

**Florida Tech Faculty Senate**  
February 7, 2017

**Minutes**

**Senators Present:** W. Arrasmith (DES), M. Baarmand (PSS), P. Bernhard (Sch. of Computing), J. Brenner (Chem. Eng./Biomed. Eng.), K. Burke (SAC), P. Converse (CoPLA), A. Cudmore (COB), C. Harvey (CoPLA), A. Huser (Lib), S. Jensen (COB), S. Jones (Lib), U. Jones (Aero), M. Kaya (BME), B. Lail (ECE), T. Marcinkowski (DEIS), R. Menezes (Sch. of Computing), S. Murshid (ECE), A. Nnolim (ESD), J. Patel (COB), L. Perdigao (SAC), C. Polson (Bio), R. Rusovici (MAE), D. Sandall (COB), M. Silaghi (Sch. of Computing), N. Suksawang (CIVIL), R. van Woesik (Bio), R. Wehmschulte (Chem), A. Welters (MTH), B. Wheeler (Aero), K. Winkelmann (Chem), D. Yuran (SAC)

**Other Attendees:** Heather Crawford (Sch. of Computing), Heidi Edwards (SAC), Nasri Nesnas (Chem), Ken Revay (BOT)

**Call to Order**

President Sandall called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m. and asked for a motion to approve the minutes of January's meeting; a motion was made by Sen. Marcinkowski and seconded by Sen. Brenner.

The January Minutes were approved by unanimous vote of voice.

**President's Report**

President Sandall has a meeting scheduled with HR to discuss and clarify contract and appointment distinctions. The originally scheduled meeting was cancelled. He then introduced Mr. Ken Revay, FIT alumnus, and member of the Board of Trustees. Mr. Revay is the son of past FIT provost Andy Revay, and will be succeeding Rob Phebus as the representative from the BOT's Academic Affairs Committee.

Pres. Sandall followed with a report from the Executive Council meeting. Census data from Enrollment will be finalized next week. According the pre-census data, FIT is up 59 undergraduate students, but down 30 graduate students, compared to last year. These numbers may fluctuate before the official census report is released. The Enrollment Office is looking at visa issues, as enrollment has the largest impact on the financial situation. With this comment, Pres. Sandall referenced Dr. McCay's appeal to university administrators for prudence

in spending at the end of the fiscal year. Currently, FIT is projected to end the cycle with a positive balance, assuming there are no unforeseen circumstances.

FIT has an arrangement with Larson Motor Sports, which recruits FIT students at a high rate. There are currently 14 internships with FIT students and those students have ACT scores higher than average students.

There will be a new Chemical Advancement Center, equivalent to Math Advancement Center.

Dr. McCay announced the Pillars of Excellence following the Board of Trustees meeting: Hardware and Software Cybersecurity; Aerospace and Space Systems; Autism Treatment and Research; Human-Centered Design and Manufacturing; and Ocean, Lagoon, Climate Science and Engineering. Those units are tasked to develop 3-year strategic plans and goals.

Sen. Burke asked if there were any plans for a Writing Advancement Center, equivalent to the Math Advancement Center and the planned Chemical Advancement Center. Pres. Sandall responded that no plans were announced for a Writing Advancement Center.

### **Committee Reports**

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

Sen. Rusovici, chair of the **Scholarship Committee**, reported that there will be two scholarships awarded, one from the School of Computing and the second from the College of Science (from a Department other than Biological Sciences).

Sen. Cudmore, chair of the **Wellness Committee**, reported an interest in the complaint handling process. The committee will discuss the intent behind the current policy before making changes, and has invited members of administration to be on the committee. Currently no complaint handling process is spelled out in the faculty handbook, as is done in the student handbook. The process should distinguish when complaints are handled formally or informally and in verbal or written form. Additionally, the process should address how anonymity will be protected when gathering sufficient information for action. This is pertinent to criteria for evaluation and promotion.

Sen. Baarmand, chair of the **Faculty Excellence Committee**, is accepting nominations for candidates up until 5 p.m. on February 22. Candidates need to submit dossiers by the deadline, ideally compiled into a single .PDF file that will be shared on a server for referees. Sen. Baarmand will send a reminder to

faculty next week. Nominations may be submitted by unit heads or senators, but faculty may also send self-nominations.

Sen. Cudmore asked for clarification that there would be no nominations from the Executive Committee. Sen. Baarmand responded in the affirmative: “There will be no conflicts of interest—no one from any of the senate committees should be nominated.”

Sen. Perdigao asked if there were any candidates for the Lifelong Achievement Award yet. Sen. Baarmand replied that there were none, but he would include a reminder in the next announcement.

