

Florida Tech Faculty Senate

April 3, 2018

Minutes

Senators Present: W. Arrasmith (DES/10), M. Baarmand (PSS/10), J. Brenner (CE/10), K. Burke (SAC/10), P. Converse (Psych/9), H. Crawford (CS/7), I. Delgado Perez (COB/6), C. Harvey (SBA/9), A. Huser (Lib/10), M. Jensen (MAE/8), S. Jensen (COB/7), K. Johnson (OES/8), U. Jones (Aero/9), S. Kozaitis (Lib/10), B. Lail (ECE/8), D. Lelekis (SAC/9), T. Marcinkowski (DEIS/10), G. Maul (OES/8), B. Morkos (MAE/6), S. Murshid (ECE/9), A. Nag (PSS/6), N. Nesnas (Chem/10), A. Nnolim (ESD/4), B. Paulillo (Psych/6), L. Perdigao (SAC/10), C. Polson (Bio/10), R. Rusovici (MAE/9), D. Sandall (COB/10), M. Silaghi (CS/8), N. Suksawang (CCM/10), G. Tenali (Math/7), R. van Woesik (Bio/8), N. Weatherly (SBA/10), A. Welters (Math/7), B. Wheeler (Aero/10), K. Winkelmann (Chem/10), D. Yuran (SAC/8), Z. Zhou (Psych/8)

Senators Absent: O. Doule (HCDIA/1), M. Kaya (BME/5), D. LeVan (CS/4), A. Walton (COB/3)

Proxies:

Other Attendees: Dan Batcheldor (PSS), Annie Becker (COB), Gisele Bennett (Research), Marco Carvalho (COEC), Eric Guisbert (Bio), Kastro Hamed (DEIS), Vipuil Kishore (CE), Dwyane McCay (President), Eric Perlman (PSS), Ken Revay (BOT), Ted Richardson (COB), Chao Wang (Lib)

[[NOTE: The attendance report above includes the numbers present during the 2017–2018 academic year. The record is for the senate seat, so if a proxy was named or if a change in senators occurred mid-year, attendance was counted and carried over. The numbers come from the approved minutes. If there is any doubt for this year, please reflect and revise the methods of communication to the faculty senate secretary for the 2018–2019 year in announcing senator changes and in naming a proxy.**]]**

Call to Order

President Baarmand called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm. The March 27 minutes were not available for a vote, as the original file had been corrupted and Secretary Burke is in the process of recovering and reconstructing the minutes. Therefore, the vote will be postponed until the final meeting on April 17, of which Pres. Baarmand reminded everyone. He also indicated that the date was a good time to have a final vote on a tenure resolution, as it is just before the Board of Trustees meetings on April 18–20.

President's Report

Pres. Baarmand reported on the topic of Senate membership following the merger of the College of Engineering and College of Science. Provost Baloga had called a meeting for the chairs of university committees with representative memberships (e.g. Graduate Council, UGCC) as well as the Senate President back in January 2018. Following that meeting the senate membership was discussed in the February Senate meeting and was decided to table the issue until the fall semester 2018, so the merger will then be complete and all the details finalized.

The discussion of senate membership brought attention to the topic of term limits. Pres. Baarmand then read from the by-laws. While a 3-year term is referenced in by-laws and the quota of representation for the academic units, there is no mention that senators could not be reelected indefinitely. It is clear, however, that there is an election process, but no limit on the number of terms. Any assumption that there is a limit to the number of years a senator can serve is therefore incorrect, as the by-laws currently stand. Pres. Baarmand contacted the unit heads with a reminder to conduct the elections as stated, in preparation for starting in the fall semester. He's heard that some elections have occurred but asked that senators refer back to their units if they have not been done yet. Elections are to take place in March of each year, with terms beginning after the April meeting.

Sen. Arrasmith asked if the larger department size in the merged college would cause any conflicts with how senators are allocated according to the by-laws, and Pres. Baarmand responded that the topic would need to wait until the fall when all the information from the merger is available.

Dean Carvalho clarified that he had received the reminder for elections and asked if they should be carried out in the current, pre-merger department configuration, to which Pres. Baarmand replied in the affirmative.

Sen. Johnson asked if elections were necessary if none of the senators were at the end of the three-year term. Pres. Baarmand confirmed that elections were needed only if the term was coming to a close and indicated that the extra reminders were an effort to bring practice closer to what's stated in the by-laws.

