

Faculty Senate Meeting

Date/Time: September 5, 2023, 3:30pm

Location: In-person in OLS201 with ZOOM link: <https://fit.zoom.us/j/98187817280>

Minutes

Senator Present: Shawn Scott (Aeronautics), Jordan Poole (Aeronautics), Tolga Turgut(Aeronautics), Charles Bryant(Business), Abram Walton((Business), Steven Rivet (Business), Angel Otero (Business Online), Donald Platt(APSS), Manasvi Lingam(APSS), Csaba Palotai(APSS), Mehmet Kaya(BES), Vipuil Kishore(CCE), Alan Brown(CCE), Nasheen Nur(EECS), Sidhartha Bhattacharyya(EECS), Nakin Suksawang(MCE), Hamidreza Najafi(MCE), Joo Young Park(MSE), Nezamoddin Nezamoddini-Kachouie (MSE), Gary Zarillo (OEMS), Rob Van Woesik (OEMS), Kevin Burke (SAC), Angela Tenga (SAC), Wanfa Zhang (SAC), Joe montelione (SAC), David Wilder(BA), Patrick Converse(PSY), Jessica Wildman(PSY), Marshall Jones(PSY), William Bowman(Library)

Senator Absent: Kenia Nunes (BES), Georgio Anagnostopoulos (EECS), Chiradeep Sen (MCE) Stanley Snelson (MSE), Pallav Ray(OEMS)

Proxies: None

Other attendees: Andressa Sleiman, Anna Muenchrath, David McMahan, Gordon Patterson, Hamid Rassoul, Heidi Hatfield Edwards, Jason Griggs, John Nicklow, Julie Costopoulos, Nancy Garmer, Nasri Nesnas, Nick Daher, Penny Vassar, Raymond Bonhomme, Rian Mehta, Rob Sippel, Roberto Peverat, Rudi Wehmschulte, Thomas Marcinkowski,Tristan Fiedler, Yakov Berchenko-Kogan

Call to order

Senate Pres. Brown called the meeting to order at 3:30pm. He welcomed President John Nicklow.

Guest Speaker: President John Nicklow

The President Nicklow begins by saying that he likes to listen more than to speak and looks for suggestions from the Senate:

I have been a part of a Senate that never actually were productive in getting anything done. And then I've actually been a part of a Senate where fights broke out—little fistfights. So, hopefully, we're in the middle because I don't want any fist fights here. and I think you're all too collegial for that, so I've been here about eight weeks. I've visited many of you on department tours, and if I haven't yet, I'm getting there. I have a bunch more coming. And Marie's done a great job of packing my calendar full of internal visits and external visits today. I was at the

Rotary. And I told them just how excited I am about the quality of our programs, faculty, staff, and students. I knew this place was really a great place to be, but I'm even more excited. At the same time, we are deeply engaged in the visioning and strategic planning process. Did you do your interview yet, Alan? Is there one or should about the strategic? [Senate president Brown responds: Yes, I did] Good. So, we have about a forty-person committee. Each person has been interviewed. We have a faculty and staff survey coming out. We have a student survey coming out. We have an employer survey really a lot of information gathering. I hope you'll fill those out and what it will allow us to do over the coming weeks and months to pull out themes and trends we can build upon. I envision something around our enrollment, the quality of our student body, and student success outcomes. I envision something absolutely about research. I don't know what that looks like. From what I see, I see a lot of opportunities to build partnerships these first few weeks of visiting with the name of the company locally, but everyone I walk into, I find our graduates, and all I can hear is we need more talent. We need more talent. Are you looking in Melbourne? Because we're right here now, we're looking to grow. Certainly, this could be a literal talent pipeline for the Space Coast for marine ecology for aeronautics. Still, I mean, it just excites me to no end. So, that process occurs. If you have feedback for the visioning and strategic plan of process. Please share it with Alan. We have a date on hold for early October, for a workshop should be on your calendar for a whole. We're going to be actually great. Get that group together in person and workshop what we've learned in their feedback.

As real-quick items, the enrollment date is yet to come. I'm excited about what comes out of that. This could be the largest Freshman class. Well, it certainly will be in a long time, but it could be the largest ever; I'm not sure about that yet. We have work to do on some of the other enrollment segments, but we'll see how that turns out. The Provost search is well underway; the ad is out. If you were probably looking, you might have seen it inside HigherEd; there's also a portfolio that's been released. If the Senate wants us, I can get that to you if you want that. It's similar. What the President's search looked like. It has a profile or portfolio for distribution.

Lastly, we've also hired a Chief Data Officer. Jessica Ickes' old position in IR is now the Chief Data Officer. We pulled Amanda Moske from the University of North Dakota as Chief Data Officer in IR, which is very good. Hopefully, she'll be serving in a very willing capacity and a collaborative way to ensure that we are completely transparent and consistent in the data we provide to each unit and constituent internally. I think I'll stop there because I know you have a long agenda, but what questions do you have for me? or what do you want to know? Something I can tell you about? It's the learning. So, no hard ones just yet. I can do more to support the Senate.

Senator Rob Van Woosik asks: How did you referee the fistfight?

