

**Faculty Senate Meeting**  
Tuesday, October 1, 2019

**Minutes**

**Senators Present:** M. Baarmand (PSS/2), P. Converse (Psych/2), H. Crawford (CS/2), I. Delgado Perez (COB/2), A. Dutta (COB/2), E. Guisbert (Bio/2), A. Huser (Lib/2), J. Ivey (SAC/1), M. Kaya (BME/2), V. Kishore (CE/2), S. Kozaitis (Lib/2), B. Lail (ECE/2), D. Lelekis (SAC/2), G. Maul (OES/2), R. Mehta (Aero/2), J. Park (DEIS/2), B. Paulillo (Psych/1), P. Ray (OES/2), R. Reichard (OES/2), R. Rusovici (MAE/2), M. Silaghi (CS/2), E. Subasi (ES/2), N. Suksawang (MAE/2), T. Turgut (COA/2), A. Welters (Math/2), K. Winkelmann (Chem/2), D. Yuran (SAC/2)

**Senators Absent:** K. Burke (SAC/1), C. Harvey (SOBA/1), M. Lavooy (Psych/1), D. Platt (ESD), D. Sandall (COB/1), S. Snelson (Math), A. Walton (COB), N. Weatherly (SBA)

**Proxies:** Eric Perlman for A. Nag (PSS/1), Brooke Wheeler for M. Browning (Aero/2)

**Other Attendees:** Mary Barker (Lib), William Bowman (Lib), Nancy Garmer (Lib), Kastro Hamed (COES), Sherry Jensen (COB), Nezameddin Kaehonie (COES), Hamidreza Najafi (MTH), Nasri Nesnas (COES), Suzanne Odom (Lib), Lisa Perdigao (Honors College), Rudi Wehmschulte (Chem)

**Call to Order**

Pres. Lail called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm. The minutes from the Sept. 10 (no. 147) meeting were approved.

**Guest Speaker: President McCay**

Senate Pres. Lail welcomed Pres. McCay to speak about the Interim Provost position which will be filled by Dr. Oyman. Pres. McCay plans to do a search for a new Provost and Executive Vice President who could be capable of taking over as university president at some point in the future. Until then, Dr. Oyman will serve as the Interim Provost but eventually wants to go back to teaching. Pres. McCay stated that the reasons for picking Dr. Oyman were that of all the administrators at this university, he is the most faculty-centric, he has been here for a while so he knows the university well and has the right experience, and he also has a great relationship with the other deans. A job description is being written now for the next Provost and when it's ready it will be advertised. There will be a national search to find the right person, and faculty will be involved in the selection through consultation with the deans and Senate leadership. Out of the eight or so on the search committee, Pres. McCay estimates that 3-4 will be faculty members. He hopes to find someone who can start no later than next fall. Pres. McCay explained that he had

been interviewing three people who were acquaintances (1 woman and 2 men), and one is still available and will probably apply. The Board of Trustees will not be part of the interviews but will have the chance to talk with the candidates.

Pres. McCay reiterated that he heard what the Senate said about the lack of Provost in the sense of the Senate submitted at the end of the spring semester, and that is what led to the interim position. Dr. Oyman took office October 1 and his contract runs to the end of June, but it could be renewed if needed.

Next, Pres. McCay took questions from the floor. Sen. Ivey asked about the stated vision of allowing the deans to have more power. Pres. McCay said he doesn't see that changing a lot because Dr. Oyman has a great relationship with the deans. This position requires someone who is faculty-focused and also gets along well with the deans. Another question was asked about the tenure review of Associate Professors now and what Pres. McCay's role will be. In response, Pres. McCay said that he hopes to be nothing but a rubber stamp because the college-level committees will do a good job. The Board of Trustees is the group that actually grants tenure. He acknowledged that because we are the first university to introduce tenure in at least two decades it has been an awkward transition because it's new to us. He stated that we can improve on the process. The university-level committee should be there to ensure the process is correct and discrimination doesn't exist. Their job is to ensure that the process was followed properly to come to the right decision, not to reevaluate a tenure dossier. The structure is equal among the colleges. The ability to look at the process can be done by the university-level committee. Dr. Nesnas asked about the role of the Interim Provost for the professors who are currently being reviewed, and Pres. McCay said that Dr. Oyman is the Chief Academic Officer now. Senate Pres. Lail thanked Pres. McCay for his time before he left the meeting.

## **Old Business**

### *Committee Reports:*

1. Excellence: Sen. Baarmand had nothing new to report. He announced that he is ready to step down as chair and nominations are now open. There will be a vote at the November meeting. This will give time for the new chair to be prepared before the awards process begins.