Committee Reports

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

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

Sen. Brenner, chair of the **Scholarship Committee**, reported that the recipients of the faculty senate scholarships were notified; one confirmed attendance at the honors convocation and one is yet to respond. Sen. Brenner also announced that Dr. Vipul Kishore would be succeeding him as senator following the meeting.

Pres. Baarmand, chair of the **Faculty Excellence Committee**, confirmed that the recipients of faculty excellence awards have been notified of the honors convocation on April 12.

There was no **Welfare Committee** report.

Sen. Arrasmith, chair of the **Technology, Resources, and Infrastructure Committee**, reported that the faculty senate website has been moved to terminal 4 and that training would be available for him and the incoming secretary. The committee plans to have a meeting in the early fall to discuss topics it will tackle in the upcoming academic year.

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

There was no **Tenure Exploration Committee** report, other than the forthcoming item of old business.

Old Business

Topic: Resolution Regarding the Development and Implementation of a Tenure System at the Florida Institute of Technology

Pres. Baarmand followed up on the task to write a resolution, following the discussions at the March 27 senate meeting. Members of senate's executive committee and tenure exploration committee convened and put together a document for the senate to review. Copies of the resolution were distributed, and it was displayed from the projector.

He then asked for a motion to suspend Robert's Rules of Order to accommodate an open discussion, so made by Sen. Marcinkowski, seconded by Sen. Arrasmith, and approved by unanimous vote of voice.

Pres. Baarmand then began to read the resolution as distributed:

Resolution Regarding the Development and Implementation of a Tenure System at Florida Institute of Technology

Whereas, as part of their participation in the university governance, the faculty members of Florida Institute of Technology have reviewed and discussed the documents titled "A Proposed 3-Year Implementation Process for Tenure at Florida Tech" and "Proposed Florida Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Tenure Model" and provided feedback to their representatives on the Faculty Senate,

and Whereas the faculty and senior leadership of Florida Institute of Technology desire to develop and implement a tenure system,

Therefore, be it Resolved by the Faculty Senate of Florida Institute of Technology that the university senior leadership, in collaboration with faculty, shall devise a tenure system. The Faculty Senate recommends that the tenure system include the following five elements:

- (i) Establishment of a committee, which includes faculty representatives, for the purpose of the oversight and maintenance of the tenure system.
- (ii) Faculty participation in the development of tenure criteria based on the merits of faculty members' performance in teaching, research, and service that will be used to evaluate all faculty pursuing tenure.
- (iii) Pre-tenure review that assesses the faculty members' accomplishments in teaching, research, and service and prepares them for tenure review.
- (iv) Post-tenure review implemented for tenured faculty members with chronically low performance as determined by annual performance evaluations.
- (v) Continuation of the contract system (including current rank and length of contract) for current faculty who choose not to go up for tenure.

The tenure system, when finalized, shall be submitted to the Faculty Senate for review and endorsement.

Pres. Baarmand clarified that the document "A Proposed 3-Year Implementation Process for Tenure at Florida Tech" was the model presented by the administration, and that the committee described in (i) was the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee (AFTC) described in the document "Proposed Florida Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Tenure Model," which is different than the current University Promotion Committee and proposed University Promotion (and Tenure) Committee. The AFTC will ensure a healthy tenure system by overseeing adjustments that need to be made during the rollout, ensuring procedural matters, and managing appeals issues.

Sen. Maul asked if the AFTC would be made up of only senators, and Pres. Baarmand replied not necessarily.

Dr. Eric Perlman explained the intention that the AFTC be a separate committee than those involved in considering individual faculty for tenure. For one, there will be grievances that arise from the tenure decisions, including termination. Second, is the oversight of academic freedom, which the exploration committee considered a different issue than issues of promotion and tenure and thus should be a separate body.

Pres. Baarmand continued by highlighting the keywords "faculty participation," which are peppered throughout the resolution. He stressed that best practices at almost all institutions of higher education involve promotion and tenure as the business of the faculty. Faculty should evaluate the work of colleagues. It was announced at the last meeting that colleges were developing promotion and tenure criteria, so those will be distributed to faculty for feedback.

Pres. McCay suggested the addition of the word "college," for the tenure criteria, as it will differ unit by unit, to which Pres. Baarmand agreed was a good point.

Sen. Nesnas, however, was concerned that faculty participation was broadly put, as there are administrators who carry faculty titles and lines. What happens when the committees are made up of only department heads and associate deans?