President Nicklow responds:

I do not get involved in fights like that and try to avoid them, because, you know, I'm seen as well, just big. So, I just backed up into the corner. I was Provost at the time. I did not participate, and it was interesting. It was a Faculty Senate versus Faculty Union. It was very interesting dynamics. It wasn't against administration. We just all kind of backed up and let it all play. I wouldn't. I would not advise that in any case. Anything else? Thank you. Then I will stick around a little bit and then I will squeeze out.

Senate president Brown brings the next topic up on the agenda, Minutes approval.

The minutes from March 7, 2023 and April 4, 2023 approved and recordings of the special meeting (discussion with Interim president King on April 27, 2023) were acknowledge.

President Report

Senate president Brown begins by saying:

Graduation weekend in May I took office, and there was a fuss. You had a President and Executive Board who didn't know each other, really at all, and we misunderstood each other about as badly as one can. In a nutshell, we worked it out: the substantive issue was that several Executive Board members had philosophical problems with a 23-month Presidency, although in the circumstances the Bylaws call for it. Respecting their views, I agreed to relinquish the second year. (The purpose of the Sense of the Senate proposed in the agenda is to formalize this.)

The search committee for an Interim Provost met a few times, considered eight dossiers, and listed the candidates' pros and cons for Presidents King and Nicklow, who chose Hamid Rassoul.

The Trustee Academic Affairs Committee and the full Board met in late June; Presidents King and Nicklow were both present. A budget of \$196M was approved, of which \$147M will come from tuition and fees. The Academic Affairs Committee met again August 23rd; Brian Ehrlich pronounced himself "excited" about the enrollment numbers. Revenue isn't up as much as enrollment, because the percent of internationals is down: domestic students get more financial aid than internationals do. Mine Subasi reported that first-to-second-year retention is trending back up, from 75% last year to 78%; it had been 80-82% the previous five years.

The Strategic Planning steering committee has met once, virtually, and the last week in August its members were interviewed by the consultants working with the committee. President Nicklow spoke about this process earlier.

During the Presidential finalists' on-campus visits last winter, the question arose if our long-term goal is to be an R1 school in the Carnegie ratings, or the strongest possible R2. The two finalists who'd been Presidents before said we need to discuss this as a campus, and decide which we really want to be. (We're currently R2.) As a first step in this discussion, I prepared the slides attached to the agenda (corrected version circulated later); I ask faculty to discuss the issue in their departments and bring back comments to the October meeting. The idea is to discuss it more between the October and November meetings, and come to a "voice of the faculty" by mid-November.

The Inauguration Planning Committee has met multiple times. The inauguration will be big; it'll be fun; it'll be January 26th; and most of the cost will be covered by sponsors. There will also be an ice-cream social on Founders' Day, September 22nd. All the ice cream is being donated by Cosmic Creamery.

The search for a permanent Provost began with "listening sessions" conducted by the search firm. I attended two of these; Tolga Turgut attended one of the same two. The Search Committee met August 23rd; Rob van Woesik and I are both members. We won't be able to tell the Senate much about this search, because the Committee is under a non-disclosure agreement; the Committee spokesman is its chairman, Hamid Rassoul.

The Library is searching for a new permanent Dean; a candidate visited August 24th, and Jordan Poole and Nakin Suksawang and I met with him. (Per Bill Bowman, there's no immediate plan to interview anyone else.)

I've met with the Interim Provost two or three times, and with him and the President once. The President's main concern at this point is strategic planning and in particular the R1/R2 issue. The Provost has offered several more ideas:

1. We offer terminal degrees in various fields, mostly Ph.D.'s but some other things. **Would it make sense for *publication* to be a degree requirement?** The point of this is that original work has limited value if it's unpublished. The Provost's Office is inclined to require *submission* for publication before the dissertation is defended.
2. **Now that tenure has been successfully installed: if we could revisit the way tenure was implemented, what might we wish to revise or modify?**
3. The Deans have proposed to create an Instructor track, which would offer a promotion pathway for Instructors. **The existing Teaching Track would not be affected.** Per John Harris, new doctorate-holding teaching faculty might be hired on either the instructor track or the teaching track: the former would have zero expectation of scholarship, the latter would "expect" some. [This issue was referred to the Administrative Policies

committee.] The difference between the instructor track and the teaching track is that the instructor track would carry no expectation for independent scholarship, whereas the teaching track will require some. Not necessarily all that much to judge from the promotions we recommended this year, but we will see as things move forward.

4. The Student Affairs office has received complaints about faculty office hours; the Provost requests the Senate prepare “guidance” for faculty on this subject. [This issue was referred to the Academic Policies committee.]

Finally, Mark Archambault is bringing the Faculty Handbook and current practice into agreement with each other, and particularly requests help with the Ombudsman Committee: does this Committee still exist? if so who’s on it? and if not, who has taken over its functions?

Senate Pre. Brown ends his report and calls for Committee Reports.

