**Florida Tech Faculty Senate**

February 20, 2018

**Minutes**

**Senators Present:** W. Arrasmith (DES), M. Baarmand (PSS), J. Brenner (CE), K.

Burke (SAC), P. Converse (Psych), H. Crawford (CS), I. Delgado Perez (COB), C. Harvey (SBA), A. Huser (Lib), M. Jensen (MAE), K. Johnson (OES), S. Kozaitis (Lib), B. Lail (ECE), D. Lelekis (SAC), T. Marcinkowski (DEIS), G. Maul (OES), B. Morkos (MAE), S. Murshid (ECE), A. Nag (PSS), N. Nesnas (Chem), L. Perdigao (SAC), C. Polson (Bio), R. Rusovici (MAE), D. Sandall (COB), N. Suksawang (CCM), R. van Woesik (Bio), N. Weatherly (SBA), B. Wheeler (Aero), K. Winkelmann (Chem), Z. Zhou (Psych)

**Senators Absent:** O. Doule (HCDIA), S. Jensen (COB), U. Jones (Aero), M. Kaya (BME), D. LeVan (CS), A. Nnolim (ExSt), B. Paulillo (Psych), M. Silaghi (CS), G. Tenali (Math), A. Walton (COB), A. Welters (Math), D. Yuran (SAC)

**Other Attendees:** Ugur Abdulla (Math), Richard Aronson (Bio), Monica Baloga (Provost), Daniel Batcheldor (PSS), Annie Becker (COB), Raymond Bonhomme (Provost), Marco Carvalho (COEC), Victoria Dunbar (COA), Amitabh Dutta (COB), Vanessa Edkins (Psych), Dwayne McCay (Pres), Rian Mehta (COA), Korhan Oyman (COA), Jignya Patel (COB), Ken Revay (BOT), Ted Richardson (COB), Tim Rosser (COA), Chelsea Stripling (Lib), Chao Wang (Lib), Donna Wilt (COA)

**Call to Order**

President Baarmand called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm and asked for a motion to approve the minutes of February 6’s meeting; a motion was made by Senator Marcinkowski and seconded by Senator Arrasmith.

The February 6 Minutes (no. 132) were approved by unanimous vote of voice.

**Announcements**

Pres. Baarmand reminded faculty to submit nominations for Faculty Senate President and Secretary—he had received only one to date. Nominations may be emailed to him and to Secretary Burke before the March 13 meeting, when the vote will take place. Nominations will also be accepted from the floor on that date.

Pres. Baarmand then addressed the recent shooting in Parkland, FL. Some faculty members have inquired about protocols for student safety. He emailed Provost Baloga and she will follow up with Kevin Graham, Head of Security, regarding any procedures and trainings.

**Special Business**

Pres. Baarmand turned to the Tenure Committee’s guidelines report. He noted that the original plan was to have a draft of a Faculty Tenure Model for this meeting, but after some conversations with the administration and consideration for the deans’ role in the process, today’s report includes recommended guidelines for the Faculty Tenure Model that the committee built from the survey results. Involving the deans and administration at this stage will allow for more active participation and fruitful discussion, and is the reason for their attendance at today’s meeting. He also hoped the dialogue will expedite the process in meeting an August 2018 deadline. Of course, faculty senate meetings are always open to all faculty, certainly deans, but in this case a special invitation was extended.

Pres. Baarmand then gave the floor to Sen. Sandall, chair of the Faculty Tenure Exploration Committee, who distributed the four-page document of guidelines**.**

Sen. Sandall reviewed the key parameters of the report. The recommended guidelines are based on the two surveys distributed to the faculty, and predominately on the second survey. Unlike the survey report presented at the last meeting, these guidelines address topics where a majority of the faculty had an opinion; therefore, the document does not include everything asked in the surveys.

Sen. Sandall read through the guidelines presented in the document, which were broken into five sections, noting that the 73% of the faculty who took the second survey were a strong representation. He emphasized the committee’s goal of demonstrating that the guidelines reflected majority faculty support. **[Please refer to the attached report].**

Pres. Baarmand then asked for a motion to approve the committee’s guidelines for building the Faculty Tenure Model, so made by Sen. Marcinkowski and seconded by Sen. Winkelmann.