Sen. Arrasmith, chair of the **Technology, Resources, and Infrastructure Committee**, reported that a link will be added to the Senate webpage that links to the TRI Committee’s Canvas page. This will facilitate asynchronous meetings. The test link, which committee members can access, works so far. There is a new version of the Model Base System Tool Migration; the committee will be working with ACITC on compatibility and implementing the new features. The committee is considering a new Voice-Over Conferencing program called Zoom, which is cheaper and has no seat limits like WebX. The initial tests are positive; it is easy to use and has good image quality. Finally, the committee is pondering IT solutions to address long wait times for emails. The seemingly ever more prevalent requirements for authentication at many external internet sites are being delayed due to the latency in receiving said authentication codes over the FIT e-mail system. Improvements to Banner would also be important for staff productivity, but it may be outside of the charter of the TRI committee to push for this.

Pres. Sandall asked for the status on administrative evaluations. Sen. Brenner, chair of the **Administrative Policies Committee**, reported that the process was ongoing and he will get an update.

## **Old Business**

### *The Multi-Track Faculty Proposal — Further Discussion*

President Sandall reported on a meeting the Executive Committee had with Dr. McCay and Dr. Baloga to discuss the status of the MTFP, as well as the potential for tenure in future. Dr. McCay is supportive of work faculty have done on proposal. His priority is to reward good teaching, specifically a path for promotion, and wants the same opportunity for research faculty. He remains committed to this primary objective, but how it is accomplished is left to faculty.

Pres. Sandall acknowledged that a lot of time has been put into the proposal, and lauded faculty for becoming more active in governance. Criticism of the proposal falls into two main arguments: 1) revising promotion criteria to account for faculty who primarily teach or who primarily conduct research is possible without a multi-track system, 2) a major revision to the current system should not take place without an assured path to a tenure system. 20% of faculty included tenure as a top-5 concern in the faculty survey conducted last year. FIT remains the only institution ranked in the top 200 without a tenure system.

Dr. McCay was open about his personal feelings; he would like to see tenure implemented, but believes it is a long-term action item.

The Executive Committee would like to pursue a revision of the promotion criteria to meet Dr. McCay's primary objective and table the multi-track proposal until long-term plans for a tenure system materialize. The committee believes a resolution from the senate will empower Dr. Baloga to oversee updates to the promotion criteria in each college that articulate promotion paths for teachers and researchers. The committee circulated a draft of a resolution for a first reading and discussion, with the intent to call for a vote in next senate meeting.

Sen. Arrasmith added that the multi-track faculty proposal was designed to accomplish both objectives: a path to promotion for teachers (and researchers) and a preliminary step toward a tenure system. Dr. McCay sees no reason to tie these two objectives together and believes that core criteria for tenure should be examined separately. Revising promotion criteria in the current system is thus possible as a separate measure.

Sen. Marcinkowski reminded everyone that the Multi-Track Faculty Proposal was designed to better define different kinds of faculty positions (e.g., different teaching and research loads) and, if approved, serve as a framework for revising promotion criteria so that they would be more equitable for faculty in these different kinds of positions. If the Multi-Track Faculty Proposal is either withdrawn or not approved, then the Senate should consider carefully how any such changes to existing promotion criteria could be framed and advanced.

Pres. Sandall responded that if the senate approves a resolution, then, as a voice of faculty, it would be the impetus Dr. Baloga needs to approach deans and task them to revise the criteria.

Sen. Marcinkowski responded that the resolution could be addressed to the upper administration; the senate seeks their support to move the proposal forward.

Sen. Baarmand was not certain this was needed. The idea of the resolution partly comes from the upper administration, so the deans are unlikely to resist it. The Faculty Senate will also be able to “endorse” the deans’ revision of the criteria before put into effect.

Sen. Cudmore added that it was a grassroots effort that the administration will facilitate.

Sen. Marcinkowski asked if the vote on the resolution will be open to all faculty, or just senators?

Pres. Sandall responded that senators, by design, represent the voice of faculty in their respective units.

Sen. Perdigao asked if the resolution could include a template with baseline criteria for the colleges to follow.

Pres. Sandall believed that was an item to discuss with Dr. Baloga separately from the resolution.

Heidi Edwards reminded everyone that the traditional aspect of faculty include all three components—teaching, research, and service—regardless of their distribution (track). She also encouraged faculty not to ignore the potential of a tenure system when revising the criteria, given that all three components would be linked to tenured faculty.

