

Faculty Senate Meeting
March 5, 2024, 3:30 p.m.
In-person in the BOARD OF TRUSTEES' Room with Zoom link:
<https://fit.zoom.us/j/98187817280>

Minutes

Senator Present:

Shawn Scott (Aeronautics), Jordan Poole (Aeronautics), Tolga Turgut(Aeronautics), Abram Walton((Business), Charles Bryant(Business), Steven Rivet (Business), Angel Otero (Business Online), Donald Platt(APSS), Csaba Palotai(APSS), Manasvi Lingam (APSS), Melissa Borgen (BES), Mehmet Kaya (BES), Vipuil Kishore(CCE), Alan Brown(CCE), Nasheen Nur(EECS), Sidhartha Bhattacharyya(EECS), Chiradeep Sen (MCE), Nakin Suksawang(MCE), Hamidreza Najafi(MCE), Joo Young Park(MSE), Nezamoddin Nezamoddi-Kachouie (MSE), Stanley Snelson (MSE), Rob van Woesik (OEMS), Pallav Ray(OEMS), Gary Zarillo (OEMS), Angela Tenga (SAC), Joe Montelione (SAC), David Wilder(BA), Patrick Converse(Psy), Jessica Wildman(Psy), Marshall Jones(Psy), Patrick Converse (Psy), Kevin Burke (SAC), William Bowman(Library)

Senator Absent: Georgio Anagnostopoulos (EECS), Wanfa Zhang (SAC)

Proxies: Michael Splitt (Proxy for Jordan Poole)

Other attendees: Mark Archambault, Hamid Rassoul, Munevver Mine Subasi, Nasri Nesnas, Yakov Berchenko-Kogan, Raymond Bonhomme, Mary Bonhomme, Nancy Garmer, Penny Vassar, Heidi Hatfield Edwards, Julie Costopoulos, Jason Griggs, Anna Muenchrath, Chelsea Carroll, Theodore Richardson, Vicky Knerly, Suzanne Kozaitis, Brian Lail, Kaylee Erdos, Nick Daher, Penny Vassar, Kenia Nunes

Call to Order

Senate Pres. Brown called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm. After a brief discussion, it was noted that some members had not yet had the opportunity to review the minutes thoroughly, as they were received only a few hours prior. It was proposed (by Sen. Turgut) and seconded (by Sen. Wildman) to postpone the approval of the minutes until the next meeting. The motion carried.

Opening of Nominations

Faculty Senate Offices: (*Open call until COB April 1st*)
President-Elect
Secretary

Nominations for Senate offices to be held next month were discussed. Positions to be filled include President-Elect, Secretary, and Welfare Chair. The nominations will be open for discussion and election at the next meeting.

Candidates for President-Elect are requested to provide a short Vision Statement to the current Senate President, by COB April 1st.

Faculty Senate Standing (Welfare) Committee Chair: (Open call until April 2nd)

Senate President Reports

Sen. Pres. Brown began his report by saying,

Since the last Senate meeting, we met with Ryan Petersen on February 20th. He circulated a summary of his proposals [Secretary note: See appendix C]; afterward, I asked for a full listing and was told he and the Provost are working on modifications based on comments from Senators. I asked for an update again on March 4th, but I haven't replied. I met with the Provost on the 12th and the Provost and President on the 13th; they commented on the tenure-modification proposal I'd written [See Appendix B], which I incorporated in the next version.

Nakin and I met with the Provost on the 26th; the main purpose was for Nakin and Hamid to get acquainted. Hamid had just heard he's to be Senior Vice Provost for Research, and talked about that; he showed us the "Heilmeier Catechism", a method (series of questions) he's used for getting funded throughout his career with great success.

We interact with administrators more than we used to, and I am aware that some Senators feel constrained about it. Under the old administration, there was good reason for this: I can name four faculty members (and feel sure there are more) who spoke freely and got chewed out for it. The building of trust must come gradually; therefore, I will make an offer. Any Senator who wishes to ask a question or make a statement without attribution may send it to me, and I will offer it anonymously. This offer stands as long as I'm in the Senate. The Provost and President are coming next month to start the conversation about tenure revisions, but if Senators have other questions, here's a chance to ask.

Committee Reports

1. Academic Policies – Sen. Kishore
No report
2. Administrative Policies – Sen. Kaya [Faculty Handbook update]

Sen. Kaya began his report by saying, the committee, comprising six members representing various colleges, has been diligently working on reconciling edits from Dr. Mark Archambault

with real-time website information. We have been given the task of reviewing the faculty handbook, which is about 300 pages.

Our committee has a diverse composition and representation from each college, excluding the College of Business, but we also have representation from the library.

