

Faculty Senate Meeting

When: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 – 3:30pm

Where: Zoom @ <https://fit.zoom.us/j/95744544218>

Minutes

Senators Present: Faculty Senate President Tolga Turgut (Aeronautics), Faculty Senate Secretary Aaron Welters (MTH), Ersoy Subasi (Aeronautics), Jordan Poole (Aeronautics), Charles Bryant (Business), Steven Rivet (COB), Abram Walton (COB), Angel Otero (Business Online), Don Platt (APSS), Razvan Rusovici (APSS), Manasvi Lingam (APSS), Csaba Palotai (APSS), Kenia Nunes (BCES), Mehmet Kaya (BCES), Vipuil Kishore (BCES), Nasri Nesnas (BCES), Luis Otero (CES), Brian Lail (CES), Nasheen Nur (CES), Nakin Suksawang (MCE), Hamidreza Najafi (MCE), Chiradeep Sen (MCE), Joo Young Park (MTH), Nezamoddini-Kachouie (MTH), Pallav Ray (OEMS), Spencer Fire (OEMS), Kevin Burke (SAC), Angela Tenga (SAC), Gordon Patterson (SAC), David Wilder (BA), Patrick Converse (PSY), Jessica Wildman (PSY), Julie Costopoulos (PSY), William Bowman (LIB)

Senators Absent: Gary Zarillo (OEMS)

Proxies: None

Other Attendees: Vicky Knerly, Al Brown, Rob van Woesik, Mary Bonhomme, Penny Vassar, Roberto Perverati, Marco Carvalho, Eric Guisbert, Rudi Wehmschulte, Andy Knight, Kastro Hamed, Mariana Juras, Grace Gamage, Rian Mehta, Jian Du, Rick Addante, Bhaskar Tenali

Call to Order

Pres. Turgut called the meeting to order at 3:30pm.

A motion was made by Pres. Turgut to approve the minutes from the Mar. 7, 2023 meeting via the meeting recording only, posted on the Faculty Senate webpage on Mar. 9, 2023. Senator Julie Costopoulos says “I move” and Senator Vipuil Kishore says “second.”

Pres. Turgut asks if anyone abstains and no one does. Then he asks if anyone is opposed. Senator Abram Walton say “I oppose.”

Senator Abram Walton elaborates saying that recordings are not minutes so unless we’re changing the policy that the recordings are now constituted as minutes, which is a change or deviation from the past, then he doesn’t know why there is a difference now.

Senate Steven Rivet says that he is also going to vote against that and that we need to have written minutes that accurately reflect the meeting.

Pres. Turgut responds that what we did and have been doing so far is acknowledging the minutes via the recordings. We have two mechanisms (the recordings and the written minutes). This time we couldn't complete the minutes in writing. That is why we're approving the minutes it via recordings. What we did is just put a motion to approve the minutes via the recordings not in writing.

Senator Steven Rivet says there should be one official record of the minutes. If we decide that the video recordings are those minutes then there is no need for written minutes, but we should not have two versions of the minutes.

Secretary Aaron Welters says in the past, during COVID, we had video recordings as the minutes. A resolution was then passed by the Senate to go back and make written minutes for those missing. The recordings are not to replace the minutes, but just as a supplement to those written minutes. The written minutes are already done for the Faculty Senate meeting on Mar. 7, 2023, but they came delayed to Pres. Turgut. Although they are with him, we need time to have the Faculty Senate look at them before we rush for their approval. So it's not that they're not done, it's just that we didn't want to send them out today and nobody have a chance to read them before we approve them.

Senator Abram Walton says why don't we just postpone the approval of the minutes until the records match and there one singular version of the minutes?

Secretary Aaron Welters says we're not going to proceed to approve the minutes just the video recording and then Pres. Turgut plans to ask for approval of the written minutes via email later this week.

Pres. Turgut says let me supplement this. I received the written minutes from the Secretary last night so there wasn't enough time to review it and then send it back to Secretary Welters. What we do is he sends me the draft of the written minutes, I look at it and if there is any confusion, I send it back and then he looks at it for a second time. In fact, if you go back to the Senate recordings of the last 11 years, the most comprehensive data recording has been conducted within the last 7-8 months, both via the recordings and the minutes. And so far the minutes have been also shared with you a minimum of 48 hours in advance. This time we couldn't do that and would have been unfair to all the Senators. For this reason we are only going ahead with approving the recordings, because recordings are a cross-check mechanism, they are more comprehensive. If there is something forgotten, we can always go back and recheck, that is the purpose.

Thus, to restate, we are going to ask for a motion to approve the March 7, 2023 meeting minutes via the recording not in writing. The writing will follow just link we have done so far.

Pres. Turgut asks for a motion. Senator Mehmet Kaya says ``Motion.” Pres. Turgut asks for a second. Senator Jordan Poole says ``Second.”

Pres. Turgut says we are just approving the recordings, not the minutes in writing. I and our Secretary could not get the minutes ready in time, apologies. But I think it is critically important to have official records of our Senate activities intact and accurate as it has been for several months. We are also still awaiting the September minutes from our Secretary.

The plan is to have the Sept. 6, 2023 along with the Mar. 7, 2023 written minutes approved via email.

Pres. Turgut says can I have an approval of the minutes via email circulation and approval within the next couple of weeks?

Senator Rivet asks did we vote on the first motion?

Pres. Turgut responds we have just approved the minutes via recording, not in writing.

Senator Rivet responds that he is question the procedure since he didn't hear a vote. There was a discussion and there needs to be a vote on that. Again I'll make my original point that verbatim recordings are not minutes and we need have one record. We can file the recordings and use them as a resource, but they are not the minutes of this body.

