate development because they have gifts over time. The Seminole Boosters have an effective group of alumni around the state they can bring to help them. The Foundation has had a series of leaders over the past 5 years.

I spent my first year convincing staff that I would stay another year. The first year I spent a lot of time with Boosters because they have a lot of knowledge and they have relationships with many of the top donors and see how that organization functioned but also how to lead. We also spent the first year creating the structures to force the orgs to talk with each other and plan esp with events. We were all doing events but no one was talking with each other about them, there was no calendar or organization about it. I created a task force on naming it, because Boosters and Foundation had different ways to name buildings and the task force had to give acceptance policies because Boosters and Foundation had developed different ways to give gifts. As we're coming into a campaign its important we count it the same way so it all adds up. I have this notion that I don't have all the answers but people in the organizations do. I have managers in the task force that had great recommendations for me and we've implemented over 75% of them. We've also started leading the Boosters and Foundation Leadership and bringing them together to see themselves as a whole group. For this last thing, bringing the staff together to see them as one FSU. But the fact is I've seen enormous goodwill across the university and they're advocates for their programs and the University as a whole. So there was good will to bring them together and get things accomplished that first year.

The second year we started off in Oct with all the boards of the direct support orgs that raise money, so the volunteer boards and associations to a summit in Oct. We started a path that the staff began to see themselves as connected in this campaign and the volunteers. In the meantime I've been meeting with retired faculty groups and members of the Foundation and colleges and units and dept chairs and sectors within colleges. We've been trying to work with all angles of communication with the campaign. These things require science and art – a lot of background work to figure out how to organize human resources to maximize fundraising. We're going to raise 1 billion, for example, a large portion is going to come from a small group of people. 80/20 rule, 20% of the people give 80% of the money. And the late 90s changed to 90/10. With UVA's campaign, 90% had come from less than 1%. We're seeing a nearing of wealth distribution in America, but I see that as philanthropy and especially those institutions that have wealthy alumni. FSU's ratio isn't going to be that... 5% giving 90%.



What that forces us to do is focus on who has the money. We want to treat everyone with respect but we have scarce resources and we want to figure out where to invest our time. We have to spend our time with people who have money. That strength of contactability will affirm the data analysis in our donor base. And we match our donor base with various wealth databases and they help us identify with gifts of money. Why do we do that? If I'm going to go ask someone for \$100,000 but they could have given me 2.5 mil, that's a lot of money left under the table, and vice versa. We get this data back and our development officer is checking in the field to verify that info. Other things we've done this year that will be beneficial is we've created a new support org that's called the FSU Real Estate Foundation and the point for that is FSU Foundation was where donors made gifts to real estate. But we came concerned that if the Foundation accepted a gift of real estate and there was an accident of that property that someone could sue the foundation and take the money. So we created a separate foundation for a wall of separation. Also over time how to creatively think and protect the borders of the university, how can we create opportunities in the community to add to real estate. How can we work with the real estate centers in the university, the Boosters and the real estate companies and the research foundation. So how can we leverage all those resources and protect the foundation?

As we go out to raise a billion dollars, there are going to be constituents and they may raise more than that amount based on their donor base and how much. So I'm imagining 200 million will come from Athletics. The Ringling museum, depending on the collections will receive 75. It's probably no secret or alumni and colleges go out and make out more money than other ones. -0--Our goal is to stop the vicious cycle of alumni non-giving. And the second is to make sure my staff can translate the excellent work of the faculty and the potential of the students into something that will really excite donors to donate. They've got a lot of options, there's a proliferation of charities in the last few years so there's a lot of competition. So our job is that we're the next best thing.

One thing Sandy told me to mention is the raised faculty memo. A lot of faculty keep in touch with students over time, you probably have better relationships with alumni than those on the Boosters or Foundation staff. You and your colleagues have a better sense of whose been successful in their profession. We need your help on a couple things. We only have email addresses and good addresses on a little over half our alumni, so we're constantly trying to update them. So give us contact info. To the extent, help us indicate who has been successful over time. In your area of research or college help identify those with financial capacity. It's going to make a big difference, in 2 ways: one is what we know is people who have a close relationship with their college or institution will give money. Davidson person said it better than I ever could, "people give out of the sense of gratitude, confidence, and hope."