I invited the College of Business, but there was no application, so the entire committee was also comprised predominantly of Senators, just as side information and not just as a reminder.

The Faculty Handbook defines our responsibilities, policies, and rights similar to the faculty constitution, and it's a legally binding document linked to our contracts that we sign. Regarding the process: The process started in January with requests from January 11th, 2024.

Then Dr. Mark Archambault shared with us his hard copy with his edits and recommendations for changes. However, we requested an updated handbook because we realized that there were differences between the real-time website information and the hard copy.

We also requested prioritized lists that are directly related to the review. Based on that, Dr. Mark Archambault did send us an email and he color-coded certain items where the red items, for example, are the highest priority for the review and then the green and the blue is the third, and then the black are not directly related to the review. We started working on the red items first because it was a type of priority, so the process. We made sure the information on the hard copy was how it was on the real-time website.

It was basically a reconciliation of both Doctor Archambault's edits and the website.

As I said, the color coding was helpful because we needed to focus on the highest priority items, as Dr. Brown shared the summary of the response to the red coded top priority items. You will see that there are sections here, sections 1, 2, 3, 4, up to 10. Each of them refers to a certain item in Dr. Archambault's email.

So, this is the response to the red items. We have met about five times before now as the Administrative Policies Committee. Then, we created a timeline document to show how this will be processed in the following months.

And in that timeline, I have here, we plan to have the red items and the green items finalized in this sense, in the order of first spring, the response from the Senators bringing it to the next Senate meeting, and then hopefully voting for it, the red items.

We also decided that an additional special meeting might be necessary at the beginning of May. We tentatively said it's May 2nd to vote for the green items, but you will see more clearly in that timeline [Secretary note: see Appendix A for the timeline]

Discussion ensued regarding the scheduling of future meetings and the dissemination of information to faculty members. It was decided to share the timeline and relevant documents

with the faculty, stressing the importance of referring to both the hard copy and the real-time website for comprehensive understanding.

Sen. Turgut emphasized the points by saying that there are major changes to be done, then they require resolutions to be discussed, debated, and then agreed on, and then go into that faculty handbook. The faculty and the senators should be aware of that. Our goal is to look at the consistency and accuracy of the perspectives of those two. Any major changes that need to be done to the faculty handbook have to go through the normal mechanisms of shared governance. That's a separate issue.

The committee acknowledged the significant effort required for this endeavor and reiterated the importance of timely feedback from faculty members to ensure accuracy and consistency in the Faculty Handbook.

3. Excellence Awards – Sen. Wildman

Sen. Wildman reported that the evaluation process for the Excellence Award had been completed by their committee. They received numerous excellent dossiers which were thoroughly reviewed and rated. After meetings and discussions, the awardees were decided upon and their eligibility was confirmed by the Provost office. All awardees have been notified and will receive their awards in person at the State of the University address.

Kalajian Professorship – Sen. Kishore

Sen. Kishore reported a discussion regarding the timing of announcing the awardees. It was noted that announcements should be made after the award ceremony, as per the emails received.

4. Scholarships – Sen. Nezamodini-Kachouie

No report.

5. Technology Resources and Infrastructure – Sen. Poole

Proxy. Sen. Bowman, on behalf of Sen. Poole, reported that IT is considering removing Panopto due to its high cost. There were discussions with the IT department regarding various issues, including password reset frequency and Panopto. It was proposed that alternative solutions such as Canvas Studio, which would still allow video recording but with limited editing capabilities, be explored.

Nasri Nesnas raised concern regarding the potential loss of editing capabilities in Panopto and the importance of ensuring that faculty voices are heard regarding editing tools. While acknowledging their limited experience in major editing, he highlighted the value of simple editing tasks they had performed. Questions were raised about the impact on the workflow if Panopto's editing capabilities were discontinued.

Jason Griggs commented that Canvas Studio is being proposed as an alternative system with limited editing capabilities. The workflow would remain similar, with recordings from Zoom being directed to Canvas Studio instead of Panopto. While Canvas Studio offers some editing features, it was noted that it may not be as comprehensive as Panopto's suite. Suggestions were made to phase out Panopto gradually and provide an overlap of subscriptions to allow users to adapt to the new system.

Sen. Jones expressed the uncertainty surrounding the merger between Bisk and Academic Partnerships. It was noted that there is a lack of clarity on the extent of work that academic units, including faculty and staff, will have to undertake. The potential unintended consequences of the merger, particularly in relation to the online learning apparatus, were discussed.