Sen. Harvey reported on a survey of the Multi-Track Faculty Proposal conducted by CoPLA. Sen. Converse had compiled data: 26 CoPLA faculty responded, with 13 against, 8 neutral, and 5 for the proposal. 70% would favor the proposal if the “up or over” concession was removed. 60% believe that there should be a clinical designation for faculty in that area. The data also includes a variety of valid concerns for units with unique circumstances.

Sen. Perdigao added that there were different interpretations of the promotion criteria discussed at this meeting that should be clarified in the resolution. She also recommended including criteria that would make a transition to a tenure system easier, for example, a third-year (pre-tenure) review. Sen. Perdigao then asked if rolling renewal contracts could still be pursued, even if the MTFP will be tabled.

Pres. Sandall responded that Dr. McCay’s initial opinion of rolling renewal contracts was negative. Dr. McCay made it clear in the meeting that he is not a fan of rolling renewals, even though it is a popular component of proposal. If a contract is rolling, you have a longer time to deal with underperforming faculty.

However, according to Pres. Sandall, evaluations done properly will prevent that.

Sen. S. Jones pointed out that rolling renewal could appeal to potential hires even though FIT does not have tenure.

Pres. Sandall confirmed that Dr. McCay is aware of the impact rolling renewals and tenure would have on recruiting good faculty.

Sen. Baarmand added that Dr. McCay did not like the idea of grandfathering current associate and full professors into tenured faculty – Dr. McCay favors a tenure committee to review each and all faculty. Sen. Baarmand encouraged faculty to keep this in mind when revising promotion guidelines.

Sen. Cudmore shared that Dr. McCay is interested to see what faculty would come up with, regarding criteria for a grandfathering process. Dr. McCay wants criteria built around merit, not from current rank or time of service.

Sen. Arrasmith suggested that discussions about tenure remain active while promotion criteria are being revised and details for grandfathering are drafted.

Sen. Brenner pointed out that tenure will not happen over night, but Sen. Baarmand suggested faculty keep the topic going so it doesn't take 25+ years.

Pres. Sandall suggested forming a task force to work on a plan.

Sen. Marcinkoski asked if a timeline for revising the promotion criteria came up in the discussions with Dr. McCay and Dr. Baloga.

Pres. Sandall replied that it didn't come up, but the resolution draft gives an Oct. 1 deadline so review can take place in the senate meetings in October, November, and December before promotion considerations in spring.

Sen. Perdigao shared concern with the timetable. Some colleges begin reviewing dossiers in fall, making it difficult to implement the new criteria mid cycle.

Sen. Winkelmann wondered if the resolution would include an option for faculty to move from one set of criteria to another.

Pres. Sandall clarified that criteria will have to be spelled out in each unit.

Sen. Winkelmann asked if a faculty member would be able to choose the criteria by which they are evaluated.

Sen. Arrasmith responded that the decision must be between the unit head and the faculty member.

Pres. Sandall added that those agreements are required per the faculty handbook.

Sen. Winkelmann was concerned that the flexibility of the MTFP was being abandoned with the proposed resolution. Faculty choice was one of the justifications for the MTFP system, since the current method allows deans to dictate how faculty distribute time.

Sen. Murshid suggested that all faculty needs be put into a single resolution in anticipation that only one may be granted.

Sen. Arrasmith disagreed. We should have each need separated so the faculty can pursue the one that has highest chance of passing. The upper administration is already supportive of promoting teachers; Dr. McCay just wants this driven by the faculty. The proposed resolution has a good chance of passing and receiving support from administration. If we mix in tenure, it will postpone the item that has potential for success now.

Sen. Murshid asked what would happen if part of the resolution is rejected?

Sen. Marcinkowski reminded everyone that amendments can be made to any resolution, either to strike a part of it out or add new phrasing to it before a final vote.

Sen. Baarmand did not see a connection between rolling contracts and promotion. We should not include information about contracts with the promotion criteria. Tenure needs a long-term discussion. This resolution is about something that can be done right away. We should stay focused on the criteria. The idea for having multiple titles and tracks is already out, so we are back to the traditional formula we've used in the past. But the promotion criteria resolution should account for the professor who primarily teaches, even though all faculty are evaluated on teaching, research, and service. Dr. McCay acknowledged that faculty should be promoted if excelling in two of these areas and adequate in one.

Sen. Winkelmann saw a potential problem with the resolution. We could have the promotion guidelines separated as directed, but our annual evaluations and contracts do not reflect this. What if you do not get good evaluations and what if contracts are not renewed?

Pres. Sandall assured that language could be added to the resolution that links contracts to the revised promotion criteria.

Sen. Menezes asked if the senate really intended to impose a standard on all of the colleges.

Sen. Perdigao clarified her previous suggestion that just a baseline be included.

