**Florida Tech Faculty Senate**

March 13, 2018

**Minutes**

**Senators Present:** W. Arrasmith (DES), M. Baarmand (PSS), J. Brenner (CE), K.

Burke (SAC), H. Crawford (CS), I. Delgado Perez (COB), A. Huser (Lib), M. Jensen (MAE), K. Johnson (OES), U. Jones (Aero), M. Kaya (BME), S. Kozaitis (Lib), D. Lelekis (SAC), D. LeVan (CS), T. Marcinkowski (DEIS), G. Maul (OES), N. Nesnas (Chem), B. Paulillo (Psych), L. Perdigao (SAC), C. Polson (Bio), R. Rusovici (MAE), D. Sandall (COB), N. Suksawang (CCM), G. Tenali (Math), R. van Woesik (Bio), N. Weatherly (SBA), A. Welters (Math), B. Wheeler (Aero), K. Winkelmann (Chem), D. Yuran (SAC)

**Senators Absent:** P. Converse (Psych), O. Doule (HCDIA), C. Harvey (SBA), S. Jensen (COB), B. Lail (ECE), B. Morkos (MAE), S. Murshid (ECE), A. Nag (PSS), A. Nnolim (ESD), M. Silaghi (CS), A. Walton (COB), Z. Zhou (Psych)

**Other Attendees:** Tristan Fiedler (Bio), Kastro Hamed (DEIS), Dwayne McCay (Pres), Rian Mehta (COA), Korhan Oyman (COA), Eric Perlman (PSS), Ken Revay (BOT), Rudi Wehmschulte (Chem)

**Proxies:** R. Mehta (COA) for U. Jones (COA)

**[[*NOTE: All senators are accounted for in the attendance; however, some additional attendees did not sign in and are not listed above unless their attendance was confirmed elsewhere in the minutes.*]]**

**Call to Order**

President Baarmand called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm and asked for a motion to approve the minutes of February 20’s meeting; a motion was made by Senator Arrasmith and seconded by Senator Nesnas.

The February 20 Minutes (no. 133) were approved by vote of voice with 1 abstention.

**Reports**

President Baarmand moved through the reports quickly to ensure time for the elections and discussion of the Faculty Tenure Model. There had been no academic or budget panel meetings since the last report, so attention remains on the topic of tenure.

Sen. Tenali, chair of the **Academic Policies Committee**, shared concern from faculty members about the use of student course evaluations in the promotion and tenure review. The committee is looking for a better way to analyze the numbers. The first step is to review the current forms and then the committee will compare with peer institutions and consider potential changes. Faculty have asked if there can be separate forms for lower and upper level classes, since the students may have a different perspective on the utility of the course. The question about overall course quality may be difficult for students to answer depending on their year at the university. The committee will explore a metric for combining scores from these different forms as well. Nothing has been decided, but the discussion is ongoing and committee will work along with the Teaching Council. Sen. Tenali invited faculty to send him comments and questions regarding the topic.

Pres. Baarmand cited the “overall course value” question on the standard student evaluation form, which is confusing for students who may not separate the value of the instructor from the course content or topic. While not a topic to debate today, he suggested that the Teaching Council ensure questions are clearly distinguishing between the course and the instruction.

There was no **Administrative Policies Committee** report.

Sen. Brenner, chair of the **Scholarship Committee** reported the awardees for the Senate’s scholarships of $1500 a year to first year students. This year’s recipients are Julia Impagliazzo (Forensic Psychology) and Gage Gossett (Mechanical Engineering).

Pres. Baarmand, chair of the **Faculty Excellence Committee**, announced the recipients: Dr. Matthew Ruane (SAC) for the Excellence in Teaching Award, Dr. Robert van Woesik (Bio) for the Excellence in Research Award, and Dr. Radhika Krishnamurthy (Psych) for the Excellence in Service Award. The awardees will receive a plaque at the upcoming honors convocation, and plaque for the Excellence in Research Award will show that it is the newly named Helmstetter Award.

There was no **Welfare Committee** report.