Pres. Turgut responds ok we are just approving the recording then. Can I have a motion to approve the recording of the last Senate meeting?

Senator Poole says ``I motion it.”

Pres. Turgut says any seconds?

Senator Mehmet Kaya says ``Second.”

Pres. Turgut says any opposed?

Senators Rivet, Walton, and Razvan Rusovici say they are opposed.

Pres. Turgut says that he is confused here. We are just talking about approving the recording not the minutes in writing. And Dr. Welters is the person in charge, our Secretary in the minutes, and he has given his explanation.

So we can just move on without approving the last Senate meeting recordings according to this. And we can prepare the Senate meeting minutes in writing and Dr. Welters can share it with the Faculty Senate.

Remember the recordings are more comprehensive and when we are doing Zoom meetings that's how many people and institutions conduct their meetings as well.

Pres. Turgut says we are going to move on as there are clearly objections. I am going to have a motion to approve the minutes via email circulation of the March 7, 2023 to the Faculty Senators in a couple weeks when Secretary Welters and I are finished with them.

Pres. Turgut says can I have a motion for this?

Vipuil Kishore says ``so moved.”

Pres. Turgut says any seconds?

Senator Nezamoddini-Kachouie says ``Second.”

Pres. Turgut says any opposed?

Senator Rivet says I am worried that this doesn't give an opportunity for this body to discuss. There is obviously some dissention here and I believe that warrants a live meeting with open discussion rather than an email. Now if we want to have that discussion through email I think that's fine, but I think that discussion or the opportunity for that discussion needs to exist. This is an important issue.

Pres. Turgut says I agree. There is precedence to this Dr. Rivet, Dr. Walton. You can go back to the Presidency of Dr. Lail and Dr. Nesnas and you can see there's been precedence via email as well. So at this moment we need to move on, but we are not approving the minutes via recordings. But we are going to email it. If there is an objection about the inconsistencies we can reevaluate them. Is this fine with you?

Senator Rivet responds as long as there is an opportunity for discussion through email, so that we have some period of time in order for that to happen then I'm fine.

Pres. Turgut says with that contingency from Dr. Rivet, the motion to approve the minutes via email circulation within a couple of weeks has passed.

Guest Speaker: EVP, Provost, & COO Dr. Marco Carvalho about assessment & accreditation after the departure of Ms. Ickes.

Pres. Turgut begins by saying that Dr. Carvalho is our guest speaker and will talk about the assessment and accreditation after the departure of Ms. Ickes. Once again he has graciously accepted to come despite short notice. Before I yield the floor to him I remind

everyone that you are free to ask questions after he completes his remarks. I have one question that was sent to me prior to be asked to Dr. Carvalho.

(Pres. Turgut yields the floor to Dr. Carvalho)

Dr. Carvalho begins by thanking everyone for the opportunity to talk briefly as he knows it's a packed agenda. His goal is to talk about the latest changes we had in our office of compliance and accreditation.

As you may recall, Ms. Jessica Ickes was a Vice President for compliance and accreditation that was an office formed by the board a little bit before last summer. The point of that was to combine some of the functions of accreditation, compliance, and institutional research under a common office. There are reasons for that to be set up. Ms. Ickes departed the university a week or so ago and I had the chance to work with her on a transition for a period of about a couple of weeks.

The way that we reorganize the functions was essentially the office is, they had 3 main functions. One function was in policy and compliance. Many of you I'm sure had a chance to work with Ms. Ickes on the policy matters. She led that effort, and she did very well. We actually had about 80% of all the University Policies reviewed during that process with all the units. That is what one of the big functions of her office is. The other function was institutional research and effectiveness. That's a well-known functionality that basically is, providing all the data, accounting and reporting for our both internal and external reports. And a third function was the part that deals with accreditation and assessment. So we fully recognize that we have a leadership transition. There is a new president, Dr. Nicklow is joining us in a few months and I had a brief conversation with him, and he's working on his own plans for Provost, and he shared that he has the intention of having a search. In order to maintain operations of the office for compliance, accreditation, and all the functions, we organize it in the following manner: The part that deals with policy and compliance is being handled by our General Council that reports under the Office of the President and Mr. Ryan Peterson is our Council. He's new, but he has been given the responsibility for completing the policy reviews and compliance. I met with him today, and we're working together to ensure that that task is completed. That's under his purview. The other 2 functions. One deals with the creation and assessment that function was given to Dr. Mark Archambault. Many of you may know him, obviously he has been around awhile, and he has led a lot of the functions in a ABET accreditation within the College of Engineering and Science. He has graciously accepted to assume the responsibility of being our accreditation liaison with SACS and assume the SACS accreditation and assessment responsibilities. I've been also working with him on that function.

Just as a matter of timeline. We have our report being submitted at a beginning of 24 with our first preliminary visit from SACS on June 24, and that's basically a preparation visit. We will have our full visit scheduled for April 2025. That is when we are going for our reaffirmation. Basically by that time, one year before that we will have had completed everything. So at the beginning of 2024, we have to have submitted our reports.

So these 3 main functions were split in this manner. Mr. Ryan Peterson, is handling policy and compliance. Dr. Mark Archambault is handling accreditation and assessment. They go together. The reporting for accreditation requires the assessment part. And for the office of institutional research and effectiveness, our agreement was to put an interim person, and I'm working with HR with the registry to bring a director for institutional research. We have been conducting this task ourselves, myself and a few others, holding this responsibility until we can bring this person on board. We hope to do that in the next couple of weeks. The idea is to have this person assist us for some 4 or 5 months, until Dr. Nicklow, the new president, has an opportunity to determine how he would like to have a permanent allocation for that.

