

Faculty Senate Meeting

When: Tuesday, March 7, 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), 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), Brian Lail (CES), Nasheen Nur (CES), Nakin Suksawang (MCE), Hamidreza Najafi (MCE), Joo Young Park (MTH), Nezamoddini-Kachouie (MTH), Pallav Ray (OEMS), Spencer Fire (OEMS), Kevin Burke (SAC), Angela Tenga (SAC), David Wilder (BA), Patrick Converse (PSY), Jessica Wildman (PSY), Julie Costopoulos (PSY), William Bowman (LIB)

Senators Absent: Steven Rivet (COB), Luis Otero (CES), Chiradeep Sen (MCE), Gary Zarillo (OEMS), Gordon Patterson (SAC)

Proxies: Al Brown [proxy for Senator Nasri Nesnas (BCES)]

Other Attendees: Michael Jenkins, Penny Vassar, Marco Carvalho, Nick Daher, Raymond Bonhomme, Eric Guisbert, Rian Mehta

Call to Order

Pres. Turgut called the meeting to order at 3:30pm. The minutes from the Feb. 7, 2023 meeting were approved and recordings of the meeting were acknowledged.

Guest Speaker: EVP, Provost, & COO Dr. Marco Carvalho about instructor course evaluations (student surveys)

Pres. Turgut begins by saying that Dr. Carvalho has been invited today because this issue was raised in the Executive Committee meeting last week on Feb. 28, 2023, even though the issues with the course evaluations was stopped at the Executive Committee meeting on Nov. 30, 2021 by the majority of the members. He thought it would be in the best interest of the entire faculty to be aware and be on the same page, on such an important topic. This is because the content instructor course evaluations, student surveys, and how they are utilized as assessments are crucially important for all faculty performance evaluations and promotion. Moreover, it's more crucial for the teaching performance development and improvement of the faculty in an institution like ours, where the classroom tuition drives 85-90% of our revenue. It is so extremely important that it should not be rushed, but approached methodically with much diligence on this professionally and via outside vetting.

(Pres. Turgut yields the floor to Provost Carvalho)

Dr. Carvalho begins by saying he would like to give a bit of background, but starts with some comments. There are two aspects to what really motivated the discussions on the student and course surveys. One is the survey as an instrument itself. There are many uses for this. There are data collections, there are longitudinal studies, there is reporting for accreditation, and several things come from that. It is also used as an instrument for faculty evaluation and that is where it can be used in a multitude of ways. Hence there are two sides of this question. One is how do we make a better survey? How do we make a better survey that is easier to use? How do we build a survey that provides the right information we are looking for? And the other aspect how we utilize the surveys. He will talk about both of them separately.

He begins by talking about the utilization. He doesn't think that any one single question in the survey can summarize the whole goal/value of this survey, hence why you have multiple questions. There is an opportunity for the faculty and their supervisor to use all the info in the survey to capture as a whole the analysis of the course. He thinks one of the changes that they made recently in terms of evaluation, which he hopes was noticed by the faculty, was to give an opportunity for feedback to the evaluation of the supervisor so that you basically provide a self-report. Your supervisor provides their evaluation to you and you have an opportunity to provide additional information. The point of that is to enhance your ability to make your point in an evaluation which includes the survey. Hence, in terms of the utilization of the survey, you have an opportunity, through that process, to bring other aspects of the course evaluation. Now, none of this is perfect, but it's a move towards facilitating a better use of this information. This is one side of the problem.