6. Welfare – Sen. Suksawang [Faculty/Staff Picnic; Equity Pay proposal]: committee report and combined with the **New Business** (Resolution on Equity Pay)
Equity Pay Proposal: A draft equity raise policy was shared with the Senators.

Sen. Suksawang's report focused on the draft of the Equity Raise Policy. Sen. Suksawang introduced the agenda item, highlighting the importance of addressing salary disparities among faculty members, particularly concerning gender, salary compression, and cost of living adjustments. The committee sent the draft policy to all senators for review and feedback.

The draft policy aimed to alleviate the impact of salary disparities caused by factors such as length of service and hiring practices. It proposed a fixed increase to address the issue, with a minimum request of \$50,000 per person per year. The formula suggested in the draft was heavily loaded, based on previous years' data, but members expressed concerns about its practicality and suggested alternatives.

There was a discussion regarding the definition of "discipline" in the policy and its implications for data analysis, as well as a debate about whether to use broader categories or individual departments for assessing salary averages. The gender pay gap was raised, with the Senate floor emphasizing the need for disaggregating the various factors contributing to salary disparities and addressing them separately.

Suggestions were made to involve the university's HR department in data collection and analysis to ensure comprehensive and accurate insights. It was proposed that HR study the gender pay gap, salary compression, and cost of living adjustments separately, utilizing established methodologies in compensation analysis.

The discussion was concluded with a consensus to request HR to provide data on salary disparities and to conduct a thorough analysis before finalizing the Equity Raise Policy, pending the availability of accurate data.

Old Business: there was no old business

Discussion:

Sen. Pre. Brown opened for discussion.

As a first item, Sen. Turgut commented on the importance of summer pay for faculty members, particularly in light of the absence of merit raises or salary increases during the academic year. Attendees expressed concerns regarding recent changes to the minimum thresholds for summer classes, highlighting potential revenue loss implications and the impact on faculty members reliant on summer pay.

Key points from the discussions are:

Increased Thresholds: Attendees noted a significant increase in the minimum thresholds for undergraduate summer classes, leading to potential revenue loss for faculty members dependent on summer pay. Concerns were raised regarding the administration's justification for these changes and the need for transparency in decision-making.

Teaching Revenue Focus: The discussion emphasized the university's status as a teaching revenue-driven institution, underscoring the critical role of summer classes in generating income for faculty members, particularly those in lower-paid positions.

Impact on Class Sizes: Attendees highlighted the potential consequences of classes not meeting the increased thresholds, including larger class sizes and diminished student learning experiences. Concerns were raised regarding the strain on resources and faculty members resulting from these changes.

Inconsistent Policies: Attendees voiced frustration over the lack of clarity and consistency in summer pay policies, citing past instances of changing formulas and delayed summer contract approvals. The need for standardized procedures and clear communication from the administration was emphasized to ensure fairness and transparency.

Attendees discussed the need for advocacy efforts to address summer pay concerns, with suggestions including direct engagement with university leadership and the Board of Trustees.

Second, Sen. Turgut raised concerns regarding the strategic plan's emphasis on research over teaching despite teaching being the primary revenue source for the institution. Sen. Turgut also noted discrepancies in the frequency of mentions of teaching and research within the document, highlighting the need for a more balanced approach. He acknowledged that happy and high-quality faculty contribute significantly to attracting and retaining top-quality students. He suggested conducting transparent salary compensation analyses to ensure competitiveness in hiring and retaining faculty. Sen. Turgut highlighted notable omissions in the strategic plan, including minimal mentions of alumni, endowment, academic mission, academic freedom, and shared governance. It was suggested that these aspects be incorporated into future iterations of the plan. Sen. Turgut also emphasized that the Faculty Senate President is a key

representative in voicing faculty perspectives and ensuring their inclusion in the plan's development.

Sen. Zarillo commented on the absence of a financial plan within the strategic plan, noting that achieving excellence in various areas would be futile without adequate funding. He emphasized the necessity of raising the endowment to support the ambitious goals outlined in the plan. He discussed the pivotal role of endowments in sustaining universities, particularly in supporting Ph.D. student salaries and research infrastructure. Caltech, Stanford, and MIT were cited to underscore the significance of endowment funding.

Sen. Zarillo proposed a resolution urging the university administration to initiate a campaign aimed at increasing the endowment to \$1 billion within the next decade. He warned that FIT's survival and competitiveness hinged on securing substantial funding to attract and retain top talent and suggested leveraging relationships with wealthy individuals, such as Elon Musk and Jeff Bezos, to solicit donations for the university. It was emphasized that reaching out to potential donors and demonstrating the university's value proposition could yield significant financial support.