Pres. Baarmand understood the concern but suggested that an assumption of good faith was warranted, and Pres. McCay indicated that his view of faculty participation was the 9-month faculty; even though administrators would be involved, they would not count as faculty representation in the committee. He then asked, rhetorically, if making the distinction in the resolution was necessary, would they need to specify full time faculty too as to not confuse with part time faculty?

Pres. McCay then moved on to the next point, pre-tenure review, advising that the purpose be for setting goals, as much as it is for assessing accomplishments, to ensure faculty are on track. Pres. Baarmand believed that was implied but agreed that it could be added to the resolution, and Sen. van Woesik concurred that goals were as important as accomplishments to the pre-tenure review.

Dr. Eric Perlman asked if the annual reviews would be connected to the pre-tenure review, as they are usually done by the unit head, and Pres. Baarmand replied that the pre-tenure review would be done by a separate committee in the 3rd year. Pres. McCay added that there ought to be two pre-tenure reviews, one at the beginning and the other after the 3rd year, and that the committee needs to be made up of faculty familiar with the tenure process.

Pres. Baarmand indicated that the Faculty Senate Plan called for the establishment of a pre-tenure committee, but after the conference it seemed that would make for too many committees. Pres. McCay responded that it would not have to be a big committee but should be done within the college. Sen. van Woesik believed the mentoring intervention would be an important factor in the faculty member's success, and Pres. Baarmand supposed it could be tied to the mentoring programs already in place.

Sen. Arrasmith pointed out that the conversation was more appropriate for future faculty and wanted to know if pre-tenure review could play a role in helping existing faculty determine if they should go up for tenure or not. Dr. McCay stated that this was a reasonable expectation of the pre-tenure review process.

Sen. Marcinkowski recalled that in previous discussions on the pre-tenure review process that the promotion and tenure committee at the university level could determine faculty in each college to serve in this advisory role, but the details would have to unfold over time based on how the implementation process goes.

Pres. McCay, however, cautioned that from prior experience the multi-college support procedure tends to confuse the situation rather than clarify it, as criteria will be different. The pre-tenure review needs to be handled by a group of peers.

Pres. Baarmand continued with the topic of post-tenure review, a mechanism to ensure faculty remain productive. This process will occur only in response to poor annual evaluations, as Pres. McCay suggested during the conference; however, it could lead to termination as is done in a contract system.

Dr. Kastro Hamed asked how often post-tenure review should occur in response to annual evaluations. Pres. Baarmand replied that the original idea was every 7 years, but Pres. McCay stressed that the administration would not support as long as 7 years.

Sen. Marcinkowski reported that the tenure exploration committee had looked to the University of Virginia as an example, where the post-tenure review will kick in when there is chronically low performance in 3 out of 5 years. While not stated in the resolution, since the committee did not want to tie in timeframes, the idea was discussed. Pres. Baarmand reiterated that those details will be worked out following the resolution.

With this example, Sen. Nesnas pointed out that there were now two bars—one to achieve tenure and the other to indicate low performance; however, neither is clearly articulated in terms of criteria. Pres. Baarmand indicated that the system would not be static and would develop over time in response to the annual performance evaluations, which would be something departments could adopt for this purpose.

Pres. Baarmand moved on to the next point, the continuation of the contract system for current faculty. After many discussions, the committee learned that many faculty wish to stay productive in all three areas—teaching, research, and service—in their current load distribution, to retain the dignity of their earned status at the university and the viability for comparable employment at other institutions. Having heard the opinion of many faculty members, Pres. McCay suggested adding rank, length of contract, and title to this point of the resolution. Sen. Matt Jensen wondered if pay be added as well, and Pres. McCay replied that it was too much detail for a resolution.

Sen. Nesnas asked if it was implied that those not receiving tenure will keep all aspects of their old positions, and Pres. Baarmand answered no, that this statement was only for those who *choose* to stay in current system. With that response, Sen. Nesnas highlighted that choosing to pursue tenure would carry significant risk.

Sen. Perdigao asked for confirmation that there would still be a promotion track for faculty who choose to remain on the contract system, and Pres. Baarmand stated that “continuation of current contract system” implied that.

With these questions, Pres. McCay took the opportunity to address the senate directly. He recognized the committee for the good job done on drafting the resolution, which he believed had all the necessary elements and made good points.