I would like to share with the group that Ms. Ickes had a lot of responsibilities and several tasks that she handle very very well. We have been continuing those tasks. There is no there is no risk at the moment we continue, she left everything well organized and we are following on her work now, and maintaining things, going and preparing for the establishment of the permanent positions with the President and until then we're continuing with the preparations for accreditation and reporting. Many of you may have been reached for data or for information from our office in the same manner you use to have. So far, I believe there has been no disruptions.

That's the update I would like to give on that office which I was asked to share with the group, and I'm happy to you answer any questions.

Pres. Turgut thanks Dr. Carvalho for that.

Senator Abram Walton says it sounded like a good update and he appreciates him coming and bringing that. He asks the question to make sure he accurately represents his constituents the question: It sounds like the transition went seamlessly then, and you expect it to go smoothly, is that correct?

Dr. Carvalho responds that is correct. I mean the transition so far has been seamless. I've been working with Dr. Archambault and you know he has the experience on that which makes it easier for him to adapt that to SACS. There is a lot of regulations and requirements that he needs to go through, but there is no concern there. I think we're going to be okay, and the reports that we have to submit there's several requirements we do, they are all on track, and nothing has been delayed. Everything is continuing. The only thing that I don't have in place yet is the institutional research director. We are able to maintain that task because our staff is extremely competent, and they've been able to help continue that operation, and I've been assisting them in that role. But my expectation, Dr. Walton is that I will have somebody in that place in the next couple of weeks as an interim.

Senator Walton says very good, thank you.

Senator Vipuil Kishore says I just wanted to follow up on our previous discussion about summer registration for PhD students. The course is, I believe, not yet listed. So I was

wondering if this would be a university-wide course that any PhD student could take in the summer for 0 credit or would it be program specific course that would be offered?

Dr. Carvalho responds that it is not program specific. The course should have been listed by now. I'll follow up on why that isn't the case. But there should be no reason for that not to be ready. Maybe just a process issue.

Senator Kishore says if it was university-wide course then I may have missed that because I was looking under my program and didn't see it.

Dr. Carvalho responds that yes it is university-wide and I believe a general prefix was defined for that. You're not going to find it in your program. You're gonna basically have to look for the general course. I can try to get that prefix to you and I can follow up on that.

Pres. Turgut thanks Dr. Carvalho for that. Then he asks a question that came from one of our Faculty Senators. It's actually under the new items in new discussion items. It's about the Faculty Mentorship. Two new faculty members contacted me to say that we should offer Faculty Mentorship to new faculty members at FIT as it can be overwhelming for new faculty to adapt and be successful in a new environment and institution. Some colleges departments prioritize this a bit more than the others. We also discussed this in our Executive committee meeting as well. So how can we improve on this and help our new fellow colleagues with respect to faculty mentorship in that there are different varying approaches from departments to colleges here?

Dr. Carvalho replies thank you for that question. This is a topic that has come up time and time again, and it's an important one, and it there has been different attempts to address this. We have looked into ways of assigning a mentor, a faculty mentor, somebody that is able to basically walk the specific incoming faculty through the through the processes, so they can get acquainted and help them with that. The problem with this faculty membership, when it's individualize, is that it becomes a little bit more dependent on the specific persons which so happens, for example, that you may have a good mentor. That depends on the relationship between the two. What I would suggest is a better way forward is probably rely on some of our committees. We have committees that provide support for the faculty that on the teaching side, on the research support side, and we haven't leverage those as well as we could have. I think there is an opportunity for us to engage a more explicit program for the incoming faculty, so they can have periodic luncheons or activities with the different committees for both research, teaching and so on, and so forth. And receive some type of resource references, or feedback, and at a minimum they get to know the committee members, so they know who to talk to, and who to ask questions. We have not taken the advantage to do that as well as we could. I think we can improve that process, and have as part of our standing committees provide a few sessions to invite the incoming faculty and expose them to the different resources and opportunities. I don't have any problems

with the mentorship program that we had in place -- have one faculty teamed up with another. But in my experience has been that this tends to work less often than it fails. Most often, there is not a whole lot of connection and the faculty end up disassociating. But there are some specific examples that work very, very well. My recommendation going forward is that we rely on our committees and ask our committees in research, teaching, and so on, and so forth, to accommodate within their agendas a few sessions that they can invite the faculty to provide some type of support and guidance.

Pres. Turgut reads a chat message to everyone saying as a new faculty mentor, I'd appreciate a more formalized institutionalized committee to promote support and guidance.

Dr. Carvalho responds yes, I think we can do that. I think we can provide support for the different committees, and some resources to enable them to have some type of either lunch and or some activity to invite the faculty and spend a little time sharing their experiences and getting to open that connection because you will give the new faculty, the incoming faculty, the opportunity to choose who they are connecting to it, and to see who they relate better.

Pres. Turgut says there was a second concern about this issue. What kind of mental support there is if needed with the new faculty, because some of them may be overwhelmed and struggling, and we discuss this item in the Executive Committee as well. (Dr. Costopoulos uploads a document to chat) Everybody sees that there is support if need for you such as counseling services and so forth, and that is available on the chat to everybody as well. Thank you for providing this Dr. Costopoulos.