Committee Reports:

1. Academic Policies Committee: Sen. Vipuil Kishore said that the committee met with the Dean of students Dr. McMahan. Dr. McMahan has prepared a guidance document for verified absence, and based on our discussion. We thought he would wanted to get feedback from the Senate floor on that document. Thus, the committee decided to have the guidance document sent out to all the senators after this meeting and have the senators review the document and provide any feedback the senate has directly to the Dean in 2 weeks, so that The Dean of students would use the feedback to revamp the document and finalize it. Dr. McMahan has sent me a track-changes locked document which I will share with you later today. Dr. McMahan asked for Senators to make any edits that would enrich the document and to send the feedback directly to him. [Senator Kishore asks Dr. McMahan if he would like to add anything to Senator Kishore’s report. Dr. McMahan says that he has nothing else to add.]
2. Administrative Policies Committee:

Sen. Mehmet Kaya says the committee would be working on the instructor track request and then we are planning on meetings. He says that the feedback from the senators today will be essential.
3. Scholarships Committee:
Sen. Nezamoddin Nezamoddini-Kachouie had no report.
4. Technology Resources and Infrastructure (TRI):
Senator Jordan Poole says she has nothing to report but asks for faculty members who want to join the committee.

5. Welfare Committee:

Senator Nakin Suksawang shares a power point presentation on three key points- Faculty Salary Equity Policy, Parental and Medical Leave Policy for 9-month faculty, and Communication.

Senator Suksawang says:

As I researched many of the existing universities (R1 & R2 institutions), I found that there were some sort of salary equity policies, and our committee tried to examine them to see if there were good policies that we could bring to the Senate. Another issue we heard a lot of complaints about is the parenthood medical leave policy, particularly for the nine-month faculty. The last item is a communication issue.

First, in terms of faculty salary equity, we do not have a solution yet, but many models exist. If you know any good model, please feel free to send me an email. I will discuss this with the committee. Questions become: Who is responsible? Who is in charge of this? Home Department or Department Head? What data do we use? How do we determine the equity? Using the internal data just to compare yourself with other peers? Or is it going to be a state payroll? We do have access to all that is already available on the website. We also have survey data from Oklahoma State University, but those contain mainly large public Land-Grant institutions. We can use this as some database to compare or use AAUP data, although it will cost some to obtain the data. What should be the baseline to determine the salary? Is it within the state or universities? These are important questions to ask. And another question is, when should this be reviewed? It's a daunting task. Do we ask the Department Head to do it annually? That might be too much work. In some places, they review every three years. In some other places they may do during the promotion period, perhaps five years or so. The longer the year, the less burden on the university until funding this. What formula do we have to use? Should it be tied to merit? Those are type of things that we must come up with. Lastly, how do we fund this? Are we going to take some percentages off the merit raise? Should it be a separate line item? If it's done every five years, put this line item in there as some sort of percentage to do that. It's often time as we work for a long time, a lot of us feel left out, and I think salary is not everything, but it does help. Obviously, you do not want to see that your salary is so low in comparison to all the new younger faculty come in that at the end of the day you might not care anymore of the place. Any feedback on any of these questions? There could be more, but these are the ones that we come up with. Please send me your feedback or suggestions.

The next item is about Parental Leave, which is more of an issue for nine-month faculty. It could be for twelve-month faculty or ten-month faculty as well. We have a policy covering parental and medical leave at the university that covers through the FMLA. Family Medical Leave Act is a federal law. Thus, every university and

company with more than 50 people needs to comply with this policy, which is great. There's nothing wrong with that. It just guarantees that you can take a leave for 12 weeks. The university cannot just fire you for any reason during those 12 weeks. That's it. It doesn't guarantee any money or any salary. You can still get paid through short-term disability or use accrued sick time. Or you can use vacation time, but that does not apply to us as nine-month faculty. The short-term disability is calculated using the salary in the contract based on a 9-month salary; thus, they are only compensated at a rate of 50% instead of 66.67%. For 9-month faculty, you are on summer vacation but are not paid during the summer. Another issue is, even though we can use the sick leave if you are a brand new [faculty member] here, you get nine days, which is probably close to 2 weeks off of pay for one year of employment. That's a disadvantage for younger faculty, but they will most likely start a family. Those are the ones who are affected by this policy.

All Florida Public universities and Embry-Riddle university give paid parental and medical leave that is more competitive than ours. They do get eight weeks of paid parental and medical leave. If you have one year, most likely you are going to get two weeks of pay and the remaining with the short-term disability, which covers six weeks of 50%; not the best deal situation as this asks the 9-month faculty to come back mid-semester to teach the remainder of the class would be a disruption to the students.

If you look at this publication [the slide: Data-Paid Parental Leave Across North America], even in public institutions, 6.6 is still more than what we have here. Unless we count the short-term disability pay and all others, we can take sick leave, probably two weeks. It's different from what we have at the national standard. A proposed parental and medical leave policy for 9-month faculty is to give 9-month faculty eight weeks of paid parental and medical leave and allow up to one semester off. Of course, all these have to be negotiated and discussed with your administration and talk and with your Department Head. You can still use the FMLA to cover the rest and all those based on the agreement. Our president is here with us; he may say that this will cost us too much money. We can come up with other options, but I think this will be the best scenario. We do have hiring issues at the university and lack some female faculty. When they look at our policy, it's not easy. If you go to Embry-Riddle university, the first thing you see is eight weeks of time off, it's clear. In fact, you have to dig down a little bit to look into FMLA and call HR [Karen Hill] or you get training if you are managing somebody. That is one proposal. Please let me know if you have any comments or suggestions. [a clarifying question from Yakov Berchenko-Kogan: if the short-term disability policy is limited to the person who was affected by an event, but FMLA can cover family members, and you can take 12 weeks unpaid leave?] Yes, the short-term disability is to the persons affected by the event. It's probably going to be done for the mother because you're the father. You're not disabled. As I talked to Karen, she says she is willing to come to explain more about this

policy because many faculty do not fully understand this. By the way, you have to be here for at least one year. If you've been here for one year, that's fair to the university. That is the policy. But, you can still take unpaid 12 weeks off right now. Anything else?