Before the motion was open to discussion, some modifications to the motion were considered: Pres. McCay requested modifying the motion to specify that these are *recommended* guidelines, Pres. Baarmand suggested that the motion clarify that these are faculty (not administration) guidelines, and Sen. Marcinkowski voiced a preference for *proposed* guidelines over *recommended* guidelines. Pres. McCay agreed to Sen. Marcinkowski’s revision and added that he wanted to ensure the faculty knew the proposed guidelines were made from the faculty.

Sens. Marcinkowski and Winkelmann accepted the suggested amendments. The revised motion on the floor stood as an approval of the Faculty Tenure Exploration Committee’s proposed guidelines as the basis for building the Faculty Tenure Model.

Discussion then commenced regarding the purpose and outcome of the motion. Sen. Winkelmann asked if the committee was entertaining suggestions to modify the document. Sen. van Woesik questioned the word “guidelines,” since the document was based only on survey results and there were no alternative models to consider when voting on the motion. Pres. Baarmand reiterated that the original plan to present a Faculty Tenure Model at this meeting had changed and that these guidelines were the basis for producing that model, which can be discussed and adjusted. Pres. McCay agreed with Sen. van Woesik’s concern that the senate was being asked to accept guidelines that are based on survey results.

The focus of the conversation then shifted to which parameters were included in the guidelines. Pres. Baarmand emphasized that policies, by-laws, and definitions would come later, in the Faculty Tenure Model, and therefore are not included in these proposed guidelines. Sen. Arrasmith recalled that issues of policy had not been discussed yet in the senate and would need to be before putting a model together. Provost Baloga questioned the intent behind clicks in a survey and what meaning they lent to the consideration of grandfathering of full professors and of instituting a substantive, post-tenure review.

In response to the questions raised about the purpose of the motion, Sen. Marcinkowski cited Robert’s Rules of Order, which dictate that a motion should be made and seconded before discussion. This had been done. He then offered the alternative to suspend Robert’s Rules of Order for a more informal discussion, but the motion currently on the floor would need to be addressed before pursuing a new one. He then qualified the intent behind the motion: while support for some measures was not entirely clear from the 73% of the faculty who responded to the survey, there are some guidelines that reflect substantial support. The committee, therefore, does not view themselves as the driver of these guidelines, but as a contributor to the discussion with the goal of presenting the will of the faculty as evidenced by the surveys.

Sen. Winkelmann observed that the document contained no discussion, so he proposed gathering feedback from the senate’s discussion and considering adjustments. As an example, he suggested a modification for an area that was not addressed in the survey, the option for faculty to go up for tenure early when having met the criteria and with the support of the dean. Sen. Nesnas cited the language “up to 6 years” in the document for current assistant professors who opt for the tenure track, but Sen. Winkelmann requested that the verbiage be added for the assistant professors who are hired into the tenure system. Currently, a 1+3+3 contract timetable is all that is defined.

Sen. Perdigao noted that there is confusion about the timeline to promotion across colleges; some colleges specify that candidates can only go up for promotion starting in their sixth year at rank while others allow candidates to enter the process earlier. She encouraged consistency. Pres. Baarmand agreed that this was an ongoing issue and that inconsistencies are hurting faculty, but Sen. Nag noted that current contracts sometimes include agreements that permit faculty to go up for promotion early. Provost Baloga confirmed that it is common to grant time toward promotion when faculty are hired out of other academic institutions. This is typical for FIT regarding promotions and also for tenure-granting institutions.

Sen. Weatherly shifted the conversation toward faculty status. The School of Behavior Analysis, for example, has a program with standard faculty in terms of rank, but these faculty are on renewable,12-month contracts. This makes them ineligible for the standard 3-to-5 year appointments of most academic faculty. He was not sure how to bring their status into the discussion, but knew their eligibility for a tenure system needed to be considered, since they do not have an administrative unit.

Sen. Arrasmith, however, cautioned against writing all the variant scenarios into the guidelines and felt that the senate needed to reach an agreement on a basic set of simple guidelines first. Pres. Baarmand agreed that guidelines should be more generic and added that it was impossible to consider all the variations until reaching the stage of the model, but Sen. Arrasmith wondered if the guidelines were sufficient. Pres. Baarmand acknowledged that the scope was limited by the survey and suggested they consider adding major points that anyone felt were left out.