Sen. Arrasmith, chair of the **Technology, Resources, and Infrastructure** **Committee**, reported that the committee is waiting for next Information Technology Executive Council meeting to get a status update of things in Work (migration to new phone system, computer refreshes, migration to the new webpage editing system (Terminal 4), classroom updates, and DocuSign. Model Based Systems Engineering tool upgrades were made and recently used in a short course to industry; the tools are working well. Finally, the TRI Committee looked into a few minor technology issues for various faculty as part of its mission.

There was no **Faculty Handbook Committee** report.

There was no **Tenure Exploration Committee** report, beyond the agenda for Old Business.

**New Business**

Following the reports, the meeting turned to the topic of new business. Pres. Baarmand announced single nominations for each position, Sen. Brian Lail for President and Sen. Debbie Lelekis for Secretary.

Sen. Perdigao, who had nominated Sen. Lail, read a brief statement he sent in his absence—due to his teaching in China in support of an international partnership between FIT and Hubei University of Education—and Sen. Lelekis delivered a verbal statement to the senate from the room.

Pres. Baarmand then opened the floor for any additional nominations. Seeing none, Sen. Marcinkowski moved to close nominations, seconded by Sen. Arrasmith, and Sen. Lelekis exited the room for the vocal vote of affirmation. The senate was unanimous in electing Sen. Lail and Sen. Lelekis to office. Sen. Lail will serve as the President-Elect in the 2018–2019 Academic Year when Sen. Winkelmann will serve as Senate President. Sen. Lelekis will succeed Secretary Burke for the 2018–2019 Academic Year.

**Old Business**

Following elections, the meeting shifted to the topic of old business: the Senate Tenure Model.

Pres. Baarmand opened by thanking members of the Tenure Committee who played a big role in preparing the document: Sens. Marcinkowski, Perdigao, Sandall, Nesnas, Winkelmann, and van Woesik, Dr. Jignya Patel, and the other members of the Senate’s Executive Committee. He then addressed questions he had received about details missing from the document, clarifying that the model for the conference with the administration is not meant to have all the details specific to the colleges. Rather, the document is the basis and set of fundamentals for the university’s tenure system. The committee believes once compared with the administrative model, the merged document will lead to working out the remaining items. He cautioned the faculty to keep in mind that the committee will have to come back to the senate for input regarding these details once the administration and senate have convened. Last, he updated everyone on the timeline, expecting the conference to compare models with the administration will take place the week of March 19. Another extra senate meeting is scheduled for March 27, at which point the outcome of the conference committee will be addressed.

Pres. Baarmand then recommended that the senate read through the document (focusing on the executive summary pages), listen to comments and suggestions, and then have a motion to approve the model as a basis for the discussion with the administration. He then began reading through the executive summary**. *[[Please refer to the first two pages of the Senate Tenure Model.]]***

Sen. Wheeler expressed concerns the College of Aeronautics had with the timeline for the plan.

Pres. McCay found the comment an appropriate one and took the opportunity to share his perspective on the process and model. He indicated that he could not anticipate how close the senate’s model would be to the administration’s model. He highlighted the main reason he found for proposing tenure at FIT, which has functioned well on a contract system: the lack of tenure positions FIT as substandard, it is a hindrance to recruiting and retaining faculty, and it prevents the institution from advancing to the next level. This reason is why he was willing to push for a consideration for tenure.

Pres. McCay then outlined core tenants of the administration’s plan, which he stated was based on tenure models at other schools. Each college will have to have a separate set of criteria because they are not the same. The requirements for faculty in CoPLA for tenure would be different than the requirements for tenure in the COE&S. The purpose of the administration’s plan is to make FIT a great university. If the faculty recommend a tenure model that is no more than an opportunity to provide a retirement home for faculty, it would not fly with the Board of Trustees and he would never propose it. It is clear that we cannot implement tenure in the coming fall semester, but, ultimately, the responsibility of what goes to the BOT falls on the president. It is very important that the tenure system is representative of the great universities of the country, and is not simply what we want personally. If we do not improve the university in implementing tenure, we are wasting our time, as there is a huge amount of work to go into creating and then implementing the system. Pres. McCay was concerned with a few items in the Senate Tenure Model, which would not be tenable to the administration and (he believes) to the BOT. We have to be judicious in what we incorporate into the model and it could take 2 years to complete. He would love to begin in Fall 2018, but this is the most important issue the senate has had to tackle, namely something that will take us from a second-level contract school to a first-level tenure university. Pres. McCay expressed disappointment in some of the differences between the two models. He believed there was opportunity to design an excellent system from scratch. Other institutions have had to tweak tenure systems multiple times over the years, but he would prefer to get it as close to perfect from day one.