2. AFTC: Dr. Nesnas reiterated the need for proxies on this committee. He urged everyone to nominate colleagues from each college. There will be one from each college except COES, which will have two (one from science and one from engineering). Members of the committee do not need to be senators, but they must be a tenured full professor. There have been no other activities right now because the committee was waiting for the Interim Provost to begin his position.

3. Welfare: Sen. Dutta had nothing to report.

4. Administrative Policies: Sen. Rusovici said that the performance evaluation form for administrators is being looked at.

5. Scholarship: Sen. Sandall had nothing to report.

6. Academic Policies: Sen. Kishore had nothing to report.

7. TRI: Sen. Silaghi said that there has been some discussion about campus wifi. Not all classrooms have a strong signal. The university now has Qualtrics. There is still a plan to close the my.fit.edu websites, so if faculty still need those, then they should contact IT for an alternative. The library is working on a guide for faculty who plan to work on developing material for the OER grant. There was some discussion about whether there is only an incentive for those developing new material and not for those maintaining material already developed. Representatives from the library committee suggested that faculty who have been working on these types of materials for years are not a good fit for this grant. There will be limited funds and the aim is to provide support for those wanting to adapt and adopt these types of materials in the future. The draft of the grant is on the Senate website and the library staff is still open to feedback on the grant program. Share your feedback on the online discussion board at <https://vote.fit.edu/senate/>.

8. Task Force for reallocating senators: Sen. Silaghi had nothing new to report.

9. Task Force on the composition of the University Promotions Committee: There was nothing new to report.

#### *President's Report*

Pres. Lail mentioned one action that has been in the works since the summer regarding the faculty handbook. There has been an effort to update it. Sen. Winkelmann has taken the lead in these efforts. Some of the revisions are simple but others require rigorous scrutiny. There will be the opportunity to add policies that are missing. The first step is to identify a procedure for making changes. In the past, changes were made ad hoc. Currently, Pres. Lail is in the process of getting Pres. McCay's approval for procedures for making changes. Procedures should be defined shortly and the Senate will be updated as things move forward. Over the next few years there will be more changes needed so we want to be well positioned to do so and the Senate will play a role in that. Dr. Nesnas pointed out that some pages are really outdated and he has been asked by faculty about the requirement of being in rank for five years before each promotion.

Sen. Winkelmann said that this is a big project and things like tenure are critical and will take priority right now. Dr. Perlman volunteered to be involved with the process and it was agreed that there have been a number of faculty involved in issues like defining tenure and the promotion process, so Sen. Winkelmann will be asking for people with expertise to help with this.

Pres. Lail announced that the Excellence, Administrative Policies, and Academic Policies committees have chairs up for election according to the rotation cycle. Sen. Sandall has also said that he wants to step down as chair for the Scholarship Committee, so there will be a special election for that. Senators are urged to submit nominations before the November meeting so there can be a vote. Chairs must be Senators. Sen. Ersoy Subasi was nominated for the Excellence chair by Pres. Lail. Sen. Kishore asked about the Academic Policies chair because he had replaced the previous chair recently. Sen. Baarmand reminded everyone that current chairs can be renominated for the chair position again, and Pres. Lail nominated Sen. Kishore so that we can proceed in the proper process with the election cycle.

### **New Business**

#### *Vote on resolutions on the University Committee on Faculty Promotion and Tenure (UCFPT) and the University Teaching-track Promotion Committee (UTPC)*

There was a motion made by Dr. Nesnas to table this vote and it was seconded and approved. The floor was opened up for discussion. Dr. Perlman shared comments by email prior to the meeting and explained that because he had been the chair of the university promotion committee last year, he has a unique perspective. Oversight is important, should be taken seriously, and should be considered to be done on behalf of the university and the faculty. As Pres. McCay pointed out, one of the things the university-level committee will be doing is guarding against bias and poor application of the rules (for example, bias against women or minorities). The committee needs to be prepared to fully examine the decisions made by the college-level committees and execute a reversal if needed. Dr. Perlman argued that the faculty of each college need to be represented equally, not just per college because Florida Tech is different than the other universities considered by the task force since it has one college that is much bigger than all of the other colleges combined. That is not the case at other universities. Dr. Perlman believes that it is not possible or workable for a committee with equal representation from each college.