While acknowledging the importance of research, attendees stressed the need to focus on core revenue streams, such as teaching and classroom tuition. They cautioned against losing sight of FIT's strengths amidst efforts to enhance research initiatives.

Sen. Turgut added comments on the significance of endowments, particularly in the context of fundraising and budgetary growth. With their substantial endowments, examples from prestigious institutions like Harvard and Yale served as benchmarks for the potential impact of robust fundraising efforts. He emphasized the correlation between endowment growth and budget expansion, highlighting the necessity of diversifying revenue streams beyond traditional sources such as teaching and classroom tuition. While acknowledging the importance of focusing on core revenue streams, Sen. Turgut advocated for a strategic shift towards increasing research initiatives to bolster endowment growth. Sen. Scott also underscored the need for a balanced approach encompassing teaching and research priorities, mentioning the potential for engagement with prominent industry figures, such as Elon Musk and Jeff Bezos, to solicit substantial donations for the university. He proposed proactive outreach strategies to leverage the interest of influential individuals in supporting STEM education and research.

The discussion highlighted the critical role of endowments and alumni contributions in driving institutional growth and financial sustainability.

Possible Adjustments in the Tenure System (proposal attached) – Sen Brown

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made by Sen. Scott and seconded by Sen. Turgut. All attendees favored, and the meeting was adjourned at 4:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joo young Park, Faculty Senate Secretary

Appendix A. Timeline for Faculty Handbook Revisions

Timeline for Faculty Handbook Revisions		
March 2024		
Meeting	Date	Agenda
Admin Policies Committee:	March 4, 2024	Continued working on the <u>GREEN</u> items
Faculty Senate Meeting:	March 5, 2024	Discuss the <u>RED</u> items (please see below the summary of <u>RED</u> items sent by Dr. Archambault)
Feedback from Senators to the Senate	Deadline: March 18, 2024	Feedback related to the <u>RED</u> items from Senators to the Senate
Admin Policies Committee:	March 20, 2024	Finalize the <u>GREEN</u> items (please see below the summary of <u>GREEN</u> items sent by Dr. Archambault)
April 2024		
Faculty Senate Meeting:	April 2, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vote for <u>RED</u> items • Discuss <u>GREEN</u> items
Feedback from Senators to the Senate	April 16, 2024	Feedback related to the <u>GREEN</u> items from Senators to the Senate
Admin Policies Committee:	April 17, 2024	
May 2024		
Faculty Senate Meeting:	Tentatively: May 2, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vote for <u>GREEN</u> items

Further summary of Dr. Archambault's color-coded recommended changes

- Must be changed in preparation for SACSCOC review (RED):
 - The numerous title and office name changes, removal of website references, FH 1.4, FH 1.5.2, FH 2.1, FH 2.5, FH 2.7, FH 2.10, FH 2.15, FH 2.19, FH 2.20.7, Faculty Grievance Resolution Procedure, New Programs Process, Guidelines & Template, University Mission Statement
- Must be changed in preparation for SACSCOC review. These are duplicative policies. The Senate should only consider whether to refer to the duplicative policy (e.g., the ones owned by HR) or just remove the section from the Faculty Handbook altogether (GREEN):
 - FH 2.6, FH 2.6.1, FH 2.8.1.2.1.2.3.2, FH 2.9, FH 2.9.3, FH 2.11, FH 2.13, FH 2.15.1, FH 2.17

- Should be changed in preparation for SACSCOC review, but lower priority than the red or green items (blue):
 - Wordsmithing for clarity (priority for this is situational), FH 1.5.1 (only the bullet on why the committee reports to the Senate when it is not a Senate committee), FH 1.5.11, FH 1.5.12, FH 2.2, FH 2.14, FH 2.16, FH 2.18, FH 2.20.2, FH 2.21, FH 2.22, Advising Students for Directed Study
- Should be updated by the Senate, but probably won't impact the SACSCOC review (black):
 - FH Appendix "z", FH 1.5.1 (first two bullets), FH 1.5.3, FH 1.5.4, FH 1.6, FH 2.18.1, Advising International Students, Advising to Improve Grades,

Appendix B. SKETCH OF A TENURE SYSTEM FOR F.I.T.: Modification of current system

TRACKS: 4. Research, Tenure, “Teaching”, Instructor

Promotion Criteria: College-by-college; must be consented to by the Faculty Senate

RESEARCH TRACK

Qualification: Terminal academic degree (Ph.D. or equivalent)

Expectation: Research

Ranks: Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Professor (or: omit “Research”). Should normally be on soft money.

Appointment: Initial one-year appointment then per availability of funds.