Pres. Baarmand inquired about the goal for the fall 2018 semester, if there was not a full system yet, and Pres. McCay replied that the standards need to be in place on day one when the system is implemented.

Pres. Baarmand then recalled that the senate tenure model was based on other tenure systems as well. Sen. van Woesik agreed, indicating that the committee had looked closely at the CalTech model two weeks ago, and then highlighted that there were two models on the table: a model for tenure and a model for transition. The tenure model, he qualified, did follow the best universities.

Pres. McCay agreed, but cautioned that a transition done poorly will cause difficulties down the road.

Sen. Nesnas acknowledged differences in the models, but reminded everyone of the many similarities shared between the models for the tenure system in the future. He did not believe more time would fix the differences in the transition model and urged the senate to quickly identify these critical points.

Pres. Baarmand did not believe anyone was under the delusion that the senate’s model would be the final plan, understanding there would be some elements taken from both models to make both sides happy and to be realistic.

Pres. McCay agreed that it was more the transition (implementation) where he (and others) had concern with the senate model.

Sen. Winkelmann stressed how challenging it was to come up with a transition plan because there were few universities that had gone through it. He asked if the administration had found any other examples, to which Pres. McCay replied no, and then clarified that the transition part of the administration’s plan was not rooted in other institutions but in the administration’s goals.

Pres. McCay qualified the plan as his belief for what was needed to make a great university. He agreed with the systems at other great institutions, all of which included in tenure all three components: teaching, research, and service. He warned that if the implementation phase ignores having to qualify all three, they become subverted.

Sen. Marcinkowski indicated that the working groups were made aware of the administration’s draft and had chosen to take a broader route to address all of these issues of a tenure system and not set the faculty up for future confrontation with the administration over issues of grandfathering. The committee understands the issue of grandfathering will be addressed at the conference, but at the same time the broad model allows the faculty to consider what type of system grandfathering would lead to. In comparing differences between the two models, there are also structural features of a long-term tenure system that are worthy of discussion.

Pres. Baarmand pointed out that there were no good models for a transition to tenure and the committee needed to come up with something and went to the faculty by way of the survey. While one could argue if a survey is the best way, the transition plan in this model is the will of the faculty and includes the supporting numbers. The approach was not self-serving, but it is assumed that the model will change.

Pres. McCay qualified that the model will have to change drastically. While the eventual tenure systems in the two models have great similarity, the transition plans are quite different.

Sen. Sandall found the conversation productive and expressed agreement that the topic of grandfathering will be discussed together with the administration at the conference.

Sen. Matt Jensen, however, struggled with the discussion. He believed disagreements over the use of grandfathering were like trying to split hairs; either the promotion criteria in place are meaningful or we need a completely fresh start. Rather than fight amongst ourselves over the details of grandfathering, adding tenure needs to be an all or nothing type of scenario.

Pres. McCay responded that all of anything, in his mind, was not very good. He did not want to mislead senators over the possibility of automatic grandfathering, and he believed that over a short period of time a significant number of faculty would be approved for tenure. But they had to meet all three areas of teaching, research, and service as is done at most major schools. For faculty who had been at FIT for a period of time, he specified that the body of work had to make significant contributions to all three areas. Otherwise, he recommends keeping a teaching and research track for faculty who are not able, willing, or interested in participating in all three. Many people have already gone through the promotion process and had a long tenure at this institution, and there are instructors who have been here 20 years. He felt strongly that any plan going to the Board of Trustees must show concern for quality.

Sen. Burke pointed out that promotion criteria and annual evaluations for current faculty already expect strong demonstrations in all three areas of teaching, research, and service, and he wondered why Pres. McCay believed a portion of existing faculty were underperforming in one or more of those areas.