That suggestion then opened the door for questions over whether tenure criteria should be included at this stage. Sen. van Woesik cited tenure documents at other universities, which outline specific criteria that reflect incredible levels of productivity. He believed promotion and tenure were two different things that needed serious consideration of criteria. He also considered the survey results an inadequate basis for the criteria since 2/3 of the faculty taking the survey were in a position to benefit from automatic grandfathering.

Pres. Baarmand disagreed with a presumption that faculty would be more self-serving than attentive to the best interests for the university. He reiterated the committee’s objective to put the majority opinion of the faculty forward as a basis for building the model and that issues of policy would be handled at a later stage.

Sen. Winkelmann addressed the motivation behind automatic grandfathering. Florida Tech could have had tenure many years ago, and if it did there would have been promotion requirements appropriate for faculty responsibilities in the past. The promotion requirements have changed over time as the university has advanced. Just because many view tenure requirements for today’s institution as being more stringent, does not mean that faculty promoted in previous times should not have been promoted or recognized for their contribution to advancing the institution. Most schools have tenure, so it is unfair to presume everyone has more stringent requirements. Our promotion criteria have changed. What it took to be promoted to associate professor 30 years ago may be different now; but, whether we had tenure or not, we would still have full and associate professors from that past promotion model. For grandfathering, we are considering people who have been here a long time and to whom Florida Tech has made a clear statement that they are valuable. Otherwise these faculty members would not be here. That is what tenure means: a signal from the university that they are worth keeping. Is it now necessary to evaluate someone who has been promoted and renewed for 30 years and is only a few years from retirement? It would be a waste of everyone’s time to evaluate each faculty member with a longstanding record of promotion and contract renewal.

Pres. Baarmand restated a point he had made to Pres. McCay at lunch: If we grandfather all full professors there may be a few not so deserving, but that’s the price we pay for implementing the change. There is no perfect system. To that end, we have to accept that maybe a few people less deserving will get grandfathered into the system, but they will not be around forever. The positions will go away.

Pres. McCay did not find it logical to equate promotion with tenure. The former, he specified, is more about raises and retaining faculty for a contract renewal and the latter is a more emphatic, long-term commitment. The outside perception is that tenure is a job for life and that is the biggest concern for the Board of Trustees. Once you start grandfathering associate and full professors, you are making a commitment for a very long period of time. We better be right about it. He indicated that if he were the judge, some full and associate professors would not be tenured. To accept the bad with the good defeats the idea of being a great university.

Pres. Baarmand wondered if it were even possible to undergo the transition without some less deserving faculty getting tenured and Sen. Rusovici cited procedures in the *Faculty Handbook* that already address how to manage faculty whose load should be adjusted due to performance.

Pres. McCay hoped that wouldn’t be the case for tenured faculty. The promotion criteria are not criteria for a lifetime commitment, so criteria for tenure need to be reconsidered to ensure long-term quality. He urged caution in how the criteria for promotion and for tenure are presented.

Sen. Winkelmann saw challenges in making comparisons with what is done at other institutions. In most tenure systems, faculty going up for promotion to full professor would already have tenure. The notion that current full professors are underperforming when their contracts are regularly renewed is difficult to understand.

Provost Baloga clarified that the contract renewals do not necessarily signal that Florida Tech wants to keep them indefinitely. The contacts allow the administration to best utilize faculty load. Some faculty just teach, so if they were not to get tenure the alternative would be a teaching track. We have some associate and full professors who are in their current positions because they provide additional service or teaching to satisfy the contract.

Provost Baloga then asked what tenure meant to the faculty and if they considered all faculty tenure-worthy.

Sen. Winkelmann believed it was a commitment from the university to the faculty member’s position, a recognition and mark of approval for the individual’s ability to serve the university in whatever capacity they are assigned to do. And he equated that meaning to how Florida Tech was already retaining faculty through promotions and regular contract renewals.

Sen. Nesnas observed that participants in the discussion were approaching tenure from two distinct facets, some considering prestige and others considering value. A faculty member’s value to the university may be unquestionable, but may not be considered prestigious at other institutions.