If confidence is going to steward that gift and help us to invest in them and donate. For hope, if you're going to give someone a large sum of money, it's for the next generation on the hope that something good will come for that. So if I could ask for your help it would be to spark a sense of gratitude among your students and people you work with. Some of the students and alumni we work with pay more taxes. Asking for money is not always foreign to them. So sparking their interest will give them confidence that your college or dept is a good steward and give them something to hope about that your academic area is going to make something better by an investment, then they're going to have more confidence.

Q: Dept chairs are part of the evaluation based on fundraising, so the issue is--- to be successful you're interested in --- departmental level has that kind of issue been raised?

A: I've never been in discussions about the department, I know the Deans a couple years ago were evaluating the college level. There were a lot of factors that go into that if that kind of thing were ever adopted. I'd say a couple things. One is most of the colleges don't have enough developmental staff to support you at the department level in a sense to evaluate on fundraising. Most people didn't become a dean or dept chair based on fundraising, its something you inherit. One of the things that would give me cause on a dept level is staffing and the second is you have to be able to know what the baseline is So you would have to figure out what the baseline for alumni giving was. And I'm not sure we have the staff resources to do that. So before we do that we'd have to have a discussion with the deans to see about pulling that off. There is a cohort of alumni or parents that you could classify because of my unit, but that's one you have to figure out.

#### **IX. Old Business**

There were no items of old business.

#### **X. New Business**

There were no items of new business.

#### **XI. University Welfare**

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

##### **Collective Bargaining**

You probably saw my email to bargaining unit faculty last Friday. It is prominently posted at the UFF-FSU web site. It provided a wide-ranging update. Today I want to focus on one bargaining issue although I will be happy to take questions on others.

That issue is non-tenure track faculty (NTTF). We held an open meeting, attended by several NTTF, with FSU Administration/BOT representatives the day after the last Senate meeting, and our first and only bargaining session this year was mainly devoted to further reviewing the working document of the joint committee and Administration objections to it.

This is a Faculty Senate issue, the subject of a special sub-committee report that was completed in late 2006. I left a handout at the table that summarizes some key issues by excerpting from that report and from our collective bargaining agreement. The "NTTF" issue involves Faculty Senate and UFF issues, and some of those messy "cross-over" issues. I think the Senate and UFF are on the same page on the key issues.

One of these is FSU's commitment to a tenure track faculty. This was a major concern to the Senate and is a major concern for the UFF. Progress on this issue has been difficult. At the bargaining table, we were told that a binding ratio (TTF to students, which makes more sense than a TTF-to-NTTF ratio) was unacceptable to

the FSU Administration/BOT. A joint administration-UFF committee worked out a “Plan B,” which tackled the problem by stressing the specialized missions that are appropriate for NTTF and “hard caps” on NTTF assignments to ensure that NTTF were not used in roles that should be performed by TTF (see “Working Document”). Now we are told that approach is also problematic for the FSU Admin/BOT, and I should add that it is unpopular with many NTTF.

I am not sure where this is going to end up, but given the issue’s importance to the Faculty Senate, I want to encourage all Senators to “read up.” That is, please familiarize yourselves with the issues as they will be “in play” in the days ahead.

**At the Ledge**

Just a brief comment. So much attention has focused on redistricting and macro-budget issues that little has been said about the many bad bills, including those designed to destroy faculty rights, that are being introduced or planned for introduction (possibly under the stealth of so-called “shell bills” already filed) in this session. You have heard House Speaker Cannon’s accusation of mediocrity and Senate President Haridopolous’ dismissal of tenure, along with the Governor’s expressed interest in the “Texas Plan,” disdain for certain disciplines, and other wacky ideas. I regret to say there are many bad ideas being floated and it will be important once again for faculty to oppose them.

**XII. Announcements by Deans and Other Administrative Officers**

There were no announcements by Deans or Other Administrative Officers.

**XIII. Announcements by Provost Stokes**

Provost Stokes was not in attendance.

**XIV. Announcements by President Barron**

President Barron was not in attendance.

**XV. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 4:51p.m.



Melissa Crawford  
Faculty Senate Coordinator