Dr. Nesnas said the AFTC has 2 COES members and 1 member from each of the other colleges and the university committee could mimic that structure in ratio by having 4 COES members and 2 from each of the other colleges. Sen. Winkelmann said that a per capita representation would protect COES because there would be a lot of COES representation on the committee and they could make sure their faculty are being viewed fairly, but the other colleges would be in an even greater minority, putting them in a worse position. There was a suggestion that there be a channel for healthy communication, and Dr. Nesnas said that department heads usually communicate with the college-level committee. Sen. Suksawang argued that it depends on the role of the university-level committee. He explained that a department head or dean might view a faculty member as difficult but this university-level committee needs to be separate from that to fairly evaluate if the faculty member is worthy of promotion/tenure. He argued that equal representation of engineering and science are needed because they are not the same. Sen. Reichard said that the problem is the statement in the resolution about diversity among the faculty because some colleges have diverse faculty that are quite different from each other. He gave the example of COES because of science and engineering faculty. Sen. Turgut said there are two different approaches: at the college level there is an assessment for the decision about

promotion/tenure and the university-level committee is there to ensure objectivity if there was bias at the college level. Overrepresentation can be as bad as underrepresentation in the long run because we don't know what will happen in the future; there could be de-mergers or new mergers. Sen. Turgut suggested that we simplify it so that every college has one representative and COES has two. Dr. Hamed asked if any of the universities looked at by the task force have a combined science and engineering college, and the response was that there were oversized colleges and possibly a merged college, but the point is diversity. Pres. Lail asked why some people think there should be 4 representatives from COES, and Dr. Perlman answered that this is because they are representing the faculty and there are more COES faculty.

Sen. Yuran pointed out that there is diversity in other colleges even if the numbers aren't as big. The university committee is there to make sure that all criteria are fairly examined. Sen. Suksawang argued that there is so much difference between science and engineering, but Sen. Ivey and Sen. Yuran pointed out that psychology and humanities are also very different within CoPLA. Dr. Perlman reiterated that COES is underrepresented and that is important because there are more of them in the faculty as a whole. Dr. Nesnas said that COES is a large oversized college with one shared dean, and we should not be basing the decision about representation on the fact that the colleges are merged because they operate like two independent colleges. There should be the same ratio of representation as the AFTC with 2 members from COES. The university committee is the oversight but also the one that reports to the administration. Candidates may be unfairly treated because of insufficient representation.

Sen. Mehta asked if there is a compromise. The idea of 2-2-2-4 (with 2 representatives from COA, COB, and CoPLA, and 4 from COES) was introduced as a compromise. There was also a suggestion for weighted voting: COES would have 40% of the vote for their candidates and for other college candidates their votes would be doubled so they have more weight (40%). This would allow the college of the candidate to have the dominant vote in that university-level vote. Sen. Ivey said that in theory he likes that idea but the intention for the committee is to make sure the university-level guidelines are being met; the candidates have already been presented as viable candidates for promotion. It was clarified that all tenure dossiers will be put forward, not just the ones with approval from the college-level committee, so everyone will get a decision from the university-level committee.

Sen. Maul shared the following information about the number of faculty members per college:  
COA 17  
COB 32  
CoPLA 65  
COES 167

Sen. Turgut argued that you can't just look at the size of the college faculty because there are different ways at looking at metrics. Sen. Mehta brought up the problem of not having enough full tenured professors to serve on the committees since they can't serve on all three simultaneously. Pres. Lail said that the representatives are just representing their college's guidelines and that's their role, so one set of guidelines should not get more votes. Dr. Perlman argued that the university-level committee is not going to work if they are not representing the

faculty, which is predominantly from COES. Pres. Lail explained that the committee's role is oversight and monitoring the procedure. Dr. Hamed reiterated that each committee is charged with an advisory role: the college-level committee advises the dean and the university-level committee advises the provost, but the decision can be adopted or overturned by that administrator.

Sen. Reichard suggested that there be 1 representative each for COA, CoPLA, and COB and 2 for COES. Dr. Perlman argued that the policy doesn't say the role is oversight, but Pres. Lail reminded everyone that the resolution is our chance to change and define a new model. Sen. Suksawang suggested that the resolution say that the old policy should be taken out and replaced, and Pres. Lail agreed that the new resolution should clarify that the policy will be updated to replace that old policy. Pres. Lail asked if we could get a sense of whether people are in support of a structure with 4 representatives from COES and 2 from each of the other colleges. Sen. Turgut suggested that it be 2 for COES and 1 for each of the other colleges instead. Sen. Ivey said that the ideal situation is for this to be implemented for the transition but given the amount of debate, it might be better to wait to implement this later after the transition. Pres. Lail responded that it's clear that we need to do this properly, so he proposed that we leave the current resolutions tabled. After a show of hands, over half of the senators present agreed that there was a need for a compromise with double the COES representation.

#### *Vote on Evans Library Promotion guidelines and criteria*

A vote was taken by paper ballot amongst the 25 senators present at this point in the meeting. The results were as follows: 21 voted to endorse, 2 voted not to endorse, and 2 abstained. The Library Promotion Guidelines and Criteria are approved.

There was a question about whether or not the promotion of Assistant Professors has been postponed and senators were told to check with their department and/or college.

#### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Debbie Lelekis, Faculty Senate Secretary