Dr. Carvalho says that there was a comment by Dr. Rusovici that he agrees with and appreciates the comment which is there is an opportunity for the incoming faculty, as they meet with the different committees and the leadership of the colleges to get guidance not only on different resources, but also what is their promotion path? What are the options for them to grow career wise within the university? There is an opportunity for us in that. Thank you for sharing this.

Pres. Turgut thanks everyone for the discussion and Dr. Carvalho for the participation.

Faculty Senate Officer Elections (Nominees for Faculty Senate President-elect: Dr. Alan Brown and Dr. Robert Van Woesik; Nominees for Faculty Senate Secretary: Dr. Joo Young Park):

Pres. Turgut says the next item on our agenda is the Faculty Senate officer elections. We are going to hold elections today, first for the Faculty Senate President-elect and then Faculty Senate Secretary. I have shared the vision statements of our two candidates with you which is Dr. Brown and Dr. van Woesik, who are currently present. Before we do the voting process I'd like to clarify a few things. The voting will be done

by the poll I will launch via Zoom and only the sitting Senators are allowed/expected to vote and later we will verify all the votes with Dr. Welters as well. At this time we received no proxies by the way, in writing from anybody, so there are no proxies in this meeting. (Pres. Turgut reads off the list of Senators allowed to vote and, in particular, notes that he is eligible to vote but because he is running the Zoom he is unable to cast his poll vote via Zoom and hence must vote at the end with his voice on camera).

Pres. Turgut says he would like to give the floor to each candidate (in alphabetical order) for three minutes with Dr. Welters also helping him with the timing so that we can be fair to both candidates, and also so we can continue with Secretary election next.

Dr. Alan Brown says thank you Dr. Turgut. Florida Tech has a story like no other. Founded in a bar on someone's pocket change. This school was operated hand to mouth for a long time. Starting in about 1990 we had 20 years of slow, steady growth on our knees, because we really didn't have the money to do what we were doing. But we did it anyway, and it's a triumph of the human spirit. I joined in 1988, because my prospective colleagues made it clear that for them to succeed they needed me to succeed and I still feel the same way about our new colleagues. I'm tremendously excited about incoming President Nicklow. I was Faculty Senate President across the transition from President Weaver to Catanese back in 2002, and the best thing I can tell you about Presidential transitions is things are likely to happen fast. As a Senate we have the freedom to look long term and think big picture, and that's how I like to work as Faculty Senate President. And so let's do great things. Let's write the next chapter, and I thank you.

Dr. Rob van Woesik says thank you. I'm just gonna quickly go back to when I was the Faculty Senate President in 2014-2015, and some of the things that I did. I initiated equity raises for everybody. I initiated COLA, initiated the professional development fund, which sort of subsequently went away. Also initiated the \$5,000 bonus for all the faculty excellence awards. One of the one of the most fulfilling aspects was when Bob Shearer was the secretary, and I remember it was April 7, 2015 or something like that and he said to me that he'd been the Secretary for the Senate for about 20 something years, and he said I was the best President that he come across in two decades. So that was fulfilling for me. I worked very hard at that that role. After I left the Senate and went to the Research Council for about 4 years worked with Dr. Carvalho on initiating the IRA Fund, which is the research fund that's really stimulated a lot of research on campus. I was there for about 4 years, initiated that in 2020. Then I worked in the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee. I've been there since 2020 in the last 6 or 7 months of being the chair of the AFTC. If I get elected as the President of the Senate, I would obviously step down as the AFTC chair and the membership. As for the Faculty Senate President, I stepped up to this role because of the transition we're about to go through. It's not a self-serving role in any matter. I think you know, I'm reasonably successful with my research and have a track record and publications, etc. So I'm doing it for the University. It's at a time of critical change, and I want to generate some stability

over the next few years or so. I find that the new President is very keen to get moving, and is very student centric, which is fine for us. But I want to have a strong leadership voice to represent the faculty so the faculty get heard, because the faculty is the life and soul of the University. So I wanna make sure that we're on the right track for our next few years of trajectory. I'll work hard to serve you well and I'd appreciate your vote. Thanks very much.

Pres. Turgut says we have time to take one question for each candidate. Would anyone like to ask a question?

Senator Razvan Rusovici ask Dr. van Woesik how do you feel about faculty having the right to represent themselves in front of the AFTC Committee when their jobs and livelihoods are on the line?

Dr. van Woesik responds I think that's an issue that's incredibly important if they feel that they have something to convey that's not already conveyed in the documents that they submit. Then I see no reason that they shouldn't be in in front of the committee if they if want an oral discussion, if something has not been present.

Senator Rusovici replies thank you Dr. van Woesik. You know I respected you. You were my Faculty Senate President and if you remember during one of the previous elections I retracted my vote so you could be elected. You do remember that Dr. Marc Baarmand was there. I just want to let you know that the way that I was treated personally by the AFTC in past summer, when I was denied the chance to appear and provide facts about my tenure. In my opinion, was lacking transparency. That's all I have. Thank you.

Dr. van Woesik responds I am not privy to discuss any of those topics from the AFTC, I don't discuss that with anybody.

Pres. Turgut says thank you and opens the floor to a question for Dr. Brown. As there were no questions, Pres. Turgut says that one of his faculty wanted him to double check on Senate President Eligibility, our only current Senators eligible, and if so, are both candidates eligible? Pres. Turgut responds that they're elected in their units, so they are both eligible. They are incoming Senators, they will be serving two years, and this is the President-elect elections which refers to the year to serve as 2024 and 2025.

Senator Nezamoddini-Kachouie says that the question that was asked of Dr. van Woesik was not related to the position that he's running for so to be fair, I would like to ask the same question to Dr. Brown then.