Pres. McCay responded that it was an opportunity to tighten the standards. While promotion criteria in some cases may have been sufficient, in other cases they may have been insufficient. He has explained to the Board of Trustees that tenure is not literally a job for life, but that perception is real and careful consideration of quality is necessary.

Sen. Nesnas referred to the similarities at the beginning of the document and recommended that Pres. McCay highlight the deviations so the senate could tackle those topics first.

Pres. McCay summarized that the biggest issue is over grandfathering and how the plan makes the initial determination of who is grandfathered.

Pres. Baarmand stressed that until the senate has the administration’s model, all there is to go by regarding transition to tenure are the surveys. For all anyone knows, faculty may like the administration’s model once it is reviewed. He was eager to proceed to the conference and learn more about the administration’s plan and did not anticipate an us-vs-them mentality. The senate’s leadership understands there is some logic behind the other plan and although feedback is taken from the faculty it will be time to get realistic about some issues. He did not believe the faculty and administration were in completely different spheres.

Sen. Sandall cited Provost Baloga’s indication that the administration’s draft would be ready by now, to which Pres. McCay responded that it was basically finished.

Pres. Baarmand shared that Provost Baloga had approved three representatives of the senate for the conference, the current president (Sen. Baarmand), the president-elect (Sen. Winkelmann), and tenure committee chair (Sen. Sandall).

Pres. McCay was not concerned over the representatives from the senate, suggesting that the next president-elect (Sen. Lail) could participate as well, but he wanted to address the senate today after reading the plan and realizing how far apart the models were on the issue of grandfathering.

Sen. Winkelmann pointed out that the senate leadership is preparing for conference with just a verbal plan from the administration and a model draft yet to be voted on in the senate. He stressed the need for the senate to continue reviewing the document that was prepared so the meeting can move to a vote to approve it for the conference.

With that being said, Pres. McCay offered some concluding remarks. He wanted to give the senate an opportunity to know where the differences in the two models were great and he did not want anyone leaving the room with an expectation that the proposed grandfathering plan would look anything like what he would take to the Board of Trustees.

Following Pres. McCay’s departure, Sen. Matt Jensen brought up the issue of guidelines. He did not understand how faculty could vote on a tenure model without the guidelines from each college, which, he believed, would have the greatest impact on how faculty would decide to vote for a tenure system. What would happen if the faculty vote for a tenure system and then the deans create the guidelines for tenure?

Pres. Baarmand assured that shared governance is emphasized in every aspect of the document. While the administration may not agree with shared governance at each step, it is there in the senate’s model.

Sen. Arrasmith did not think it was possible to sort out all the details of the criteria at this stage and trying to would tank the whole plan. However, he stressed that the document did create the guidelines for how faculty would be involved in creating and evaluating the criteria.

Dean Oyman took the opportunity to emphasize that in the College of Aeronautics there are five professors working on its guidelines; it is not the dean, but the faculty, who are building them, at least in COA. He did not believe the deans in other colleges were handling it any differently, stating it is the responsibility of the dean to take what faculty share to the provost.

Sen. Johnson was doubtful. He pointed out that the administration had made it clear that they have their own plan for implementing tenure and that the buck stops there. There is little motivation to pour time and effort into adopting a senate model. He recommended receiving the administration’s plan and then provide the feedback from the faculty.

Pres. Baarmand saw truth in Sen. Johnson’s point, but then argued that abandoning the senate’s model would negate the entire purpose of this body of faculty governance. The senate was tasked to come up with a plan and the senate will do its best to come up with the plan and to negotiate for it to the best of its ability. To give in and await the administration’s model to discuss would be a failure of the process that started a year ago that the faculty would have to live with that forever. He encouraged the senate to see the process through to the end and do its best to protect the interests of the faculty. Whatever the outcome, we have to try.

Sen. Johnson considered Pres. Baarmand’s response a good one, but cautioned proceeding with eyes open.