The other side of the problem is the survey as an instrument itself going back to 2020-2021 when then Faculty Senate President Nasri Nesnas started a process with the committee to review, modify, and improve the survey. This was a faculty driven process started in Spring and came to him in the end of Spring, with a survey modified for implementation. At the time there were several disputes, discussions, and points of view on how to do that survey. He communicated to Dr. Nesnas with a copy to Dr. Brian Lail that the survey was late in the process and so is not going to be implemented in Spring and saying we will revisit it in the Fall which gives an opportunity for the Senate to be able to reconsider and include the comments that the faculty bringing forward. In the Fall, the then new Faculty Senate President Brian Lail, reached out to him and said it will be a bit of a longer process for us to be able to complete that survey, so can we go ahead and implement the prior survey, which is a much more reduced survey until we complete the new one? His answer, which was in an email documented back in November, was basically No, I don't agree with that. And here is his point of view, which he also documented on the email. He didn't see a motivation for us to create a data discontinuity that we are collecting on our survey for something that will last a year until an actual survey device comes in. He thinks that only brings loss for us. We're going to have a gap in the analysis we're making with no actual gain, because this survey by definition needs to be improved. So the motivation at that time is that the Faculty Senate

will engage to provide me with a revised survey that will then be voted and implemented, which the faculty is comfortable with and support. This hasn't happened yet, I never received a new survey.

As we stand right now, he is 100% welcoming to the review, no problems at all with a revision of the survey. I will support a revision of the survey, and I would like that to be done with the process that is, includes inclusive and supported by the faculty, without the concerns that were raised at that time. Should that happen? Absolutely. It is a survey that can be replaced and can be improved. The moment we can get a document that we are comfortable as a faculty and administration that's agreed upon new survey for course evaluation ready to implement, and he'll be the first one to do that, or to recommend the next provost to do it.

Pres. Turgut starts with a question for Provost Carvalho. If their supervisor, the department head, or the college team, is using just one question, they are welcome to do that?

Provost Carvalho responds saying absolutely. I think that you know most of us know that this is a mutual development process. You're not only providing information, but you're also providing insight to the person that is evaluating you to observe perspectives that may not observe normally, they are not the common perspectives. This is this is healthy, this is productive and it opens up the ability for you to highlight other aspects, not only of things that you're doing, but also from comments and evaluations that students are making of your course. I believe in doing that you can fully utilize that instrument, and that's not to say that is a perfect instrument, but he's saying that you can utilize it in a much bigger, greater extent than we may be doing so until we have an opportunity to improve it.

Senator Csaba Palotai asks the question if they take on this opportunity to work on improving the survey, what is the timeline we are looking at, when should the deadline be to get it to you to be approved by?

Provost Carvalho responds that realistically, if we can work on this during the Fall, then the following Spring is a very realistic time line for this. He also encourages doing it with a group that also engages with external support, we can support covering the costs for advising, because it provides an opportunity for you to be able to build something strong with external views.

Pres. Turgut provides some insight on this process. In many institutions this is done jointly by the Faculty Senate and the Chief Academic Office, and resources are allocated for this venture and always an outside vetting is involved. This is because we need to make sure we don't lose our objectivity. A through process would take 6-12 months realistically.

Senator Nakin Suksawang asks the question that we know that one of the existing problems with the survey is long with many questions (27 questions were most

institutions having around 12), if we want to get this more extradited, could we have your team/office provide some survey, that we could even purchase, that we can then vet on and just tailor to our needs?

Provost Carvalho responds that we'll be happy to do it and to engage the faculty from some initial survey that we can help build with professional help.

Provost Carvalho gives an additional comment that he wants us to be careful with those change to the survey, we should be comfortable that we're making a change that will last for some time. The reason for that is because of the data that you're collecting, if you're not retaining that continuity, then you're losing.

Pres. Turgut asks the following question from the private zoom chat: Don't we need to discuss the purpose and way we use the surveys and arrive at a definitive agreement first, before we discuss how we change the surveys?

Provost Carvalho responds that's a very insightful question, because sometimes one of the things that people lose track of is that you don't just use the survey for doing an evaluation for faculty, although it is one of the usages. We do accreditation reports, we do longitudinal reports, and review of programs. That's why we kind of hesitate to make significant changes until we're comfortable, because, losing that kind of tracking of data. Hence, yes I think it will be extremely helpful for us to get together, bring our IR group, bring our other offices to say this is how these surveys are useful to us and this how we can build some type of bootstrap session so that whatever group engages on that effort understands the multiple uses that this survey has as well as the data we have collected, and the data that we have to continue collecting. I appreciate whoever brought that question forward, because that is actually the best way to do it.