Interim Provost, Hamid Rassoul, commented on an analysis of Faculty Salary:

Such analysis was done in June 2023, and I have those slides which I will share with the president. The analysis is not complete but it gives you a very good picture where we are in terms of *faculty age* and *years of service* across the university and colleges. Most importantly, toward the end, it would be a comparison with our competitors in Florida, institutions like Embry-Riddle, Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, Florida Atlantic University, University of Central Florida, and University of Florida. In addition to that, the comparison was done also with a list of National Peer Institutions from Arizona State University, Brown University, all the way to Virginia tech, and so on and so forth. The analysis is there and need more refining. For example, when was comparing the salary of genders, there is a combination of the assistant professors and the associate professors, and the full professor of one gender compared to the other one without consideration of the most of the female professor at this age there are in assistant professor level and associate, and then for the male, many of the faculty who've been here longer, and there are full professors, so It's not comparing apple and orange properly. It's a very good study, which can be used as a base. He found a couple of statistical mistakes on that one which needs to be addressed. But this study was done, and said he would be more than happy to share that with the President. And so that senators can work on that one and then make sure that all the information is correct, getting help from some of the statisticians to look at the numbers as well. The bottom line, the message, based on this study, is that our salary is not that compare to our peer institutions. Whatever it worth, you could take a look at it, and then come up with your own conclusion. So, who are involved in this? These are peer salary comparisons. How does Florida Tech compare to the other Florida Institutions? And these are national STEM peers, based on data submitted by institutions to CUPA. For 2020, 2022, and 2023 academic year based on the salary amount as of November 1, 2022. The faculty member consists of non-tenure, tenure track and the tenured faculty and so that study is available for your further examination and review. That's end of my comment.

Senator Suksawang thanks interim provost Rassoul's comments and continues his presentation on the last key point, Communication:

There was some concern about the inconsistency of the communication. I don't think it's an item for a welfare committee, but it does have an impact on our Welfare in many aspects. We have a lot of people leaving the University, and

sometimes faculty are not in the loop. And sometimes, when we'd have to contact, for example, I want to get the person you might be dealing with the registrar. You keep emailing that person and trying to help students, but then we found that person had left already. We are looking for a solution to that. Maybe the Department Heads or the Head of the group should email all other faculty involved so that we can at least address some of those concerns. Those are the types of items that we discuss. I think it's a good time to talk about Welfare. It's a new administration. That would help, as some of these issues are from the past five years. That's it and concludes my report.

Old Business

Senate Pre. Brown thanks Jason Griggs and staffs for setting up in the room and mentions the first agenda item in Old Business is the election of an Excellence Award. He then asked if Senator Tolga Turgut wanted to make a motion at that point.

Senator Tolga Turgut said no but asked if he could say a few things about Pre. Brown's earlier comment on in-part recognition. Senator Turgut says:

I appreciate that. Thank you on behalf of the executive committee as well. It should be clarified to everyone that the executive committee and I, the most immediate past president of the Faculty Senate, were trying to do our job during the unprecedented situation. That's what it was, and because someone became president who was on a terminal contract. Therefore, we must have mechanisms in place so that any similar situation does not happen again within our faculty senate because this Senate belongs to all of us, and we must protect it. That's all I was trying to do, and other executive committee members were trying to do as defined in our constitution and bylaws because the executive committee is tasked with coordinating the business to come before the Senate. Thus, we were just trying to reach out and have a meeting with the president-elect and then later our president of the Senate, Alan Brown. That's all it was. And we must learn from it. We cannot say it happened in the past. Let's just discard it. We must make sure it does not happen again. Thank you.

Senate Pres. Brown thanked Sen. Turgut and moved up to the next item, the election of an Excellence Awards Chair. The nominee is Senator Jessica Wildman. Are there further nominations? Hearing none. Would Senator Wildman make a campaign speech?

Senator Jessica Wildman speaks:

I'm a professor and the Program Chair of the Industrial Organizational Psychology under School of Psychology. I don't have much to say other than I am a colleague, Julie Costopoulos, and the committee needs a replacement, and I am eligible and willing. So, if you would like me to do that. I am happy to do so.

Senate Pre. Brown asked if there are any questions for the nominee and says:

Hearing none. Is there a motion to acclaim Senator Wildman as the Chair of the Excellence Awards Committee? Senator Marshall Jones makes the motion. Is there a second? Is there discussion of the motion? I'm not sure why. All in favor? Please say, aye. Anybody Oppose, please say nay. Senator Charles Bryant says Aye.

[Pre. Brown tried to find a way to proceed the voting while there was a suggestion to launch a poll.]

Senator Turgut suggested: That would be hard for everybody online, because they're not all senators. May I suggest? If they have anything to say, yes or no, they can just put it on the chat if they're senators, because not all of them are senators. So, we have to protect the voting integrity.