In light of the concerns about apparent inequities in promotion criteria expressed by Dr. McCay, the Senate's Executive Committee, and those attending Senate Meetings in January and February, Sen. Marcinkowski recommended a soft recommendation in the resolution to address a differentiation of criteria to ensure equitable treatment regarding roles and responsibilities. The sense of differing faculty tracks is lost without the multi-track system.

Sen. Arrasmith reiterated that the criteria must have all three parts—teaching, research, and service—but still account for different roles and responsibilities among unit faculty.

Sen. Marcinkowski concluded that it would fall to the dean and faculty member to discuss those percentages and units. We want to avoid disparity that perpetuates the concerns we've had.

Sen. van Woesik assured that everyone going up for promotion should have contracts in their dossier. The committee can compare the college's guidelines to the contracts; this could be a requirement of the revised criteria.

Sen. Wheeler argued for having promotion criteria in the contract. This is not always done in all colleges.

Sen. van Woesik shared that some colleges are loose in how the three areas of teaching, research, and service are distributed. It makes it difficult for members of committee to make evaluations.

Sen. Perdigao redirected the discussion to the issue of evaluating and validating good teaching. Measurements across colleges are very loose. Student evaluations are required by most colleges but not peer evaluations of teaching. We need better mechanisms for evaluating teaching if its role will be emphasized in the revised criteria.

Sen. Arrasmith questioned how the mechanism would be included? If the resolution passes, then the administration will have the deans revise the criteria. Faculty are not a part of the process.

Sen. Baarmand, however, did not believe the deans would revise the criteria alone. They will have a committee in their unit to work on this. The senators in



those units should be a part of those committees. Senator insight will be valuable to that committee. Faculty should have an active participation in the revisions.

Pres. Sandall suggested that faculty participation in the revisions be added to the resolution.

Sen. S. Jones shared resources for evaluating teaching. The Science Education Department can provide leadership in developing those mechanisms. Librarians can help faculty find tools as well.

Sen. Arrasmith suggested keeping the resolution succinct, but pairing it with a letter that spells out what faculty would like included with the revision.

Sen. Marcinkowski liked the idea of keeping resolution clear, but thought a letter may be the wrong format to express concerns and offer suggestions consistent with the nature and intent of this resolution.

Sen. Baarmand hesitated on elaborating too much about the mechanics of revision in the resolution. We need to leave this to Dr. Baloga. We should put faculty participation in the resolution, but if we spell out the criteria and metrics it will not be well received. Let the administration figure out the best way to do this. Remember that the revisions will come back to faculty senate for approval. We can raise concerns then.

Sen. Arrasmith warned that if the resolution does not spell out basic requirements, the senate would not receive them.

Sen. Baarmand replied that the administration knows that metrics will be needed. This is their job.

***\*At this point in the meeting, Pres. Sandall distributed the resolution draft for a first reading at the request of Sen. van Woelik.\****

Pres. Sandall pointed out that parliamentary procedures would dictate that the senate have discussion, revisions, and then be eligible for vote at next meeting. Some items have come up in discussion at this meeting that could be amended.

Sen. Marcinkowski reminded everyone that the senate can vote to suspend Robert's Rules and have an open discussion as we revise the document. Once the document is finalized, the rules can be reinstated and the revised document put forward for voting. He summarized 2 modifications discussed so far, the first is substantive regarding concerns about equitable treatment, differential criteria, and contract alignment and the second is procedural concerning faculty involvement in the process of revising the criteria.

Heidi Edwards added the concern that these documents are for use across the university, not just internal to the unit. Consistency needs to be part of the resolution.

Pres. Sandall agreed to meet with Dr. Baloga to discuss this concern.

***\*Pres. Sandall called for a motion to “temporarily” table the Multi-Track Faculty Proposal, so made by Sen. Marcinkowski and seconded by Sen. Baarmand.***

***The motion passed by unanimous vote of voice.***

Pres. Sandall thanked faculty for the productive review and consideration of the MTFP. He is pleased with the active role the senate has taken in university management and the insightful conversations that emerged. The MTFP can be brought back with a motion. Revisions to the resolution will be scheduled as new business during the next meeting. Please send suggestions for wording changes and a revised draft will be distributed a week before the next meeting.

#### **NEW Business:**

Pres. Sandall announced that nominations and motions for elections of new officers are now open. If interested, please let him know. Self-nominations are acceptable. Nominations are also welcome from the floor at next meeting, when all nominees will make a brief statement and the senate will vote.

#### **Adjournment**

President Sandall asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting, so made by Sen. Marcinkowski and seconded by Sen. Arrasmith.

Pres. Sandall adjourned the meeting at 4:46 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin R. Burke, Secretary