Pres. Turgut asks the following question he received: As the Faculty Senate President, you mentioned in the beginning of the discussion that this Survey initiative reached to the Executive Committee in November, but it was stopped at the Executive Committee level. Can you elaborate on that, please, and tell us who we are involved in this initiative and the reason why the Executive Committee decided to stop the initiative?

Pres. Turgut responds that he will answer the first part because he was an executive committee member in the capacity of the President elect back in November 30, 2021. We welcomed Dr. Tom Marcinkowski who had gathered five member task force which was open to other members to join as well, and that had representation from all the colleges at that time. There was a lot of disagreement at the Executive Committee level with his approaches, and that is where it stopped, never making it to the Senate floor. Even though Dr. Marcinkowski had met with the office of the Provost with Dr. Subasi, the then Assistant Provost, for the resources to be available, how to move forward, and we even did the preliminary assessment. Dr. Turgut did it with him as one of the task force members and Dr. Lail would remember this too.

Provost Carvalho responds I don't have insights on what happens within the Executive Committee, but I do confirm right after there was a reengagement in Fall 2021 to review the survey. Dr. Marcinkowski did reach out and request that should we need support for getting external support/consultants, would they be able to provide it and they said absolutely we would and to the best of his knowledge, Dr. Marcinkowski engaged on that process to form the committee and to work with the Senate on that committee. But he doesn't believe that anyone from his office worked on the process since.

Senator Csaba Palotai asks the question that there is one issue that comes back repeatedly which is related to the low rate at which students provide feedback and the idea to tie the student feedback to the registration process or something similar, is there some way or an idea to increase the participation?

Provost Carvalho responds yeah and there are several. We should definitely engage on that discussion in terms of providing students with an opportunity to have enough time or reserve time, or to have some type of benefit during class to be able to fill out the survey. There are several ideas that I think that we should really look into. The timing is somewhat constrained because we have to remember that we try to ensure that surveys are responded to before the finals go out so that the students are not responding emotionally to a final result. And conversely, the surveys are submitted at that point, and they are not touched, sealed until the finals go out so that the faculty also doesn't have any access to any of that. Protection on both ends. But on the other hand there should be many mechanisms we should be looking into ways to try to improve participation.

Pres. Turgut replies that he'd like to add that he leaves the students 15-20 mins, gets out, gives them time to do it, without giving any awards, and his participation went up from 50 to 95%. Even now days with the electronic feedback he asks them to bring a laptop to do this.

Senator Abram Walton responds that he wants to echo Provost Carvalho. I think your spot on in the fact that you're trying to divorce the emotional appeal between the students and the faculty between this tight window of grading. We must be careful if we were to tie it to getting their grades.

Provost Carvalho then gives a brief update on the issue of PhD students that Senator Vipuil Kishore brought forward previously. He reminds us that the question brought forward was the fact that PhD students and graduate students in general, have the requirement to be enrolled to have access to university resources as defined by our policies. One of the challenges we have is during the summer. As he mentioned during our last conversation, changing the policies is complex. The alternative we proposed to address the issue is to create a 0 credit cost course that is only available to PhD students and only during the summer. We will start with that process and see how it works and we can look into expanding the course to all graduate students. He's been working with the registrar on that, in fact, meeting this day to determine what it will be and how to go about doing that. And we are intending to implement and available this

summer. This means that all of you that have Ph.D. students, they will be able during the summer at any level, any year, not just in candidacy, but anywhere they will be able during the summer to register for that 0 credit course, 0 cost. And then in doing so they are registered students so they can be on campus, they can utilize the resources, they can be in your labs, etc. Assuming that these addresses the concern brought forward to us, we will implement that for the summer, and we will start with Ph.D. students, and then we can evaluate how that work and make improvements next year.

Pres. Turgut responds: Thank you for that. In fact, I was updating Dr. Kishore yesterday via email that I contacted you last Friday, and then you are going to take immediate action this week. This is a great resolution.