Senator Mehmet says Yes.

Senate Pre. Brown says, seeing no chat, I guess we do not have any objections. He congratulated to **Senator Wildman on getting elected as the chair of Excellence Awards Committee.**

Senate Pre. Brown says:

We have a proposed sense of the Senate which I wrote, and the idea is to formalize the idea that I will step down at the end of the April 2024 meeting. The reason I'm putting it in here is the next thing we have to do is open nominations for Present-Elect. and in fairness to potential candidates, we probably ought to tell them what we're asking them to run for.

Proposed Sense of the Senate (Pre. Brown):

“The Sense of the Senate is as follows:

- (1) The term of the current Senate President should expire at the end of the April 2024 meeting;***
- (2) This should be treated as the expiry of a normal one-year term;***
- (3) The Senate should elect Presidents-Elect accordingly, viz., October 2023 and April 2024, to assume the Senate Presidency in April 2024 and April 2025 respectively.”***

Senate Pre. Brown says:

I guess I'm moving that. Do we have a second? [Senator Nakin Suksawang seconded]. Is there discussion beyond what we already did? Okay then, it's time to vote. Now, how do we this? We'll call for a vote and raised hands and we'll turn around and count.

What we're going to do is call for votes. We'll might as well use raised hands here, too. We'll have those on line will be asked to use the zoom raised hand feature. If

you are on your camera [for zoom participants], use your own hand, but senators only please.

Those in favor so indicate.

Senator Charles Bryant asks; could you please state clearly what we're in favor of, or you're being asked to vote on this?

Senate Pres. Brown responds:

We were being asked to vote on the proposed sense of the Senate stated in the agenda. Reading as follows, the sense of the Senate is as follows, (1) The term of the current Senate President should expire at the end of the April 2024, meeting; (2) This should be treated as the expiry of a normal one-year term; and (3) The Senate should elect Presidents elect accordingly, viz. October 2023, and April 2024, to assume the Senate Presidency in April 2024, and April 2025 respectively. I probably should have mentioned that what this would do is put the Senate on cycle so that the next elections can be held in a normal setting and duration of terms and stuff. The other way I could step down in April 24 I could resign, but that would kick off a cycle of special elections. And if you think about the bylaws, you could never get out of it if somebody took a long presidency sometime, which would be the same objection. Are we ready to vote, or are there further questions?

Senator Kishore asks, are we saying that we are asking for nominations for next year? And there will be a vote in the October meeting?

Pres. Brown affirms by saying, that's next and asks. So, indicate senators. Only please.

Senator Walton reminded Pres. Brown that he votes on his colleagues' behalf since they gave him their proxies. Pres. Brown confirmed that Senator Walton's vote is triple as a result.

Voting result:

In favor: 23 (14 from the Senate floor (in-person attendance) and 9 from zoom participants)

Oppose: 5

The motion (for the *Proposed Sense of the Senate* stated above) passed.

Senator Turgut says to Pre. Brown that Senators cannot be proxy for other Senators because Senators may be part of the quorum too. we must be careful about that. It's okay now because there's quorum, but if senators are absent, they should give proxy to someone who's not a Senator because we must have a quorum for the meeting to be official as well. Thank you.

Pres. Brown responds:

yes and mentioned that nominations are now open for President elect to be elected next month. Nominations will remain open through the September 26 when the Executive Committee meeting takes place. Nominees are asked to submit a brief vision statement to the Senate Secretary before September 26. I'll add, about those vision statements. I was taken by surprise last year because we didn't used to do that. but I liked the exercise of writing it crystallized my thinking.

New Business

President Brown brings up the following new business items.

The first item is the proposal for an instructor track:

I discussed it with Dr. Harris today, and he wanted to make two points about it. (1) The proposed instructor track would open a promotion pathway to people who don't currently have one. Specifically, those instructors who don't have terminal degrees. (2) It is in Boldface at the bottom of the proposal. This proposal has absolutely no impact on the existing teaching track faculty. It solely applies to the existing instructor track. What is the difference between the instructor track and the teaching track? The instructor track would have zero expectations for independent scholarship, whereas the teaching track would have some, although it is probably not very much. They'll vary from college to college. Administrative Policy Committee and Academic Policy Committee are going to talk about this in a month.

People who wish to express themselves should communicate with one of those committee chairs and join the committee if possible.

Senator Mehmet Kaya says: I do not have a member from the College of Business nor anyone from the COPLA. Feedback from those colleges would be appreciated. Since I am from COES and am not familiar with those two colleges.

Senator Kishore says, the same applies to the Academic Policies Committee as well. We have 3 members, and all three members belong to the COES but we don't have anyone representing the other colleges. So, if you are available and interested, please reach out to me.

Mehmet Kaya added to his previous comment by saying we have one from COA and one from Library. But none from the rest of the colleges.

Senator Charles Bryan asks, what is that committee?

Senator Kaya answers, Administrative Policies Committee is the name of the committee that I'm chairing.

Senator Turgut added to Senator Kaya's comment: this kind of change is under the purview of the administrative policies under our standing committees. By the way, academic policies will support you as needed. That's how it was discussed as well

because if you look at the scope of the administrative policies. This is exactly related to administrative policies.

