

Florida Tech Faculty Senate
January 10, 2017

Minutes

Senators Present: W. Arrasmith (DES), M. Baarmand (PSS), P. Bernhard (Sch. of Computing), J. Brenner (Chem. Eng./Biomed. Eng.), K. Burke (SAC), P. Converse (CoPLA), A. Cudmore (COB), C. Harvey (CoPLA), A. Huser (Lib), S. Jensen (COB), U. Jones (Aero), M. Kaya (BME), S. Kozaitis (Lib), B. Lail (ECE), T. Marcinkowski (DEIS), S. Murshid (ECE), A. Nnolim (ESD), L. Perdigao (SAC), C. Polson (Bio), D. Sandall (COB), M. Silaghi (Sch. of Computing), N. Suksawang (CIVIL), G. Tenali (Math), R. van Woesik (Bio), R. Wehmschulte (Chem), B. Wheeler (Aero), K. Winkelmann (Chem), D. Yuran (SAC)

Other Attendees: Ismael Cremer (Aero), Cheryl Davis (Lib), Victoria Dunbar (Aero), Matt Jensen (MAE), David Lowe (Lib), George Maul (OES), Ronaldo Menezes (Sch. of Computing), Nasri Nesnas (Chem), Korhan Oyman (Aero), Jignya Patel (COB), Ted Petersen (SAC), Rob Phebus (BOT), Eraldo Ribeiro (Sch. of Computing), Isaac Silver (Aero), Ryan Stansifer (Sch. of Computing), Chao Wang (Lib)

Call to Order

President Sandall called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m. and asked for a motion to approve the minutes of November's meeting; a motion was made by Sen. Marcinkowski, seconded by Sen. Brenner.

President's Report

President Sandall has scheduled two meetings with HR to review the both the language and legal distinction between contracts and appointments. This discussion is ongoing. He had nothing further to report.

Committee Reports

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

There was no **Scholarship Committee** report.

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

There was no **Wellness Committee** report.

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

There was no **Technology, Resources, and Infrastructure Committee** report.

New Business

The Multi-Track Faculty Proposal — Second Reading

President Sandall delivered a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the feedback received from the faculty regarding the proposal. His slides summarize a comparison between version 1.4.1 (originally posted on Faculty Senate website) and the newly revised version 1.5 that took the initial faculty feedback into consideration.

[[*President Sandall's presentation slides of the MTFP revisions are available on the Faculty Senate Website. With many additional faculty attending the second reading, redundant comments and questions are intentionally left out. The January Minutes include additional questions and comments raised in discussion, beyond what is clearly stated in the proposal and presentation slides and in the feedback already documented in the December Minutes. At the request of Executive Committee, the relevant points raised during the discussion are summarized below without name identification.]]

Summary of Changes to the Proposal Documented on the Presentation Slides:

- *New Foundational Principle:* New faculty cannot change track for 3 years
- Lines 218-221 Clarification regarding administrative faculty rank and track.
- Lines 298-305 Existing assistant professors are not required to apply for promotion for 6 years (previous version stated 2.5 years) in the traditional track.
- Lines 321-321. Clarification: All faculty evaluations are kept on file, good or bad. This is existing practice.
- Lines 341-343 Teaching Track faculty are expected to invest time into pedagogy best practices, but are not restricted from conducting research in their discipline.
- Line 369. Deleted lecturer position.

Summary of Needs for the Proposal:

- A clear path to promotion for teaching and research faculty.
- Reduce provisional agreements.

Summary of (Q)uestions and (C)omments from the floor, as well as (R)esponses provided by President Sandall and the Executive Committee.

Q. Will the same promotion committee evaluate teaching track faculty as traditional track faculty?

R. The proposal does not restrict this from happening.

C. Separate promotion criteria are needed before a separate committee is formed.

C. Each college needs autonomy for how to 1) establish criteria, 2) implement the criteria, and 3) determine if there is a bias. The Senate should request that the deans document how fair review of teaching track faculty would be.

C. There are [at least] 2 cases when faculty with deficiencies in teaching were not promoted, but the constitution of the committee does change. Introducing another committee is not a good idea; make sure criteria are clear and that the committee chair holds committee members accountable for an objective evaluation.

C. In the past, not even half of the committee showed up to review dossiers on file. There was just 1 vote.

C. There has been bias in the past. The department head stated the faculty member's distribution of time toward teaching and research, but the committee did not follow it.

C. The deans should be given autonomy to clearly define criteria for promotion, otherwise it is left to the bias of the committee.

C. Some colleges provide very little information. The committee needs tools.

Q. Why was the rolling-renewal option for the teaching track struck by the deans/upper administration?

R. The administration originally struck the rolling-renewal option for all tracks, but compromised in keeping it for the traditional track. The Executive Committee stated in the original proposal that all three tracks should have the rolling renewal option. The Senate can vote to amend the proposal and put it back in for all tracks. That would make the tracks more equitable.