Dr. Alan Brown responds that he doesn't see any reason someone shouldn't be allowed to represent themselves in front of the AFTC, I'm not familiar with it.

Pres. Turgut says we can move on to the voting process now, I will launch the poll for the Faculty Senate President-elect and I will vote at the end via voice.

[Pres. Turgut launches the poll and shares the results on Zoom; 29 Senators voted via the Zoom poll with 14 votes for Dr. van Woesik and 15 votes for Dr. Brown (only Senators voted and their votes all have been confirmed by Secretary Welters via the Zoom report) and 1 Senator (Pres. Turgut) voices his vote for Dr. van Woesik (since he cannot cast his vote via the poll as host of Zoom); the vote is tied at 15/15]

Pres. Turgut says his vote is for Dr. van Woesik. This makes it is 30 votes and a tie: 15 for Dr. Brown and 15 for Dr. van Woesik.

Pres. Turgut says as it is a tie and we have little time, he would like to ask for a motion to do this by roll call. First, would the candidates be okay with that motion?

Dr. Brown and Dr. van Woesik reply yes.

Senator Nasri Nesnas asks if this would be proper procedure since in the past we have done anonymous voting. So I think we need to review the bylaws and make sure this would be acceptable. Also I think this puts people under a lot of pressure, and usually when voting occurs, the candidates are not present during the voting. So I have a personal concern about this.

Senator Walton asks about a point of order. Given that the vote was not tied. Is it proper protocol that a sitting President would actually induce a tie when the rest of the body has already voted? And wasn't usually the case that the President has the tie-breaking vote not the tie making vote? I don't know and so I am asking if anybody understands the protocol here.

Pres. Turgut replies, can I clarify that? I know it per the Roberts' rules. It is at the discretion of the presiding officer. I announced it at the beginning of the voting that I was going to vote no matter the result via voice.

Pres. Turgut says that there are two options here. Either we do not do the elections of the President-elect or we wait until I get the Zoom report and we verify each person who has voted is actually a sitting Senator as I have announced the names earlier. I'm also open to suggestions. Both candidates have said that they are ok with exiting the room to not put pressure on Senators to vote.

Senator Julie Costopoulos says my questions are that Tolga has to vote orally because of the Zoom poll, I don't know if Dr. Walton understood that? You were saying if the numbers appear different than they really are it is because you aren't able to vote as you launched the poll. Is that correct, that is because you had to vote orally?

Pres. Turgut responds exactly. That is how we ended up with a 15/15 vote tie.

Senator Vipuil Kishore asks whether it is possible to count the number of Senators in the zoom and see if we have 30 Senators as a kind of indirect validation of the number of votes we have?

Pres. Turgut responds I can or that what we could do instead is do a second round of voting but this would be more confusing.

Pres. Turgut ask for a motion to do the voting by voice with the candidates stepping out of the room with a pause on the recording for anonymity so there is no pressure on the Senators.

Senator Costopoulos asks if we could have a couple of minutes for one general question to the candidates that might help the Senators make their vote?

Pres. Turgut responds yes let's do one question round.

Senator Costopoulos says I have a vision question. What do you think the role of the Senate is for faculty on our campus? What is the purpose and vision of a Faculty Senate in your mind? What is its purpose?

Dr. Brown replies to be the voice of the faculty, that essentially it. It is hard for administrators to know what we think. They probably see a few people who are vehement. But the Senate collects and distills the general voice. Then the President communicates it.

Dr. van Woesik replies people going into the Senate sometimes forget that they are representing their departments. I think it is critical that the Senators have a representative voice in the Senate, not just their personal voice. Because the Senate is a small body that then amalgamates all those voices and gives that voice to the President of the Senate that can convey that information to the Upper Administration, Board of Trustees, the Univ. President, etc. Thus, it is a combination of all those hierarchical levels that we have to keep in mind. It's not somebody just going into the Senate representing themselves.

(The candidates leave the zoom and Pres. Turgut asks for a vote again pausing the Zoom recording; ***the results of the Faculty Senate vote for Faculty President-elect for 2024 and 2025 term is 19 for Dr. Brown and 13 for Dr. van Woesik; the President-elect is Dr. Alan Brown***).

Pres. Turgut says that the vote has been verified by himself and Dr. Welters. The result of the voting is 19 for Dr. Brown and 13 for Dr. van Woesik. So the President-elect that

has been elected to serve between 2024 and 2025 is Dr. Alan Brown according to these results. This completes that election.

Pres. Turgut moves on to the election of the Faculty Senate Secretary Joo Young Park who is running unopposed. He asks her if she would like to say a few words.

Senator Joo Young Park says I am an Assistant Professor from Mathematical Sciences. So continuing from the great efforts made by Dr. Welters, I would like to contribute in adding my efforts to develop transparency and include more voices toward open and frank dialogue. Thank you.

Pres. Turgut thanks her and launches the poll noting that as there is only one person running the options of that Zoom poll will be yes, no, or abstain.

[Pres. Turgut launches the poll and shares the results on Zoom; 30 Senators voted via the Zoom poll with 26 voting (yes) for Dr. Joo Young Park and 2 no votes and 2 abstains (only Senators voted and their votes all have been confirmed by Secretary Welters via the Zoom report); ***the results of the Faculty Senate vote for Faculty Secretary for 2023-2024 term is for Dr. Joo Young Park***]

Pres. Turgut shares the poll result saying that 26, 2, and 2 voted yes, no, and abstain, respectively, which is the official result for the Faculty Senate Secretary which is another officer of the Senate. Welcome and congratulations Dr. Joo Young Park.