Senator Kaya added to Senator Turgut: That makes sense, but I can still work with people and get any logistic help from any of the committees if you would like to express your opinions and provide feedback.

Senate Pre. Brown says Senator Costopoulos asks if the committee membership does not require being a Senator, and he affirms that that's correct.

Senator Kaya added to the comment for the chair position, you need to be a Senator, but to be a member you don't have to be a Senator.

Senator Turgut added his comment one member of each standing committee must be a senator. The chair must be a Senator and one member only. The rest can be faculty members from any college.

Senate Pre. Brown says, as this point was brought up about representation from different colleges, It's important to get committee members from all the different colleges because promotion practices differ between colleges.

Senator Costopoulos asks a question about the instructor track: I know when we created tenure. The concern among many Faculty was that tenure would be created and Faculty would be encouraged to leave and be replaced with instructors. Is that a concern with the creation of this instructor track? Is there a concern that it would enable less hiring of tenured Faculty? And why or why not?

Pres. Brown responds: Dean Harris said No such thing. I didn't ask him that exact point, but he didn't. He expressed no such intent. Further discussion on that issue? [no further comments from the floor]. Then, it's in the hands of the committees.

Pre. Brown brought up the next item, a request from the provost, a request for guidance on office hours. He asks if this item is considered an academic policy or an administrative policy.

Senator Turgut responds, I think it's academic because it's related directly to the students.

Senate Pre. Brown says, the Academic Policies Committee got out of the previous issue. I think they're on the hook for this one.

Senator Kishore responded that the committee would discuss and asked to reach out to him if anyone was interested in joining the committee from other colleges.

Pres. Brown brought up the other issue which was a request from Mark Archambault for guidance on the Ombudsman Committee: Does anybody know the current status of that? I did not get time to look it up. I remember it existing a long time ago in John Windsor being the chairman, but that was a long time ago. I'm kicking back and forth mentally between communicating to Mark Archambault at the risk of spending an extra month on the issue or figuring out what committee it belongs to.

Senator Turgut says, Ombuds Committee, as far as I know, is under the purview of and appointed by the Provost himself. That's how it is for the policy. Senate is not a party in this. Currently, I think, the Ombuds Committee members are no longer within the university. That's why it's vacant. Dr. Rassoul has the right to appoint, I think, 3 members to that Ombuds Committee and it's by the Provost. Pre. Brown said he would report to them.

Discussion

Senate Pre. Brown begins by sharing his power point slide on R1/R2 before the discussion.

Senator Suksawang commented that before we go, just quickly, I would like to get some feedback on the Parental Leave and Medical Leave. What do you think about the proposed idea? Because I think we're almost ready to write something for next voting, and I wanted to make sure that it's correct or not.

Senator Rob Van Woesik says: you mentioned one option. You've only got one option, but we've extra two options. We've got the option we have now, which is zero right? And your proposed option, which is option 2. So then that would be better to put it that way to us, so we can vote on option 2. Because I'd prefer that than option one, which is zero.

Senator Suksawang says: perfect. Okay, that's one way. Any other feedback?

Senator Jordan Poole says: I was just thinking as a female younger faculty member. I do know that was something that was competitive at looking at when working. At my department of COA. We have quite a few female Faculty. I would be happy to discuss with them some of their thoughts on this and email you.

Senator William Bowman says: as the library is composed almost entirely of 12-month faculty. We'd probably want to take some time to look at and compare the policies there to see if there's anything we would need to incorporate on our end.

Senator Suksawang responds: we could probably look at putting 12 months on the list as well. But the main focus at that point was just to look at nine months because we had a disadvantage compared to even the existing 12-month is really bad already. In the beginning, it was parental leave. But I think it should be extended to medical leave, which would probably impact everybody because everybody has different needs. Please send me an email if you have any feedback or anything strongly; data support of that

would be great because that could be added in as a backup—just one more voice for something other than nothing.

Senate Pre. Brown asks again: Is there further discussion of the family medical leave issue? [no other comments from the floor]. You want a quick discussion of the slides, anyway, I don't know that we have time to talk about them very much, but I can talk about what's on them.

Senator Rob Van Woesik asks: Can I just ask you a question because I went through your slides in detail. It brings back the point of this instructor issue. It's related to this matter. Are all those numbers based on all faculty? Are the instructors not included in these numbers? Moving forward, the issue becomes whether there is a way that teaching faculty will be absorbed into the instructor faculty, which is something I want to avoid for this institution.

Pre. Brown responds, in the per capita figures, the faculty who count are assistant, associate, and full professors. So that's a very real concern.

Senator Turgut says:

Can I add a little bit more to the discussion? because we did discuss this in the Executive Committee as well. I did make some points because we have to look at the bigger picture here. I'm looking at the instructor track and also looking at that pivoting to moving from R2 to R1. That's a major pivot for our institution, by the way. and I looked at the memo sent from the Deans to Dr. Rassoul, the interim Provost, and talked about the one about the instructor track. Yes, it wasn't directly addressed at the Senate, but it was between the Deans and the Provost, and per shared governance. You know it hasn't been officially come in writing here yet. But it's good that we are doing this exercise, and I like to look at the numbers. I looked at the benchmark institutions here like UF, USC, Texas A& M, University of Houston. Well, the common theme is that they're all public universities except one USC. Is the private one there, and I looked at their budget and endowments as well. You're looking at 1 billion within a range of 1 billion to 18 billion dollars. And the student numbers are 50,000 plus.