C. Offering different contracts to different groups will create inequity in salaries and impact the ability of faculty members to change institutions who do not understand the inequity. We should have 1 contract for all tracks, with the deans establishing criteria for the committee to follow in promotion.

Q. Why do we use the titles Teaching Professor or Research Professor?

R. Titles mean something. The institution cannot blur the lines that will mean something outside of the institution. The distinction is even more critical with a tenure system.

C. In every profession your performance is based on your responsibilities. An individual is evaluated on what is expected of them.

C. The college deans and department heads will need funding to release faculty of teaching loads when there is no external funding agent. Deans would like power to decide who is promoted, but that is not healthy for the institution. The committee and deans should both contribute to the evaluation.

C. There are problems with the transparency of the guidelines. CoPLA recently revised its guidelines to account for administrators who divide their time differently among teaching, research, and service. Other colleges do not account for this, but I'm not sure if solving this needs to be linked to a multi-track system.

C. We do not want the teaching track faculty to be viewed as 2nd-class citizens. What message is sent when traditional track failures are sent into the teaching track?

C. The revisions do not resolve issues of the teaching track being a less coveted track. How does this incentivize anyone to join a teaching track by their own will?

C. If we have teaching professors, they should be really good teachers. Failing in the traditional track does not make you a good teacher.

C. If the deans recognize that we have really good teachers, the committee should respect that as well.

Amendment to the Revised Proposal.

Sen. Winkelmann made a motion to amend the revised proposal by reinstating the rolling renewal contracts in the teaching track. The motion was seconded by Sen. Arrasmith.

Discussion on the Proposed Amendment Followed.

C. A multi-track promotional system softens the lines of a multi-track faculty system. The proposal, in its current revision, is complex and carries a lot of baggage. If there is a simple solution to the problem of teaching-oriented faculty being promoted, we should pursue it: focus on the promotion guidelines and enforcing those guidelines.

C. All promotions should address 3 components: teaching, research, and service. Guidelines need to be adjusted to account for all three.

C. The wording in the contract for all faculty should be the same.

C. The current proposal does not provide teaching track with the same benefits as the traditional track. If everyone is contributing to the university mission, they should be treated the same. Reinstating the rolling renewal component to the teaching track will attract better candidates and quality teachers to that track.

Q. If the rolling renewal contract is a precursor to tenure, will adding rolling renewal back to the teaching track put teaching track faculty in the same consideration for tenure as the traditional track faculty?

R. We should expect more from high quality teachers than just showing up to teach classes. That's a big part of their responsibility, but that's not all. High quality teachers could do research in pedagogy. Of course, we should not equate this research with research dollars in how we evaluate teaching track faculty.

C. Research in pedagogy should be counted as research in the traditional track. There are other ways to measure research and scholarship activity that enhances teaching capabilities. I'm concerned about instructors; they have no incentive to do professional development because they have no path to promotion, but perhaps promotion to lecturer or senior lecturer is possible. Autonomy should not be given to deans alone but to the entire unit.

Q. Why is research not clearly stated for teaching faculty in the multi-track proposal?

R. This new revision soften the language from research in pedagogy to active engagement in pedagogy.

C. The deans have to meet teaching quotas in their unit and assign teaching loads accordingly. If a faculty member is teaching a 4/4 load and advising, can they conduct research?

C. The proposal uncovers many issues as we reflect on equity: teaching loads across units, how research is defined, what Dr. McCay wants. We cannot resolve all of these issues today. We should tease these out, including the motion on the floor, as multiple things are going on.

C. There are too many variables to put into 3 big silos; it should be left as 1 big silo with multiple criteria for promotion.

Vote on the Amendment

Senators voting: 28 of 34

In favor—by voice

Opposed—2 by hand

Abstention—7 by hand

The amended passed.

Further Discussion

C. We need to start with the promotion problems before passing a multi-track system. The faculty will not support this system without tenure.

C. Why don't we draft a parallel path to revisit the promotion guidelines at the same time we continue to discuss this proposal?

C. This [proposal] is the wrong mechanism to enact Dr. McCay's wish to help good teachers. If you have clear criteria, you do not need a multi-track system.

C. Units have to take the initiative to revise their criteria and present to the Faculty Senate for vote.

C. Let's vote on the basic concept and move on. This discussion is time consuming.

R. The multi-track system is our ticket to tenure in a timely fashion. The board will have to vote on the tenure system. Dr. McCay does not believe the votes are there [at this time].

Adjournment

President Sandall adjourned the formal meeting at 5:10 p.m. Informal discussion continued in the room after adjournment.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin R. Burke, Secretary