Sen. Kozaitis asked if just the line about grandfathering be changed to remove the stark difference, but Sen. Perdigao pointed out that the early draft had recommended grandfathering both full and associate professors. The current model has compromised slightly, but for a truncated process for the associate professors. The biggest issue, she believed, was if criteria were to be developed from the top down. She believed the promotion guidelines in place were already good metrics for tenure, but to give up on grandfathering the full professors would be problematic because they must be the ones to determine the criteria.

Sen. Matt Jensen asked why the tenure committee had made the concession about grandfathering associate professors, to which Pres. Baarmand replied that the tenure committee had discussed in detail and saw merit in being proactive to propose an abbreviated, hence favorable, process in an area where the administration would likely not budge.

Sen. Winkelmann suggested proceeding and Pres. Baarmand continued to read through the executive summary, allowing questions as they came up.

Sen. Kozaitis asked how the AFTC committee could even exist to oversee the implementation until full professors are tenured and Sen. Perdigao emphasized why grandfathering of full processors was necessary for shared governance.

Dr. Eric Perlman highlighted that the concern over top-down governance had motivated the tenure committee’s efforts to build-in faculty representation from the beginning with the AFTC. If we need these committees to implement the tenure transition, there have to be an initial number of faculty who are tenured.

Sen. Rusovici cited some well-known institutions ranked among FIT in the US News report and believed the faculty looked strong in comparison.

With that, Pres. Baarmand referenced Pres. McCay’s intent to manage the number of tenured faculty, stating that on several occasions that the number of tenured faculty should be between 30–50%.

Sen. Sandall quickly pointed out that the range was indeed the national average, but that adjuncts were included in the calculation.

Dr. Rian Mehta was concerned that the approach resembled a quota system, but Pres. Baarmand pointed out that at other institutions tenured faculty lines were held and filled in such a manner.

Sen. Nesnas then proposed an amendment regarding the establishment of criteria. As currently written, each college is responsible for adopting appropriate criteria, but unless faculty roles are specifically defined in this process shared governance is not guaranteed. He recommended stating that each college will have tenured faculty create the criteria for promotion and for tenure.

Sen. Yuran wondered if the criteria for promotion and tenure had to be distinct, but Sen. Perdigao suggested an opportunity to improve upon the criteria, particularly in the area of teaching where few metrics are defined.

Sen. Nesnas concluded the proposed amendment by specifying “from the current contract-based promotion guidelines,” affirming that faculty outside the tenure system would still be able to apply for promotions.

After moving further through document, Sen. Kozaitis asked for clarification regarding the up-or-out policy and Pres. Baarmand confirmed that it was just for new faculty hired into the tenure track system, as is done at other institutions.

Concerning the topic of post-tenure review, Mr. Ken Revay asked if the 7-year period was common and Sen. Sandall replied that it was in the middle, with institutions ranging from 5 years to 10 years. The 7-year mark would be a step beyond the 5-year contract appointment for full professors on the contract system.

Sen. Yuran was worried that the 7-year cycle would be too restrictive to longitudinal research projects in Psychology and other areas, but Sen. Winkelmann reminded everyone that annual reviews would still be conducted and could monitor the progress of long-term research plans.

Dr. Tristan Fiedler suggested cutting down the executive summary by simply stating “faculty who do not meet the standards of the post-tenure review.”

Sen. Kaya wondered why faculty might not choose tenure if the guidelines would be similar to those for promotion, and Sen. Sandall replied that the contract system would not have a post-tenure review.

Sen. van Woesik asked how the 4-year contract system for associate professors would work with the 6-year timeline in the proposed model, wondering if it would make them vulnerable.

Sen. Winkelmann acknowledged that the final statement regarding existing associate professors meant that those faculty could lose their position, which could incentivize some faculty not to go up for tenure. He pressed for a system that would motivate faculty, while not be self-serving, but did not want to create situations where valued faculty members could lose jobs. He considered that a failure of a system.

Pres. Baarmand agreed that if it is a good system there should be no reason valued faculty would not get tenured; however, he wanted to make sure current associate professors would do their best.

Sen. Winkelmann proposed returning the last section on existing associate professors to the original plan, that any who were not granted tenure would be retained on the contract system. He believed protecting current faculty was not in just the faculty’s best interest but also that for FIT. Valued faculty members should not be lost in the transition.