Old Business

Committee Reports:

1. Excellence Awards Committee: Senator Julie Costopoulos says we will be announcing the winners of faculty excellence awards in research, service, and teaching at the Honors Convocation. I hope you guys will be there.
2. Academic Policies Committee: Senator Vipul Kishore said he has nothing to report at this time.
3. Welfare Committee: Senator Nakin Suksawang said he doesn't have anything to report at this time. But, given the new president of the university, he is asking for volunteers for his committee to revive the Equity raise and the other related stuff that is important, but nothing happened on it last year even though we submitted something, there wasn't any funding. He wanted to see if there was any interest from the faculty to get involved in this.

4. Administrative Policies Committee: Senator Mehmet Kaya said that he has nothing to report.
5. Scholarship Committee: Nothing was reported on this committee at this meeting.
6. Technology, Resources, and Infrastructure (TRI) Committee: Nothing was discussed as this committee needs to elect a chair.

President's Report:

President Tolga Turgut says next is my report as discussed in our last meeting. I concluded officially my services within the President Search Committee on Mar. 4, 2023. I'm proud of the contribution I made as the only faculty in the seven member committee as the other members were from the Board of Trustees. I have put in hundreds of hours of work since last year in April. First phase included the selection of the search firm. The second phase included the profile of the interim President and the selection of the interim President, which included going through Bio's, resumes and then conducting interviews along with all the Board of Trustees. And then later for the permanent President. My work completed at the first week of March.

I wanted to share a quote from the Board of Trustees chair Travis Proctor: "I wanted to send a personal thank you for your participation on the Search Committee. As I mentioned on the call, you brought forward an important perspective that I am confident has helped us be more contemplative as we approach this important decision. You have represented the faculty with distinction, only further underscoring the importance of having their perspective included in many important decisions ahead of Florida Tech. I respect and appreciate that you have been willing to share even in those cases where you may have felt it was not aligned with the majority position. Your engagement has improved the overall process."

As you see with this note from the chair of the Board, I did my best to represent our institution as best as I can, always trying to bring the academic perspective and mission of our University. Because it is the Senate's mission to represent the best of the academic that we have and I did it with integrity, honesty, and fairness, at times making the easy and convenient choice would be less stressful and secure, but I have not been afraid to go against the grain and pushing an alternative viewpoint among all the trustees. Very recently Dr. John Nicklow was selected by the Board of Trustees as our next President. Now it is our duty to coalesce around him and support him as best as we can going into the future.

As you know, the departments and colleges were reminded to hold their Senator elections for the Senators, whose 3 year terms are coming up. The new Senator names were expected to be received by the Faculty Senate by the third week of March. Most departments and colleges were collaborative with this, but some did not respond timely or with conflicting times and terms. I take the service to the Faculty Senate and the role of the Faculty Senate in participation of shared governance, very seriously. It is still

mind baffling to me that a few senators provide conflicting stories and/or refrain from disclosing the exact dates of their service to the Senate. I have been a keen advocate on maintaining official records of the Senate since I have been a Senator and executive committee member. Because,

1. It helps for institutional memory via record/archive keeping.
2. It helps for awareness of time line of service between the Senate and the departments/colleges. Thus, help provide opportunities to any faculty to serve in the Senate.
3. It helps assure voting integrity in the Senate where we are representing our constituents/colleagues.
4. It helps maintain a serious, respectful, and democratic representative platform which is the institution of our Faculty Senate.

At the end of the day the more seriously and with ethics & integrity we conduct our roles here determines how seriously and respectfully the top management of our university approaches us.

I will announce the incoming Senators according to the information I have been provided by the departments and colleges.

Lastly, Dr. Nesnas is leaving the Senate ending his term and Dr. Brown is replacing him as Senator. Thank you Dr. Nesnas for your services. Dr. Louis Otero is completing his term and being replaced by Dr. Siddhartha Bhattacharyya. Thank you Dr. Louis Otero for your services. Dr. Brian Lail is leaving the Senate and Dr. Georgios Anagnostopoulos is taking his seat. Thank you Dr. Lail for your services. Dr. Welters, our Faculty Senate Secretary, is also outgoing and we will still be working with him for the next few weeks for the Senate minutes and thank you for all the services. He will be replaced by Dr. Stanley Snelson. Dr. Spencer Fire is an outgoing Senator and he has been replaced by Dr. van Woesik for Fall 2023. Dr. Costopoulos is an outgoing Senator and being replaced by Dr. Rick Addante. Thank you all for your services.

Dr. Welters can you provide some insight into how diligently we have been working on the minutes of the Faculty Senate as you are the outgoing Secretary.

Secretary Welters says yes. We always get the Zoom recordings of the Faculty Senate meeting posted within 48 hours to the Faculty Senate website. Then we try to get the written minutes out to the Senators well enough in advance to that the Senators can read them and approve them. When writing the minutes, I try to use the videos, transcripts, and whatever information I can collect to get the most accurate written minutes that I can, but it does take a long time.

Pres. Turgut says thank you. You've served 2.5 years with 3 different Faculty Senate Presidents, thank you for that. Thus you have firsthand information about how much data is out there, how much information is shared, and how transparent it's shared, how quickly it's shared. So you are the direct source in that department. Thank you again for volunteering to help Dr. Joo Young Park in her future services as well, as the incoming Senate Secretary.

New Business

(President Turgut brings up the following piece of new business.)

