1) Meeting opened by Perry Moon.
2) Dahmus moved, Cordova seconded—to approve the minutes of the 2/8 meeting, with corrections.
3) Discussed electronic voting for the previously proposed changes to the Council constitution—open through March 2nd.
4) Debate continued on the contents of tenure binders.
   a. Discussed evidence for conference presentations. Dahmus recommended that the papers read be included in binders, in addition to the conference schedule. Conversation ensued about various kinds of conference presentations, (paper, panel, poster),
   b. Discussion continued, two competing imperatives emerging: the desire to keep binders brief and well-organized enough to be readable, and the desire to have on hand all the necessary evidence a tenure committee member might need to make an informed decision.
   c. Discussion focused on printouts of student evaluations, which are responsible for a great deal of the bulk of tenure packets. Since pre-tenure reviews and departmental annual review would summarize the first years of evaluations, a previous committee had formerly recommended that the most recent 2 years (four full semesters) be included. Debate was entered on the results of selecting the most recent years. Harrelson-Stephens recommended at least the most recent four semesters.
   d. Discussion moved to the problems of using student evaluations in tenure decisions, Dahmus pointing out the relatively small sample size.
   e. Other evidence for teaching excellence was discussed: observations, administrative evaluations, third-year review documents, the teaching narrative. Finally, rejoined argument about how many copies of syllabi to be presented when courses are taught often.
5) Taafe moved, Dahmus seconded, that the tenure dossier be required to include at least four full semesters of teaching evaluations at SFA. Carried unanimously with 11 votes.
6) Dahmus moved, Taafe seconded, that the tenure dossier only include the most recent syllabus from a course, excepting special topics courses and others with variable subjects. Passes unanimously with 11 votes.
7) Discussion rejoined about teaching evaluation percentages and dossier contents. Taafe asked about grade distribution. FARs include grade distribution A-F by course, and annual reviews now summarize. Marsden asked about whether raw statistics would be available electronically to
individual instructors in one place, to use to make their own charts. Harrelson-Stephens notes that they must generally be entered by hand.

8) Dahmus moved, seconded by McDermott, that dossiers should include conference papers or equivalent evidence along with the page of the conference program. Passed unanimously with 11 votes.

9) Discussion continued about tenure dossier contents.
   a. Discussed where research reports written for grants, federal government documents, book reviews, professional memberships, workbooks, study-abroad teaching, field service, committee work, and self-published work would fit in the dossier categories.

10) McDermott moved, Spradley seconded to adjourn: 4:13pm. Passed unanimously with 11 votes.