Eligibility: Graduate Faculty – yes (*); tenure – no

TENURE TRACK Professor

Qualification: Terminal academic degree (Ph.D. or equivalent)

Expectations: Research, Service, reduced Teaching

Ranks: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor.

Appointment: Per FH 2.8.1.2.1: initial one-year appointment then tenure-track as at present.

Post-tenure review: per FH 2.8.1.5 as at present.

Eligibility: Graduate Faculty – yes (*); tenure – yes

NON-TENURE TRACK Professor (“Teaching Track” or “Hybrid Teaching/Research Track”, “Hybrid” for short)

Qualification: Terminal academic degree (Ph.D. or equivalent)

Expectations: Teaching, Service, reduced Research; in the absence or near-absence of research, service record should be substantial.

Ranks: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor. New doctorate-holding teaching faculty may (College option) be hired to this track (possibly as, *e.g.*, Professors of Practice).

Appointment: Initial one-year appointment then 3/4/5 per rank, per FH 2.5.

Eligibility: Graduate Faculty – yes (*), tenure – no

(*) For Graduate Faculty membership and appointments, see GP 4.1.1 and 4.1.2.

INSTRUCTOR TRACK

Qualification: minimum Master's

Expectations: Teaching. Service. Research not expected.

Ranks: Instructor 1, Instructor 2, Senior Instructor (or other titles). This should be the entry portal for all faculty without terminal degrees.

Appointment: Initial one-year appointment then two years at a time. (Or: 2/2/3?)

Eligibility: Doctoral Faculty – no, tenure – no

EVALUATION (all tracks): Rating categories should be Exceeds Expectations, Satisfactory, Needs Improvement, and Unsatisfactory per FH 2.8.1.4.

CHANGING TRACKS

TO TENURE TRACK FROM OTHER TRACKS: Faculty on the Research or “Teaching” Track may request consideration for tenure, not more often than once every seven years. They may be considered for tenure either immediately or after a probational period of up to two years (Provost’s discretion). If not granted tenure, they shall revert to their original tracks.

FROM TENURE TRACK TO “TEACHING TRACK”: If a faculty member’s pre-tenure review (after three years) reveals inadequate research progress but outstanding teaching ability, such a faculty member may be offered a “Teaching Track” contract, subject to departmental needs and with the permission of the Provost. Because of the University’s investment in new tenure-track faculty, this transition should be available subsequent to the pre-tenure review (*e.g.* after an unsuccessful tenure candidacy) only in special cases with the express consent of the Provost and/or President.

FROM INSTRUCTOR TRACK TO OTHER TRACKS: When a faculty member on the Instructor Track completes a terminal academic degree (Ph.D. or equivalent), such a faculty member may be offered a contract on either the “Teaching Track” or the Tenure Track as appropriate.

Appendix C. Supplemental Terms Summary from Senate Special Meeting with General Council (February 20, 2024)

Supplemental Terms Summary

1. Ethics, Compliance, and Conflict of Interest
 - a. This is required by accreditation and various federal grants and contracts
 - b. Ethics aligns with our University values
 - c. Similar to what was done previously—it has been a couple years since the last one
 - d. Disclose outside activities and employment—only way to know of conflict
2. Intellectual Property
 - a. Removed from contract and put in this supplement
 - b. Allows for researchers and faculty to disclose IP that they are bringing with them
 - c. Part of flow downs on some government contracts
 - d. Agree not to protect IP and work with FT if we need to copyright or patent
3. Information Protection
 - a. Nondisclosure agreement language
 - b. Compliance for government flow downs
 - c. Necessary for research contracting and work for others
4. Protection of Property
 - a. Agree to return documents, supplies, and equipment back to university when a faculty member leaves the University
5. No Breach of Prior Agreements
 - a. Sometimes other companies have non-compete agreements—usually private research companies
 - b. Employees should disclose if this is applicable
6. Non-Participation in Foreign Talent Programs
 - a. This is a flow down on some government research and a requirement for our mitigation efforts.
 - b. You promise that you are not a spy or member of the Chinese military
7. Payroll Deduction Authorization
 - a. Required by law in some states
8. Use of Name and Likeness Authorization
 - a. Required by law in some states
9. Third Party Notification of University Rights
 - a. Employees cannot take Florida Tech IP and market it to new employers.
10. Governing law and Severability
 - a. Florida law governs
 - b. If some of the contract is invalid, the contract is still valid
11. Counterparts
 - a. The terms can be signed in multiple ways—including electronic
12. Further Assurances
 - a. If we need an employee to sign patent applications, they agree to help
13. Acknowledgment
 - a. Employees agree to read these terms
14. Effective Date
 - a. Terms are effective immediately