Pres. McCay continued by expressing the need for a strong system if tenure were to be introduced, which he believed was crucial in today's world where many experts, in response to a series of assessments done across the country, do not believe private, non-elite institutions will survive. If FIT can reach the top 100, it will be among the top 30 private institutions. Tenure is the major occurrence needed to propel FIT forward. Peer rating, a poll of administrators at other institutions, is a telling piece of the US News rankings. A '5' net rating is the best, '4' is good, '3' is mediocre, '2' is troubling, and '1' is an indication to close. Currently, FIT nets 2.3 from peer institutions, which isn't even mediocre in their eyes. FIT produces graduates who are just as good, but the peer institutions do not believe that, and it hurts our institution. Many foreign governments will not sponsor international students unless the institution is ranked in the top 100. There must be a major, impactful event to move forward. While FIT ranks well in other areas, the peer rating breaks us. Something special must be done to draw in the attention of our peers. FIT is the only institution in the top 274 without tenure, and some are considering a removal of tenure. If we introduce tenure with a *good* system now, we'll get an editorial in the chronical. That would be great publicity and they will know who we are. It's not about me, or any individual, it's all for our institution.

Pres. McCay then introduced Dr. Gisele Bennett, the new Senior VP for Research, as an example. When announcing her new position at FIT, her colleagues at Georgia Tech asked why she would leave for an institution without tenure. That's like a community college. Some faculty question tenure, but this is an opportunity to show the Board of Trustees, the alumni, the parents, and everyone else how great we are. This is the only way to move the needle away from 2.3. FIT has great faculty, and while other things like major awards can help, tenure can help us climb to 3.0. Pres. McCay cited some relevant alumni, including CEOs, college presidents, warship commanders, and revolutionary software designers. He agreed that risk was involved, and that some faculty could lose their jobs, but with this initiative will come new blood and opportunity to recruit and hire a handful of renowned full professors with tenure.

Following Pres. McCay's appeal to the faculty senate, Pres. Baarmand read the last sentence of the resolution, which emphasizes that the tenure plans will come back to the senate for endorsement.

As his parting words, Pres. McCay acknowledged that it would be easier to bring an endorsement to the BOT than a full plan; it is scary to vote on a system, but an endorsement is easier.

Pres. McCay left the meeting.

Pres. Baarmand asked senators to take the resolution to the respective units for feedback in preparation of a vote at the April 17 extra senate meeting, which will be done by paper ballot. He then opened the floor for comments and questions.

FROM THE FLOOR

Sen. Jones wondered if it would be helpful to have another poll of the faculty to see if the support for tenure has changed following all the discussions, plans, and motion for a resolution.

Pres. Baarmand indicated that the 3-year plan proposed by the administration will be revised in accordance with the outcome of the conference. Some provisions, like the 50% cap, will be removed. Of course, it needs to go back the administration for their review, but it can be sent to all faculty as well, so they can see how the skeleton of a plan is shaping up. The tenure committee should be able to distribute these revised documents soon, so they can be part of the discussions surrounding the resolution.

Sen. Arrasmith added that the intent is to make the plans consistent with the resolution, which encompasses items in the faculty's favor. The resolution is needed for the BOT, but the plans must reflect the resolution and will have a longer timeline before returning to the senate. We have to have faith that the protections placed in the resolution will help guide the continual development of the plans.

Sen. Sherry Jensen had a question regarding no. 2, that "participation" could be viewed as passive. She recommended something stronger.

Pres. Baarmand echoed Sen. Arrasmith in believing some faith in the system was needed. Once there is an equitable collection of reasonable people, discussion can occur without anyone forcing opinions on others.

In response to Sen. Sherry Jensen's question, Sen. Burke recalled that "shared governance" was the language in early drafts, and Pres. Baarmand clarified that the language was replaced with "faculty participation" after the conference committee, since the administration was concerned the BOT would equate "shared governance" with shared management of the university.

Sen. Matt Jensen, however, wondered if that was all the more reason to have a stronger word. Should the faculty be cautious if the administration is particular about removing that word? Pres. Baarmand considered promotion and tenure the business of faculty, and, while the administration is responsible for oversight, it is up to the faculty to promote our colleagues. If a system comes back to the senate that does not have the element of faculty participation, we will have the recommendation of the resolution as a mechanism to address it.

Sen. Murshid was skeptical that the system would really qualify as tenure since one could be fired within 7 years of earning.