Senator Vipuil Kishore responds that he thinks this will go a long way in terms of letting the students continue their research over the summer, and he totally appreciates the initiative and the quick action you took in that regard. Hopefully, we can come to a long term solution, but this is really good for this.

Pres. Turgut asks the following question from the private zoom chat: With respect to detaching from the emotional component of the evaluation process, might we consider a two-part process that would include an evaluation in the first month of the semester, where the students have gotten to know how the class works and have a good feel for the instructor, but have not had a chance to develop grudges because they don't like their grades?

Provost Carvalho responds yeah and it will be an interesting thing to consider. Normally we are trying to get insights about the course, what kind of return and perceived perceptions they have from the course. In doing it too early in the course we may be limiting their ability to make a fair assessment, so it's a balance. We need to work on that. But these are all good points that we can bring into discussion together as we go into this review.

Dr. Turgut thanked Provost Carvalho for his time and participation with Provost Carvalho then leaving the meeting.

Old Business

Committee Reports:

1. Excellence Awards Committee: Senator Julie Costopoulos says they had many great applications this year. But we are only able to honor one nominee per year and their finalizing that right now. We are thrilled with what we did see and are hoping faculty will apply again if they are the ones who are not honored because there were so many great ones this year.
2. Scholarship Committee: Senator Nezamoddin Nezamoddini-Kachouie said they have shortlisted 50 students from four different colleges for Senate Scholarship

Award for Excellence. He has been contacting them to check the eligibility. In regards to the writing essays, he is receiving responses and collecting them. Then he will have a second short list and we can move forward to one or two recipients.

3. Welfare Committee: Senator Nakin Suksawang said he had nothing to report.
4. Administrative Policies Committee: Senator Mehmet Kaya said that he has nothing to report as of now.
5. Academic Policies Committee: Senator Vipuil Kishore said he has nothing to report.
6. Technology, Resources, and Infrastructure (TRI) Committee: Nothing was discussed as this committee needs to elect a chair.

President's Report:

President Tolga Turgut begins by saying that he has basically concluded his service as the President Search Committee member as of last weekend. He was very busy working with the data collected after the visits of the five finalists together with the other six committee members, who are all trustees. There was the feedback individually received by the chair of the Board of Trustees. There was also the survey data shared with us. There was around 80-90 surveys gathered for each candidate from pretty much all stakeholders. This includes faculty, alumni, students, and staff. Also there was a meeting with the Deans and the other upper administration personnel and the President Search Committee deliberated on Saturday and so he worked almost all day Saturday. Now it's handed over to the Board of Trustees and we will be hearing the final decision of the permanent President within the next several weeks with a maximum sometime in April.

In regard to the Search Committee, he personally worked between 400-500 hours since April on this committee, during the summer holiday, plus Christmas and several weekends. And he always felt the very important responsibility of being the voice of all the Florida Tech faculty as best as he could. And in doing so he always simultaneously tried to keep the perspective of Florida Tech as a whole as well. After all, Florida Tech is always going to be strongest when all stakeholders are well in sync for a shared vision, and are inspired to go in the same direction for success. The trustees serving on the President Search Committee were very open, because he has to give the credit where it is due as he always does, and receptive to him and he thanks them for the entire faculty as well. I should underline the fact that, having another trustee, such as Dr. Gronfeldt, which I mentioned about her in our last meeting, who has academic credentials, and she is an active professor at MIT in our trustees also helped to have her on the Search Committee, because together we could bring a stronger faculty perspective in search of our next President.

Reminder about to the department and colleges about Senator elections:

President Turgut, as the next item on the agenda, the departments/colleges are reminded to hold their Senator elections for the Senators whose three-year terms are coming up. The new senator names are expected to be received by the Faculty Senate by the third week of March. This will provide adequate time and opportunity for new Senators to run for the upcoming April elections, which prepares the Senate for the next academic year.

He is making this announcement deliberately to have it go in the agenda, as well to give enough time to the departments and colleges to make their internal elections in a timely fashion.