Pres. McCay considered this an excellent point of distinction. He recalled the nature of Florida Tech as an undergraduate teaching institution when he first arrived, but argued that to become a great research university faculty needed to excel in both the classroom and the lab. Institutions we aspire to be produce ten times the amount of research with faculty who also teach. He agreed that a serious process was needed to consider all full professors, but not everyone should be tenured. There needs to be significant scholarly activity.

Sen. Burke cited differences in the conditions for tenured and tenure-track faculty at the aspirational institutions, namely the course loads, use of graduate assistants, and opportunities for pre-tenure sabbaticals, and wondered if there were plans to compete in those areas, to which Pres. McCay responded they were goals that would be achieved one step at a time.

Pres. Baarmand cautioned Florida Tech establishing its own brand of tenure. People know what tenure means in comparison with other top 200 institutions.

Dr. Annie Becker then asked why criteria were not discussed in the guidelines and indicated she could not see in the document where it states what tenure should mean and who should have it. Sen. Sandall noted that criteria would not be decided by the senate but at the college level. He agreed that the conversation needs to begin, but it will have to come through a different channel. Pres. McCay then added that the tenure criteria should not change for associate and for full professors; he believes tenure should go to anyone who meets the criteria regardless of rank.

Sen. Winkelmann concurred that tenure criteria should support aspirational goals, but encouraged a consideration of the current state of the university, notably an institution that is 88% tuition driven and therefore more indicative of a teaching than a research university. He asked that the tenure system account for the many full professors who were hired with assignments, resources, and expectations of a teaching institution and whose work has enabled Florida Tech’s advancement over the years.

Dr. Annie Becker, however, questioned how this would help Florida Tech advance further and Sen. Winkelmann responded that the criteria would change slowly along with the university as it moves away from heavy teaching and service loads toward more research.

Provost Baloga agreed that there should be a reward system and promotion opportunities for those faculty, but held that the tenure track system should be different in order to move the university forward.

Sen. Rusovici pointed out that a lot of full professors had brought money to the university, even if they did not fit this tenure model.

Seeing the divergent views of tenure established, Sen. Nesnas shifted to procedural issues. He asked if Pres. McCay would elaborate on the abbreviated format he envisioned for full professors seeking tenure.

Pres. McCay described an initial phase of establishing a core group, which likely would include deans and members of the administration. Then, he continued, full professors would submit an abbreviate dossier that could be prepared in a few weeks, including 3–10 pages that summarize publications, citations, and courses and include student and peer evaluations. Some faculty may be given the opportunity to resubmit the dossier within a year. He believed a handful of full professors would not get tenure, since they had never been involved in research, emphasizing that tenure had to account for all three areas of teaching, research, and service. He acknowledged that each college would have its own criteria. Following this step, Pres. McCay believed the core group would be followed by a tenure committee to handle the applications and make recommendations.

Sen. Nesnas asked if Pres. McCay viewed tying tenure to promotion and Pres. McCay replied that faculty in the future would go up for tenure and promotion to associate professor at the same time, as is done at other institutions, and faculty hired as associate professors would go up for tenure within the first year. He believed it would take 2-3 years, however, to complete the process with the existing faculty who did not want to stay on the contract system.

Pres. Baarmand asked if the administration had a tenure model drafted. Pres. McCay indicated that his main responsibility was to bring a model to the Board of Trustees, but he recommended that a committee representing a leadership model and a senate model conference to put together the final model that he would recommend to the BOT. He did not consider the survey a sufficient model for the senate and noted that the conferencing parties would have to reach some agreement in meshing the two models together. Pres. McCay then restated his commitment to making Florida Tech a great research university, which he did not believe was possible as a contract school. He noted that great teaching-only schools were considered regional, not national universities.

Pres. Baarmand asked when the senate could expect the leadership model so the original timetable could be adjusted without missing the window to compare and discuss. He noted that another extra senate meeting was scheduled on March 27.

Pres. McCay answered that it was almost finished and he projected its completion in a few weeks. Before leaving the meeting for another appointment, he reiterated his goal to make Florida Tech a great research university. Until the research profile grows, Florida Tech will remain a high tuition revenue institution that is unable to build the research infrastructure found at other great institutions. He believed the size of the faculty should be bringing in closer to 100 million dollars in external funding, citing the 12 million dollars brought in currently. Pres. McCay also acknowledged that non-funded scholarship was also important for raising the university’s reputation. Finally, he thanked the senate for the opportunity to speak at the meeting and to share his passion for implementing tenure, which he was unsure would ever happen.