Sen. Matt Jensen referenced Dean Carvalho's presentation at the March 27 meeting, where the criteria for the College of Engineering and Science were being built from data with minimal involvement of the faculty, to which Pres. Baarmand clarified that Dean Carvalho was not finished with the process and will present the criteria to faculty for review at a later stage. Pres. Baarmand believed faculty involvement from the beginning was preferable but pointed out that the deans are aware that faculty feedback is necessary. Sen. Jensen, however, was not sure if all the deans were involving faculty in the process the same way.

Sen. Winkelmann reported that he had met with Dean Carvalho last week. Indeed, the data collection was performed by the administrators, but the second stage will include sharing a draft of the criteria with a couple faculty members from each department in the future College of Engineering and Science. This small group of about a dozen faculty will review the initial draft and make suggestions, then the criteria will be released to all faculty for feedback.

Sen. Tenali asked who had picked the faculty from each department and Sen. Matt Jensen wondered if program chairs were being counted as representative faculty from the department, and to these questions Pres. Baarmand reminded everyone that the resolution creates a tool for the senate to have a say before deciding to endorse the criteria

Sen. Silaghi asked if additional suggestions for the resolution could be gathered from the rest of the faculty when consulting with the units, and Pres. Baarmand stressed that if edits were to be made something had to be finished at the end of the meeting so senators could present it to the units.

Sen. Nesnas wanted to return to the point raised by Sen. Murshid. While having a post-tenure review addresses abuses of the tenure system for faculty, having department heads responsible for deeming what is "chronically low performance" for tenured faculty, as part of annual evaluation, opens the door for other abuses. At some point, someone's productivity may dip.

Sen. Matt Jensen asked for clarification if voting to endorse the resolution was also voting to have a tenure system in place in the fall of 2018. Continuing that thought, Sen. Pedigao understood that the next step would be to create and review the tenure system but pointed out that no process for that step had been determined. To add yet another unclear matter, Pres. Baarmand indicated that the BOT were also discussing whether a BOT vote was necessary or just an endorsement to proceed.

Sen. Silaghi asked if a competing resolution could be drafted without, or with modified wording for, the post-tenure review, but Sen. Arrasmith worried it would never be accepted by the BOT and Pres. Baarmand believed the faculty could not be a unified body with two resolutions.

Sen. Winkelmann returned to the timeline; there is no mention in the resolution of when tenure will be implemented and if we are bringing a second endorsement to the BOT in October, obviously the tenure system cannot be implemented for the fall 2018 semester. Some details may not be realized until the following spring. With the 3-year implementation plan proposed by the administration, with the first year involving full professors, the second associate professors, etc., there will likely be further developments throughout the 3-year process. Pres. Baarmand indicated that that had been his point exactly in the system being dynamic with faculty participation to the extent that this senate body can push for it.

Sen. Delgado Perez referenced a comment Provost Baloga had made at the last meeting about faculty with an administrative function. The resolution and plans describe 9-month faculty, but what is intended for 12-month faculty with administrative roles who also teach and have other faculty roles? Pres. Baarmand replied that the administration's plan has administrative faculty going up for tenure first, but only for their faculty role, not for their administrative role.

Sen. Rusovici asked if there was any chance the BOT might delay the process, to which Mr. Ken Revay, chair of the BOT's Academic Affairs Committee, replied that there was no reason to delay with the plan to receive the endorsement and general plan on April 18 and then vote on April 20. The timetable, he said, allows for everyone to proceed before a full vote in October.

Sen. Lail highlighted that the resolution had a different purpose. The faculty have seen the plans from the senate committee and from the administration and have questions about them. The resolution states that the faculty have enough interest to move forward in continuing to develop the plans. The bulleted items consolidate points in the plans to guide the process of development. We are simply endorsing to proceed or not to proceed, not voting on the plans.

Sen. Nesnas returned to the suggestion made by Sen. Jones, wondering if there was time to make a poll so senators can see how their units fall in comparison. Senators will still be the ones voting but will be able to see the resolution from the perspective of their units if there is a mismatch. Sen. Nesnas also suggested changing "low" performance to "negligible," since low was a random value for comparison and negligent was a qualifier that one was not carrying out their duties. That language, he believed, was used in other places in this context. Protection from negligence is the real reason some institutions began to adopt a post-tenure review. Pres. Baarmand, however, stressed that the punitive aspect was not the sole purpose of the post-tenure review. It also provides remedies to improve the faculty member's performance. But Sen. Nesnas did not believe that a system with a punitive post-tenure review due to "low performance" was tenure. Sen. Johnson agreed, stating that the policies for post-tenure review at

other institutions center on the language “with cause,” not low publications, and Dr. Vipuil Kilshore added that the post-tenure review brought risks, but not benefits.