And the faculty numbers are 4000 or 5,000 Faculty plus. I also looked at this PowerPoint presentation. Thank you for that, Dr. Brown. It's a good, maybe partial review. We need more data to understand the institutions in R1. I took a look at them, too. 60% of them are public universities. About 30 to 35 is private and the lowest, with the endowment, is the Colorado School of Mines, which is a 150-year-old, very niche university, by the way, very well known, highly reputable, and they have only undergraduate and graduate degrees in engineering, science, and math with a focus on energy and environment. That's their niche. So, other than those in the R 1 universities, none are close to our budget or endowment.

And if you look at our endowments, you know, it shows as circa around 85 million dollars, and our budget is 188 million. And are grants around different numbers.

But circa 15 million dollars, to put it in perspective. I also mentioned this in my farewell speech last year as the outgoing Senate President. Yes. R1 is a good goal to have, maybe in 30 years, for this institution.

We recently went through a lot of changes as an institution. By the way, since 2018, we've had two colleges merge, which was followed by the tenure system. We haven't been able to measure the success or unsuccess in those fronts as well. So now this is a major pivot. So this is the same again, I'm telling everyone. Please look at this, I see a big picture, because in these kinds of big institutions there are too many tracks like that. and we only have over 300 faculty, by the way, and this instructor track? Similar propositions were made for those who remember a few years back as well. And there is for example, our College, COA, has a pathway from instructor to assistant professor in the teaching track now, but I remember the discussions. The original name was supposed to be non-tenure track for that track, because when you name it, teaching, it limits what those faculty are doing. And let's remember that many of those faculty were also in part promised to be grandfathered as well. So, this new track may collapse into the current non-tenure teaching focus track we have. It's not as simple. Just introducing a track for our size. Thank you.

Senator Gary Zarillo comments:

May I put another metric on top of this? So in FY 22, when you look at the FIT audit, there are a lot of numbers in there. I think everyone on this in the Senate should have a look at that. The new one is coming out in October, because it gives you a good status of the financial health. It's a really good way to understand what the financial state of FIT. The tax return is also available. It's more difficult to understand. But the audit is basically a balance sheet. So just looking at research alone, expenditures to support the research office are on the order of 14.5 million dollars, whereas the actual group contracts and grants for that year are about 18 million, they're very close. As you know, our research really barely supports the research office. If you're going to go to an R1 university, you want to see an order of magnitude difference between what it costs and what you're bringing in, we have no research foundation. All of our indirect costs are swept into the general fund, more or less so, if this is a long-term thing, I think it's going to take an academic generation or two before we can even consider to do something like that. Most of our most of our income is from student tuition. So, you know our main focus here. Whether you like it or not, whether you like a reality. Check or not is education, quality, education. Research is secondary. It's almost a byproduct.

Pre. Brown began his presentation:

These classifications [from the slide] are administered by an outfit called the American Council on Education. There in Washington, DC. Doctoral universities are considered to be those that award at least 20 research and scholarship Doctoral degrees and have 5 million in research expenditures. There are 2 classifications, R1 and R2; we are currently, as you see, R2. We gave 63 doctorates and 17 million and had 17 million in reported expenditures for not sure which year, whether it was the year of 2021 or 22. [Senator Zarillo comments: That looks like 21, 22 was about 18 million dollars].

Pre. Brown continues his presentation:

There are ten metrics. Seven of them are size, related science and engineering research expenditures, non-science and engineering research expenditures. Science and engineering research staff holding doctorates that include postdocs, but it's not limited to them. Doctorates awarded in Social Sciences, Humanities, STEM, and others, and there are 3 per cap measures.

One is science and engineering R&D, one is Non-Science and Engineering R&D, and the other is the research staff line. The raw numbers are not used directly in the doctorate; the raw bucks and raw numbers of degrees are not used directly. Instead, they're ranked. So, to improve your standing, you have to pass somebody. Each score is multiplied by a coefficient; grossly speaking, STEM fields count more than other fields. I'm skipping a lot of math. I can't do the math. My colleague can do the math. This gives two indices. One is an aggregated research activity, and the other is a per-faculty activity.

In this scatter plot, the vertical axis is per capita activity. The horizontal axis is aggregated activity. Inside the arc, the green dots are R2, and Outside the arc, those are supposed to be dark blue dots, which indicates R1.

The knot of blue dots right above the arc at the left. Those are a bunch of small tech schools. There's us. I was interested to hear the mention of the Colorado School Mines because they have right about our size faculty, and they've just made R 1. There they are. The spot all the way at the top, with the highest per cap of everybody. It's Caltech. No surprise.

Here are some numbers: Colorado School of Mines had roughly five times our science and engineering research numbers and four times our non-science and engineering research numbers.

The other raw numbers are not really that different per cap. But five times since their faculty is the same size. The last 2 columns are the medians of the R 1 and R 2 groups. We are below the median of the R 2 group, which is not way below the median but below the median of the R 2 group.