Following Pres. McCay’s departure from the meeting, the senate moved into logistical matters. Sen. van Woesik recommended getting the leadership’s bullet points for the model as a comparison, so that time is well spent, but Sen. Sandall asked that the senate first return to the motion on the floor to accept the Tenure Committee’s proposed guidelines.

Sen. Winkelmann asked that the senate accept the proposed guidelines so that work on the Faculty Tenure Model could begin and Pres. Baarmand assured that the model did not have to follow the guidelines.

Sen. Perdigao pointed out that the promotion process in the *Faculty Handbook* has guidelines that govern procedures and asked to what degree the senate could deviate from the proposed guidelines in preparing the model.

Sen. Nesnas echoed this concern, wondering which of the guidelines were being challenged in their consideration for the model.

Pres. Baarmand confirmed that the process of building the model would naturally involve deviating from the recommended guidelines, which were based on survey results, but pressed on the more urgent issue of the time available to have something prepared to compare with the leadership’s model.

Sen. Brenner asked the leadership in the room, the Provost and deans, for an update on the resolution that was passed in the senate last year to revise the promotion guidelines. The resolution, he recalled, was the outcome of the multi-track faculty plan that was tabled due to the faculty’s insistence on more precise promotional criteria. With the topic of tenure on the table, the need for those guidelines is more apparent.

Provost Baloga replied that emphasis was taken away from the resolution once the topic of tenure was brought to their attention, but recalled that some deans had been working on the revisions. She reflected that the main point of the resolution was to take up the topic of recognizing teaching in the promotional criteria, but believed that this would look different from the tenure model. Sen. Harvey wondered how excellent teaching faculty would fit into the tenure model.

Sen. Rusovici then pointed out that the *Faculty Handbook* specifies a 2/3 majority approval to change the College of Engineering’s promotional guidelines.

Sen. Lail asked what would happen after two models are merged in a few weeks. What is the final approval and who will sign off on it?

Provost Baloga clarified that officially Pres. McCay would make a recommendation to the BOT following the vote of the faculty at the general assembly and Pres. Baarmand noted that the timeline was built to conclude the faculty’s process at the general assembly for this reason. Sen. Sandall wondered if Pres. McCay would be in a position to recommend anything different than the outcome of the faculty vote to the BOT, even though he would be an active participant in the conference to merge the two models into one. Provost Baloga believed that by the time a model goes to the general faculty for vote it should be a foregone conclusion that the president will present the outcome to the BOT.

At the conclusion of the discussion, attention returned to the motion on the floor. Sen. Winkelmann summarized the revised motion, noting that the document is a set of recommendations that were proposed by the Tenure Committee in response to majority faculty opinion captured by the surveys. We can, he stated, pursue modification in creating the model and are not bound to what is in the document.

Pres. Baarmand then called for a vote by hand to approve the Tenure Committee’s Proposed Guidelines as the basis for building the Faculty Tenure Model. The motion was approved with a majority vote of hand, 18 in favor and 9 abstentions **[affirmative majority of a quorum]**.

Pres. Baarmand assured that whatever comes from using the proposed guidelines in the process of creating the Faculty Tenure Model will certainly be discussed at length, even if it continues into the summer. He then asked for a motion to begin preparing the Faculty Tenure Model, so made by Sen. Winkelmann and seconded by Sen. Rusovici. The motion was approved by majority vote of hand, with one abstention.

Following the vote, Pres. Baarmand recommended that the model include introductory material, definitions, by-laws, a set of procedures, details on the makeup of committees, and then the timeline for implementation.

Provost Baloga advised coming up with something less than 40 pages to capture the essence of the discussion, questioning the value of putting all those details in before conferencing with the leadership.

Pres. Baarmand did not believe the model should be more than 10 pages, agreeing that the details of the criteria would have to wait, but wanted to ensure that the by-laws clearly built the process of shared governance into the model.

**Adjournment**

Seeing the time, Pres. Baarmand then made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Sen. Winkelmann, and with a unanimous vote the meeting concluded at 5:03 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin R. Burke

Faculty Senate Secretary