Sen. Winkelmann reminded everyone that from discussion with Pres. McCay, and tenure system the administration would support would have to have a post-tenure review system to address chronically low performance.

Sen. Matt Jensen asked if the resolution was for Pres. McCay or for the senate, to which Sen. Winkelmann responded that the resolution was put forward by the senate as support for a tenure system. If the resolution is not strongly supported, according to Sen. Winkelmann, it will demonstrate to the BOT that the faculty are unsure. There is hope that if Pres. McCay is passionate about tenure and if the resolution passes, that the BOT will be convinced it is what the university needs.

Sen. Matt Jensen then asked if there could be a vote to incorporate some of the changes that were suggested, rather than default to leaving them in. He wanted a formal process for making the changes to the resolution. Sen. Kozaitis wondered if poor could be substituted for “low,” and Sen. Morkos asked if a separate vote could be made for that one word. Pres. Baarmand, however, thought that any word used would need to be defined.

Dr. Eric Guisbert noted that the post-tenure review would be a two-step process and asked if the decision would be granted by a committee of administrators or a faculty committee, to which Pres. Baarmand emphasized faculty representation in the committee was critical. These matters should be handled by faculty, he continued, the way they are considered best practices at other institutions. But the administration wants to have some oversight of this, so we have to allow for committees that include representatives from both parties. He did not see it as a two-stage process. Dr. Guisbert, however, cited that administrators would be handling the annual reviews that would trigger the post-tenure review. He asked if the language could be changed to specify that the post-tenure review would be done by faculty committee. Pres. Baarmand reminded everyone that the committee would have to include administrators as well.

Sen. Nag then pointed out that there was no mention of a committee in bullet #4, so no way to get a sense of faculty participation in the post-tenure review committee. Sen. Perdigao suggested paralleling the language with #3, so as to avoid confusion on the makeup of the committees.

Sen. Arrasmith returned to the metrics of performance that the administration would be using in post-tenure review, highlighting that there were clear differences between low and negligent. Sen Weatherly agreed that the degree would be based on the unit heads’ determination on an annual basis. Teaching metrics, he added, would be even

more subjective, and with that Dr. Dan Batcheldor pointed out that the Teaching Council was reviewing metrics.

Mr. Ken Revay drew a comparison. If he had a chronically low performer, as a manager, he would have to put a performance plan in place. While the employee could be up for termination, hopefully, there would be an opportunity to remedy the performance. It will be clear to the employee ahead of time what the expectations are for improvement. The process is an emergency out.

Pres. Baarmand added that there would also be an appeals process because anything put in place has the potential for abuse and the faculty cannot set rules for avoiding abuse in the efforts to make sure faculty are productive.

Sen. Welters believed that if the tenure system is not strong enough to protect faculty, then there is an imbalance of power. If the language cannot be changed in a way to balance power, then faculty do not have true input and have to withhold opinions. Sen. Jensen found this an astute point, noting that the sharing of opinions changed noticeably after the administration had departed the room and he worried that committees made up of faculty and administrators would result in the same reluctance to share viewpoints. Sen. Welters added that if faculty don't believe they have the power to make any changes to the wording, there will be no good faith in moving forward.

In response to these concerns, Pres. Baarmand reminded everyone of the role of the AFTC as defined in the resolution. If one cannot fight for faculty interests, they do not belong in the committee. There is no reason to withhold opinions when the administration is in the room. Sen. Winkelmann added that the role of the AFTC is maintenance of the tenure system and if tenured faculty feel concerned about expressing opinions, then that would be an issue that demands the attention of the AFTC. The plan for tenure will not be perfect, but the resolution is full of faculty participation and shared governance, far greater than what currently exists. It is a vast improvement.

Sen. Welters agreed and commended the committee on the job well done with the resolution but asked if senators really wanted to move forward on a tenure system if they thought the language of the resolution was too weak, but were afraid to strengthen it.

Sen. Winkelmann assured that the faculty representatives were not afraid to criticize items in the administration's 3-year implementation plan. The resolution is the where those discussions ended. We cannot go back on the process of compromise.