He has reached out to the department heads and the college teams via email on February 22, which our secretary, Dr. Welters, was also in the communication. That way there will be more time for faculty to consider running for a Senate seat and minimize the chances of completing elections by appointment, but do a proper election within departments as required by our Constitution and bylaws. Moreover, if the Senate is earlier informed, such as before the end of March, then the newly elected Senators may have the opportunity to run for Standing Committee chairmanships of the Senate. Being a Senate officer means being elected to serve as the Senate Secretary or Senate President. Those are the offices of the Senate. This issue is also in part related to the term limits, which we have a resolution for on the agenda today. In my email to the Department Heads and College Deans, I also requested that when each Senator representing each Department college was elected, precisely how many terms they have served so far. He and the Secretary do their best to keep accurate data for institutional memory purposes. But without their input and support, this may not be so easy otherwise. Finally, he requested for them to let us know if they have any Senators whose term is not completed, but is unable to serve anymore in the Senate for any reason, whatever the reason may be, after the completion of this academic year 2023. I have received some information on how many terms some Senators served and/or since they were elected. However, some of the information I received is contradicting and/or conflicting with official records such as the Senate approved meeting minutes. This is a serious concern. He does his best to verify the data by the minutes stated back to 2011. When he dug into those records he became well informed. I do not like to provide names, but we do have Senators among us who have been serving consecutively as Senator since 2011. We also have senators. Those who have been serving consecutively at the Executive Committee for 8-9 years due to continuous Committee chair. I'm sure we would all agree that this is not the ideal situation for equity, equity of opportunity, and inclusion of all faculty. This leads to the next item in the agenda.

Resolution on Proposed Modification to the FH 1.4, Bylaws Articles II, sections 1 and 2 of term limits for senators, senate officers and committee chairs is for endorsement:

This has been in discussion since our December 6, 2022 meeting. Current policy as defined in our Bylaws, Article 1 and Section 1 states: "The members of the faculty, voting by academic unit for their individual representatives, shall elect members of the Faculty Senate for a three-year term". Furthermore, Standing Committee chairs are elected for 2-year terms and Senate officers (Senate President and Secretary) are elected for 1-year terms. There is no defined limit of serving in any capacity at our Faculty Senate.

Before he shares the screen on the resolution and before we move on to the voting phase, he shares some the details about this. As some of you may know in my vision statement when I ran for Senate Presidency on April 6, 2021, which the recordings are available for everyone, I discussed about the term limits for the Faculty Senate as one of my goals. My objective with that is to have a more diverse and inclusive representation in the Faculty Senate. Last meeting, I shared the full size point PowerPoint presentation with you, and opened this topic for further discussion. We have been discussing it in three consecutive meetings. In the immediate aftermath of our last Senate meeting on February 7, 2023, the PowerPoint was shared with you by email, at 5:55pm or 5:56pm the same day to be shared and discussed within your Department's colleges.

Let me provide some further insight to you based on my research on Senate Minutes going back to 2011. There were 15 to 20 Senators in the Senate per the minutes until 10-12 years ago, serving. Many things changed in our University. I'm sure we can all agree, and also in the higher education. We must adapt to that, and reflect it on the representation here. After all, none of us are here to represent ourselves individually, but our fellow colleagues in our departments and colleges, so we are providing a service to our departments and colleges. Faculty Senate is a representative body, and must lead by examples on inclusiveness, integrity, accountability, and transparency. Many universities have chosen to have term limits in many of their committees and their Faculty Senates within the past several years. This is also in part because people can fulfill their service expectations as a part of their loads and for annual evaluations and promotions. In fact, our own AFTC members, when they prepared their charter revision, and we approved here on our January 10th meeting, they included two-term limits of three years each. In order to avoid the bottleneck of rotations, it would be best to be in sync in all committees across the University, as well as the Senate. Having same people serving on the same committees, and the Senate for many years, may lead to monopolization of those committees and the Senate, and prone to abuse of power. Not only is this not in the best interest of the institution, it is against productivity, versatility of the faculty, and the contribution of the faculty to the improvement of the institution as a whole. There should be a healthy balance of experience which is required for institutional memory all the time and new faces for fresh energy. Only then we will have a more dynamic and productive Senate who is accountable to all the faculty that it represents, which is 300 full-time faculty. Moreover, anyone who is a faculty is always welcome to participate, by the way we encourage that in our meetings, and contribute in many ways. It can be via membership of task forces, membership of the standing committees, and they can always contribute by their department/college Senator, and/or