The median of the R1 group, 273,789,000, is a quarter billion. Why I bring up the median of the R 1 group is that there are about 300 doctoral schools. Total split half and half between R1 and R2. So, the middle of the R 1 group is about number 75 or so. Yes, a couple of academic generations.

There are a lot of relatively low-hanging fruit things that we could do fairly to make it easier for everybody to do research and more productive, like putting in a Grant writing office for staffs to maintain instruments instead of faculty doing it part-time without specialized training.

Senator Gary Zarillo comments:

Can I make a comment on that? So you're talking about additional expenditures. Some people in this room know that all of the gift accounts have been swept across the fiscal year's turnover. So, my analogy is: I'm a 12-year-old kid. I got \$20 from my uncle. 15 min later, my mom confiscates it because she's a single mom. She has no choice. So, the CFO has no choice but to sweep those accounts to keep us afloat. So you're talking about additional expenditures. Where is that funding going to come from? Reallocation from this cost center to that cost center? One of the things we really need is 500 million to a billion dollars in our endowment. That would give us a cushion. Until we get to yes, we can do some low-hanging fruit. But you know, it's going to take a lot of time.

Hamid Rassoul comments:

Let me just make a quick comment here regarding endowment and gifts the reallocations, that is under review. There was a move to another account, and then it's going to be fixed. I'm giving you my word. That was something that was done from one account to another account, and it will be fixed, I promise you.

So I think we need to ask ourselves what makes a university great. Why does the university invest in research, and they want to move to that one? The success of a great university is the graduates. This will be accomplished by quality of education. Here I use education in the most inclusive sense: research, teaching, student training, and advising. The three most factors to provide quality education: our faculty, students, and the curriculum across the university, and I believe this should be in order of importance, faculty, students and curricula. We need this investment, and we'll continue doing that one in attracting high-caliber faculty, and consequently, because of those faculty high-caliber students, the quality of faculty and the students will automatically improve the quality of instruction that we have. From time to time, we need to ask ourselves what is, and why we are doing research. Because if you're just looking at the dollar sign invested in the research. and then consider that as expenses, we are looking at the wrong metrics. Research is the engine that drives academic success. Outstanding research defines a great university, and we want to be a great university and we are a great university. Research brings name recognition and more qualified

students and top-caliber faculty. That's why the others want to associate with Florida Tech. Without investment in the research, we will be a very fancy high school or a community college. Research enables faculty to be outstanding Tier-one educators. We are a Tier-one institute and generate outstanding graduates and it brings peer recognition to our scholarship and large, competitive, external funds. The external funds that our researchers currently bring to Florida Tech is not bad for the investment that we are putting into them. We are supporting a researcher with the DGRATS, and they will multiply that one by a factor of 5 and 6 to bring the fundings.

Do we want to have three times that one, the minimum of 45 million? Of course, but that takes time. So, this is a long discussion, and I'll be more than happy to talk about our strengths and weaknesses. And the opportunity that we have on another occasion. But we need to look at the research as an investment. And that's the goal of moving toward R1. That's where we want to be.

Senator Gary Zarillo comments:

I agree with everything that Dr. Rassoul has said. We are a great university. We provide a great education. We do great research state-of-the-art research in some areas. What we have to get out of it, and I've seen this over the 35-plus years I've been here. Continuous boom and bust cycle, boom and bust, boom and bust, usually more bust and boom. We just have to get on a stable financial plan, but every time, we have a budget shortfall. The first thing that gets cut is faculty hires and graduate students every single time, along with some staff. We have to break that cycle somehow. I don't know how to do that, but you know we must be in a financial equilibrium to move forward.

Senator Turgut added his comments to Senator Zarillo's:

We all remember that we went through a budget-free cycle, too, for a few years, just, I think, around 2015, 2016 until 2018, 2019, and then we were about to come out of it. We came briefly, and then the COVID pandemic hit. So we've been through a lot of radical transformations if you will. No one here is objecting to the idea of trying to get more research grants or the importance of research grants. But we must make a reality check where we stand with numbers and our core strengths. Given my experience in the Senate and also outside of Academia, any company or any institution that moves away from their core Revenue generation tools is always doomed to fail because our general strength by numbers is 85 circa 85% classroom tuition. Let's get it stronger from the numbers that Dr. Brown presented. What I see is, we are in the middle of the path for R2. Our target should be being one of the best R2 first, and be stronger in the classroom tuition and teaching, and have more industrial partnerships because that's the avenue and better alumni engagement as well. That will drive the

endowments. We just saw the Colorado School of Mines. Three hundred million dollars, I didn't say, but that's also a public university. By the way, that's not even private. They just barely made it. And looking at the last slide, with 22,000, we are the medium for the R 2 on top of the matrix, and we are only 17,000. So there is room for us to improve to be a great R2 STEM-focused and be a niche university, like Colorado School of Mines strives to do. But it took them 150 years. That's the reality.

Senator Zarillo adds his comment: Great reality check. That's what we're doing. No one likes a reality check. But you have to do it every once in a while. We are a great university, for sure.

Senate Pres. Brown asks for a motion to adjourn.

Senator Zarillo responds, a motion to adjourn.

Pre. Brown responds, Is there second? [A senator seconds, All in favor with No oppose] Meeting adjourned.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05pm.

Respectively submitted,

Joo young Park, Faculty Senate Secretary