Sen. Murshid then asked if it was indeed the case that the senate was to vote on the resolution as stated, take it or leave it, but Pres. Baarmand redirected to the point of the resolution: to ensure faculty participation in each committee.

Sen. Arrasmith also reassured that there had been a lot of back and forth with the administration. The representatives for the senate advocated to get things in the resolution and the administration did compromise on some points. It would be foolish to believe faculty can name all the terms at this point. The administration needs to know they can still manage just as much as we need to know we have a say in these matters and are active participants. The plans will come back to the faculty.

Dr. Vipuil Kilshore asked about the October vote among the BOT. Will the criteria come back to the senate before then? Will anything be implemented in fall 2018?

Pres. Baarmand confirmed that, if approved, the core skeleton of the plan would be put into place, but many details regarding the criteria will develop in tandem with the 3-year implementation process. Whenever the system is put together and everyone feels it is complete, it should come back to the senate. We will not have a summer meeting, unless a special one is called.

Sen. Matt Jensen asked if the senate endorses the resolution, but does not like the resulting details, can the tenure system be voted down. Pres. Baarmand recalled that Pres. McCay had suggested that a tenure system could be created just for new hires, or, perhaps, the whole idea will be dropped. And with that response, Sen. Matt Jensen supposed the vote in 2 weeks would be the best chance to shoot down a system the faculty do not like. But Pres. Baarmand disagreed; he wondered how anyone could predict at this point. Sen. Kozaitis believed it would be better than the current system, even if it is not as wonderful as the faculty desire it would be a step in the right direction. If we stay with the current system, we will have the same problems driving the fears of this discussion.

Sen Murshid agreed, believing that there is still the unknown with the current system, and Sen. Yuran worried that the efforts of the committees and these discussions would be a waste of time if the resolution is shot down before even trying to shape a tenure plan. Sen. Nesnas considered whether a quick single yes/no poll of the faculty could be done to anticipate the risk of the resolution not passing.

Sen. Winkelmann cited the senate as representative body, advising that the senators perform their duty by bringing the resolution to the respective units for feedback. There cannot be a referendum of the entire faculty to perform this step of governance, as only half of the faculty may respond.

Sen. Murshid found unknowns with both systems, as the current system is being remapped. At least with the proposed tenure resolution, faculty participation is stated. Sen. Nolim agreed, believing that without some faith in the system tenure will not work. While faculty may not like the prospect of a post-tenure review, there will be no support from the administration moving forward without it, and the faculty will get nowhere.

Sen. Matt Jensen asked if there could be a vote by rollcall, so we have a record of how senators/units voted. Sen. Winkelmann reminded everyone that he would assume his role as faculty senate at the April 17 meeting and suggested the option to vote by rollcall be brought up then since there may not be a quorum at this point in the current meeting and Robert's Rules were suspended for this discussion. With that, Sen. Sherry Jensen requested a reminder that senators are to vote as a representative of their respective units.

Sen. Arrasmith warned of the danger in voting from a position where many have requested information that is still to be determined, and Sen. Winkelmann cautioned the fixation on criteria, post-tenure review, and the low bars, because changes were going to happen with or without tenure, as Dean Carvalho indicated that the new criteria were also for promotion, irrespective of tenure. He agreed that the proposed tenure system resembled the contract system but highlighted the addition of faculty participation in oversight.

Dr. Vipuil Kilshore asked if there will be two separate sets of criteria for tenure and promotion, and Sen. Winkelmann confirmed that would be the case for current faculty, but future faculty would have just one set of criteria.

In an effort to close the meeting, Pres. Baarmand summarized a few word choice suggestions that had been proposed such as the change from low to negligent (or poor), the retention of contracts in title, rank, and load, and the parallel structure to the committees described in points #3 and #4. He emphasized the need for senators to get the opinions from the units, no matter who is in the room, and Sen. Perdigao reminded everyone that in the discussions with units to make it clear that the vote is for the resolution, not for the two plans that have been discussed. Sen. Lail added that the fight for faculty participation has been made and that focus should be on endorsing the key elements of the resolution, as preserving those items will be the strategy moving forward with the plans, not just waiting on the details. Pres. Baarmand believed there is goodwill from the administration to move forward with the resolution. Compared to five years ago, the faculty have much more impact. We should take this as a positive development and continue to build on it without resorting to us vs. them scenarios.

With those closing remarks, the meeting adjourned at 5:23 pm.

Respectful submitted,

Kevin R. Burke, Faculty Senate Secretary