directly communicating with the Faculty Senate President and the Secretary. If anybody would go back to reading the minutes going back to 2011, as he has done, you can easily understand the bottleneck created in the Senate floor. In the last 11-12 years we have had three Senators becoming Senate Presidents, two terms. One Senator served as both the Senate President and the AFTC Chair at the same time. Some unopposed elections. The other Senators who served as President in the last 10-11 years only once are mostly no longer faculty at FIT. I strongly believe that if these few faculty did not leave, then they would also have run again and again, probably. So let's be more inclusive and provide more equity of opportunity to more of the faculty, and serve in this great representative body of our faculty Senate.

(Pres. Turgut opens the floor for questions before proceeding with the resolution voting)

Senator Brian Lail suggests there be an opportunity for some further discussion to make sure varying viewpoints are heard before moving to a vote.

Pres. Turgut thanks Senator Lail for that and calls on Senator Julie Costopoulos who raised her hand.

Senator Julie Costopoulos says that from the constituents in the School of Psychology that some of the questions we regarding not consecutive term limits, but lifetime term limits, and she didn't know if you were planning to pose those as separate questions. The reason was this: If the job of Senate is to handle faculty grievances and to address faculty concerns to upper administration, they felt that tenured faculty and more senior faculty are in a far better position to be able to do that without feeling endangered. And, so my creating a lifetime term limits, it would limit the Faculty Senate to new faculty, particularly when you have got a high turnover as they have had. Thus, she didn't know if you were planning to have those voted separately, but that was a different issue than consecutive term limits, so you can only serve two terms consecutively, but the lifetime term limit was a concern.

Pres. Turgut responds I can pull the resolution, and there is an aggregate limit of 10 years. We researched many universities, and most of them have implemented term limits across the board, and they do have an aggregate number of years as well which is taken into consideration within the resolution. The last item reads as an aggregate of 10 years that is the cap that you can interpret it as a lifetime as well.

Al Brown (serving as proxy for Senator Nasri Nesnas) says he was a long time Senator and three time Senate President, way back when, and in that capacity he believes he got some feel for the Senate, for how it works, for what makes it effective. The Senate is the Executive Committee of the Academic Faculty and as well as the Advisory Committee to the Provost. It carries out the responsibilities most effectively in my belief when the Senate is strong, when it has knowledge, when it has institutional memory. You get those things most effectively when you put good Senators in place and keep them in place. Back in the day we used to have some small constituencies that had only one Senator and I could see how bottlenecks would have arisen in constituencies like

that. If the faculty are having trouble getting into Senate, it seems to me that's a departmental issue. If elections are not being held on time or not being held by secret ballot, go to your department head, go to your Dean, come to the Senate. I don't think that the Senate has ever made a practice of supervising Senate elections, but it could. As far as term limits themselves, he doesn't believe term limits for Senators are in the best interest either of the Senate or more importantly of the faculty.

Pres. Turgut asks for any opposing views from those just given.

Senator Abram Walton says that he has spoken with all of the Senators in the College of Business, most of the faculty, including the Administration, and I echo Mr. Brown's sentiment. The College of Business unanimously opposes this as one of the most ridiculous and preposterous things we've seen proposed thus far. There's not a single vote in the College of Business that would be for this. This is something that should be relegated to the Department or College level. If you're having an issue of participation, in fact, all of the evidence that you suggested, and I made this comment last time that this came up, and I'm surprised that you've continued to push it forward because, the evidence that you provide for the lack of rotation and presidency, etc., is not a lack of participation in the Senate, it's a lack of people wanting to or applying for presidency, etc. So Mr. Brown's comments, I think, are valid, and again speaking from for literally a unanimous College of Business vote, if you decide to ram this through the University Senate, we want nothing to do with it.