Faculty Standing Committee Chair elections: Nominee for Chair of Academic Policies Committee [Dr. Vipuil Kishore (running for re-election)], Nominee for Chair of TRI (Technology Resources and Infrastructure) Committee [Ms. Jordan Poole (running for the first time)], Chair Faculty Excellence Awards Committee (Open call until April 4, 2023).

Pres. Turgut says that next is the standing committee chair elections. The first one is for the role as the Chair of the Academic Policies Committee with only one nominee, Senator Dr. Vipuil Kishore who is up for reelection.

[Pres. Turgut launches the poll and shares the results on Zoom; 24 Senators voted via the Zoom poll with 21 voting (yes) for Dr. Vipuil Kishore and 0 no votes and 3 abstains (only Senators voted and their votes all have been confirmed by Secretary Welters via the Zoom report); ***the results of the Faculty Senate vote for Chair of the Academic Policies Committee is for Dr. Vipuil Kishore***]

Pres. Turgut says next we're voting on the role as the Chair of TRI (Technology Resources and Infrastructure) Committee with only one nominee, Senator Ms. Jordan Poole.

[Pres. Turgut launches the poll and shares the results on Zoom; 23 Senators voted via the Zoom poll with 17 voting (yes) for Ms. Jordan Poole and 0 no votes and 6 abstains (only Senators voted and their votes all have been confirmed by Secretary Welters via the Zoom report); ***the results of the Faculty Senate vote for Chair of TRI (Technology Resources and Infrastructure) Committee is for Ms. Jordan Poole***]

Pres. Turgut says that this is the first time we will have two female Senators in the Executive Committee which I am proud of by the way. Congratulations to both of you. Thank you Dr. Julie Costopoulos for your services as well.

(President Turgut brings up the following piece of new business.)

Discussion of Faculty mentorship to junior faculty members

Pres. Turgut says next on the agenda was started when he asked a question to our guest speaker Dr. Carvalho and he addressed it. Are there any additional questions for discussion about the Faculty mentorship on the floor?

(As there are no further questions, President Turgut brings up the final piece of new business.)

Farewell remarks of the outgoing Faculty Senate President

Pres. Turgut says I am going to have my farewell remarks, because at the adjournment of this meeting, Dr. Razvan Rusovici will be taking over as the Faculty Senate President.

I would like to make some remarks on what has been done in the last year because of it was a very transitional year with many things going on in our institution.

First, I would like to thank all of you here and all the faculty that has served in the Faculty Senate before us. It has been an honor, and privilege to lead the Faculty Senate in this role. In one of the social events on campus a few months ago someone from the top management was introducing me to someone else. He said this is the guy with the hardest job and most thankless job on campus and then I kind of agreed with them. It's an honorable job. It's a privilege to serve, but it's one of the most the thankless jobs, and it's where you have to serve selflessly. It needs to be done well whomever is the next Faculty Senate President after us. It has to be done well needs to be done selflessly without any self-serving agendas and requires navigating successfully through conflicts with the top management at times. That's probably one of the hardest areas. Probably that is why a term is limited by one year in our Constitution as well. Because if you really work hard, you need a break after serving one year at the Senate. Because if you really want to do it deservingly and put in the time it requires at least an extra 300-500 hours of work within one year.

I strived to lead with care and seriousness. Navigated successfully through challenges of the many unknowns brought within the last 1 year in our institution. I have had the Provost as our speaker, interim President, and the accreditation officer of the university. I have tried to lead entirely by following the policies and procedures based on our constitution and bylaws. I have never rushed with any resolution and voting until all the discussions were heard. Nothing has been discussed less than 90 days. For the first time in my Senate service experience we conducted a vote by roll call in a policy revision issue.

What were my accomplishments? We moved ahead with the spring break to align with Brevard public schools. Thank you for all those suggestions to the Dr. Julie Costopoulos and a few other members at the Executive Committee as well.

We had a Faculty Salary Adjustment of 4% in September 2022 (highest recorded within the last several years), Merit Pool increase to 4% from 3% (first time), got a one-time bonus of 1.5% across the board for all faculty on December 16, 2022 due to realignment of merit increase payments being postponed to beginning by the Fall semester, approval of Clemente Center being free of charge for Faculty and Staff (effective as of February 1 2023).

Revision of the most comprehensive and impartial AFTC charter, and first voting by roll call vote for policy revisions, uploading of zoom meetings and approved minutes within maximum 48 hours after each senate meeting, Improved record keeping of

senator terms and records, improved communication with the Provost Office. Opened a very constructive dialogue which is in the best interest of the faculty, for the first time we have 2 female faculty representing us at the Executive Committee level.

I built a strong rapport with the executive Board of the Board of Trustees via serving at the President's Search Committee. Always try for constructive dialogue with the Board of Trustees as well.

Open and timely communication with the Senators and the entire faculty. I have never dismissed any email or message that came to me or disregarded them. I have addressed every single one of them.

Institutional memory has been served by improved record, keeping due to recording minutes and posting minutes of meetings to our Senate web page as they were completed by our Secretary. By the way, the minutes that are posted during my term are the most comprehensive minutes, they are like 8-10 pages and if you look at the other minutes of the past, you're going to see 2-3 pages. Obviously, we can't reflect everything that's why, having the recordings is a great asset.

Relatively more timely collection of senator lists and/or promote faculty senator elections within their departments/colleges.

Pres. Turgut goes on to say I strongly believe that Faculty Senate should be the pinnacle of integrity and democracy. I have learned what integrity is from my late father who was a three-star general in the Turkish Air Force, he defined integrity as doing the right thing even when no one is looking or watching you. That is how I tried to conduct my Faculty Senate presidency because if we comprise on integrity, ethical values, transparency, democracy, and accountability, then we will have a very dysfunctional Senate and University as a whole.