Sen. Brenner highlighted that the amendment was a protection against people changing.

Sen. Matt Jensen referenced the survey results, which indicated that a clear majority wanted existing associate professors grandfathered as well. He recommended returning to the plan to grandfather them instead of wrestling with the issue of making a concession. The negotiations would thus start from what the faculty want.

To aid the discussion, Sen. Perdigao presented some numbers provided by Institutional Research. There are 86 full professors, 95 associate professors, 118 assistant professors, and about 400 adjuncts.

Returning to the topic of criteria, Sen. Suksawang was puzzled why the criteria for tenure would be more stringent than the current criteria for promotion to full professor.

Sen. Nesnas considered this a good point and wondered if there should be different criteria for each rank in both areas of tenure-track and of the current contract system.

Pres. Baarmand responded that there would be differences in promotion and tenure criteria in terms of load for faculty on the contract system and on the tenure system.

Sen. Winkelmann returned again to the last statement for existing associate professors and asked for a vote in support of changing the model so that faculty who are not granted tenure would be allowed to remain on the contract system. **[[*The vote passed by vote of hand, 23 in favor and 3 abstaining.*]]**

Following the vote, the discussion continued regarding existing assistant professors. Sen. Brenner suggested it be made clear that the 6-year timeline would not begin until the college’s tenure criteria are finalized.

Sen. Wheeler suggested an even longer timeline for assistant professors, since associate professors had a larger body of work to present toward the same criteria.

As an alternative, Sen. Burke wondered if declaration of intent to pursue tenure had to be made at the onset of the tenure system or just within the 6-year timeframe.

Sen. Suksawang believed assistant professors should make declarations up front so they are evaluated and supported by the unit heads each year based on the criteria.

Noting the time, Pres. Baarmand quickly summarized the suggestions on the floor: 1) specifying 6 years from the date the college’s criteria are finalized and 2) adjusting the timeline for existing assistant professors in comparison to the existing associate professors.

Sen. Perdigao recommended keeping the 6-year timeline for both to be consistent with those entering tenure systems at other institutions, and Sen. Yuran asked that the document clarify a moment of declaration so that those faculty would receive the same level of resources and support as new faculty hired into the tenure system.

Dr. Fiedler suggested that the description of assistant professors in transition be expanded to account for these issues, but Sen. Winkelmann recommended giving the same safeguard to existing assistant professors as given to existing associate professors, that they remain on the contract system if not granted tenure.

Dean Oyman, however, was concerned that if existing assistant professors make declarations for tenure track and are given the same resources and support as the new assistant professors by the deans, then there would be no punishment for underperforming in the tenure review.

Pres. Baarmand added that the number of faculty in each unit would not be changing dramatically, so if everyone is automatically tenured there would be no additional hiring of new faculty. If we want to bring in new people, some faculty who are not meeting expectations will have to go.

Sen. Winkelmann responded that the point of the tenure transition plan should not be to get rid of faculty.

Sen. Yuran believed that tenure should come with two sides, support and pressure. To apply pressure without support was just as wrong as providing support and not receiving performance in return.

Sen. Johnson asked if the option to choose between tenure track and contract was just for existing faculty, and Sen. Baarmand confirmed that new hires would be applying specifically for one or the other as was approved for the position.

Sen. Nesnas found no evidence that existing assistant professors would receive additional support and anticipated there would be no change.

Pres. Baarmand then made an effort to conclude the discussion so the document could be approved for the conference. He suggested 1) making the change that both assistant and associate professors be retained on contract system if not granted tenure and 2) that the 6-year timeline be specified from the date the college criteria are established. Additionally, he noted that some minimal changes would be made to incorporate text borrowed from the AAUP dealing with termination and dismissal.

Following a brief head count it was noted that a ***quorum was no longer present*** to vote on the proposed model. The remaining senators agreed to circulating the revised model for vote by email, and the meeting adjourned at 5:48 pm.

**[[NOTE: *The model was approved the following week by email vote: 33 in favor, 3 against, 4 abstaining, and 2 senators did not vote.*]]**

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin R. Burke

Faculty Senate Secretary