Pres. Turgut then offers a couple suggestions for my successors on my future vision. Number one, we should continue to maintain the positive and constructive dialogue with upper administration, which includes the Provost Office, President's office and the Board of Trustees. Number 2, continue to record the Senate meetings for transparency, communication, open dialogue, and institutional memory. Number 3, enhance the functionality of Faculty Senate by promoting a better balance of institutional memory and new faculty. Strive for more rotations to have more equity of opportunity to serve in the Senate and maybe taking breaks in between.

Senator Razvan Rusovici asks to squeeze in a few words, please, because my class starts. I apologize, but I would like to talk a little bit if you don't mind. Thank you.

Pres. Turgut says that I was going to address you after I am done, unlike my successors which did not allow me to speak. I was going to hand it over to you to speak, if you don't mind I am about to be done.

Senator Rusovici replies absolutely, Dr. Turgut go ahead.

Pres. Turgut says thank you and continues. Open a more transparent communication line between the Executive Committee of the Senate and the Senators, thus the entire faculty. Everything discuss, whether agreed or disagree, should not just remain with the Executive Committee. Senators have a right to know what is debated in the Executive Committee to be kept in the loop and informed. After all, Executive Committee is accountable to the Senate and the Senate is accountable to all the floor in the faculty.

Continue to promote more respectful and collegial discussion. Debate call in the Senate. I've noticed one alarming issue. I've got some feedback from some faculty as well. We have faculty stratification through tracks, titles, and ranks leading to potential future discrimination issues among the faculty. After all, academic freedom applies to all faculty in higher education, regardless of titles, tracks, and ranks, we must not allow intimidating culture via tracks, titles, and ranks. Respect for academic freedom, collegiality and cohesiveness is the formula for a successful faculty, and the Senate for Florida Tech. And in my vision statement, 2 years ago I talked about 3 pillars to success, which are revenue, rankings, and accreditation.

We cannot only focus on research grants because research contribution to our revenues only circa \$14-15 million out of a total revenue of our institution of circa \$180 million. Yes, let's focus more on research. Have a plan in place how to improve it. With realistic timelines, however, we should not do this at the expense of compromising the quality of classroom instruction, where so much of our revenue comes from. The way to do that is, by not losing one single faculty, highly qualified faculty, who performs well in classrooms and in other avenues of scholarship and service.

Being an R1 research institute is a good target, but getting to R1 means \$50-100 million in grants and graduate 100-150 PhDs every year.

In closing, once again thank you all. It has been an honor and privilege to serve as the Faculty Senate President. Next year I will continue serving in the Senate as the former Senate President, and I will continue to contribute as best as I can.

(Pres. Turgut yields the floor to the next Faculty Senate President, Senator Dr. Razvan Rusovici)

Senator Razvan Rusovici says Dr. Turgut, thank you for your service, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak for a few minutes. While your goals Dr. Turgut are admirable, in the sense that the teaching and research should be placed on the same pedestal, this has not been my past experience. I do intend to request the faculty to look really hard at themselves and try to expand tenure to everyone not just to research faculty.

In the past there were 2 tracks, and, as you said before, there's a caste system or something to that effect. The second part that I would like to address is ethics. It has been lacking at this institution, I know from a fact it has had devastating effects on the morale of the faculty, and, as I said in my candidate speech last year, I think that this ethics needs to be addressed on campus because it leads to faculty attrition. The faculty attrition, as expressed by the Provost himself has been 30% or one-third depending on who you listen to. So we want to take a very good hard look at ourselves and see what can we do about it? In my term, I intend to introduce an Ethics Committee aided by the

new Ombudsman, Dr. Grace Gamage. She is here and if she would like to speak for a couple seconds and say hello. I apologize to Dr. Gamage for not giving you enough time.

This is what I would like to implement. There's going to be a new committee on Ethics. We're going to investigate potential conflicts that will lead to other conflicts and reduced output in both teaching and research. As far as I know, many people who have left this University, according to the policies of the former administration are people that have succeeded wherever they went. I have numerous examples just from my own department. We had 3 people leave last year for various causes. All of them are fully employed, making more money, and being happier than they are now. So we have to look at ourselves and ask: What are we doing wrong? Why are we looking for these superstars when the superstars reside among us? And I agree with Dr. Turgut's assessment that teaching is important.

I would like to say the following to the incoming administration. Please value our faculty. They're second to none. They're working in an infrastructure that needs a lot of work in terms of resources, in terms of people in terms of staff. I'm very excited to welcome the new President from the University of New Orleans. I have a little bit of knowledge about his University because I reviewed their aviation program. One of the things I heard here was research. We are going to improve research the right way. I was recently offered the Dean's position at a different university. And when I went to this university, which was somewhat smaller than ours, I learned what they do for research, and its orders of magnitude beyond their capabilities. So I would like to promote our faculty, to retain our faculty, to actually request the administration institute an immediate moratorium on letting people go for various pretenses and just value ourselves. I am not going to accept a situation where we're going out and spending significant amounts of money looking for newer, fresher faculty that stay in this institution for one or two years and go because the conditions are hard.

(Senator Rusovici stops there and asks to allow Dr. Gamage to speak, but she had stepped out)

Tolga Turgut asks for a motion to adjourn.

Senator Gordan Patterson responds. Motion to adjourn.

Senator William Bowman responds. I second the motion.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03pm.

Respectively submitted,

Aaron Welters, Faculty Senate Secretary