Pres. Turgut says thank you and you can vote against, that is always available. But I wanted to ask questions at this point, there can be opposing views. By the way, the other universities went through this issue as well.

Senator Walton says we have an issue with filling the seats that we have. There are certain seats no one else wants. So when you say something is being voted for or on with one person in the seat that goes unopposed, that not because we're keeping people out, no one else is actually applying for certain roles, we encourage them too. We at our college level hold votes and I think that by forcing term limits you're actually imposing at the university level its wish. When our college says we want these long standing Senators to be part of that, we have the college level votes to do that. And so the removing of that at the University level is completely opposed in the College of Business. I've been asked to speak up here, because, unfortunately, I'm the full tenure professor that has to do that on behalf of colleagues. But unanimously, no one wants this in the College of Business.

Pres. Turgut says thank you for those views.

Senator William Bowman says that he's spoken with his colleagues in the Library, and we do not oppose it as much as the College of Business does, there was one change that they wished to propose which was the inclusion of some kind of exception for reappointment in the event that we not enough faculty were interested or available for the roles except those who've already gone over their term limits.

Pres. Turgut says thank you, its appreciate, and it is noted.

Senator Lail says he supports all the comments from both Dr. Brown and Dr. Walton, in particular. I think the challenge with this one, at least, is that there's not a one size fits all solution due to the nature of the different sizes and varieties of our different academic units. And to not fully appreciate that, and make a change like this, in fact, would propose to create additional problems rather than solve problems. The answer sits directly with the academic units, and that's well-defined and if the problem exists, it needs to be brought up at the appropriate place. I know we can compare with other institutions, and I've done a better reading on this over the years as well. This and other topics. And you know, we have to realize that a lot of universities actually have support staff that help with the Senate body. You know their Senate has administrative assistance and support staff, so we have to be careful if we take on all these additional roles of monitoring elections, and this and that, beyond what we already do. We might not be as effective at actually standing up and representing the faculty because we get over burden. And again we have very capable academic units. So my opinion is that is where this responsibility falls to.

Pres. Turgut says thank you. I appreciate that. He would like to say a few things before he yields the floor back. With respect to sizes in terms of faculty numbers, I come from the smallest college. As a college we fully supporting this. We discussed among our Senators as well, and we don't have a rotation problem, and as the smallest college in terms of faculty numbers, we don't struggle. I do not understand why the other colleges or departments would struggle. That's number one. Number 2 is there has been debates when this was brought in the Faculty Senate. In many institutions, the Faculty Senate on its own is a legislative body which goes over the Faculty handbooks and looks out for the best interest of its faculty as a whole. That's how the Senate works, we are a representative legislative body where we do policy changes, and this cannot be taken down to the college or department level. It has to be approached as the entire full time faculty via the Faculty Senate on its own.

(Pres. Turgut yields the floor back.)

Senator Vipuil Kishore says he agrees with Dr. Lail and the others who mentioned before this. I think the Senate we can probably encourage and or maybe strongly encourage the academic units to have some sort of rotation, but to enforce rotation and have it as a rule is not something that my program supports as well.

Senator Jordan Poole I just wanted to say an opposing view a little bit from the College of Aeronautics. Our view on this is not necessarily saying it's a terrible thing to have people that are Senators for long term. I'm a first-year faculty here, and I would not have learned as much as I have without having the opportunity to be on the Senate. If there were Senators that had been in there 10-12, 14-16 years, however many years, I wouldn't have necessarily had as much of an opportunity if people kept voting the same people in. So that's what we're saying that in College of Aeronautics, some of our faculty have agreed that some type of a term limit might be beneficial. My viewpoint is

having a little bit of both sides, not just new ideas, new fresh faces, but also people that have been in for a long time in Senate. You can learn a lot from them, so I'm just saying, as a sort of an opposing view.

Pres. Turgut says he would like to share with you his screen on the resolution so that it goes into the minutes as well. This is the resolution on the floor and the current state. Basically this is the reflection of the concise PowerPoint that I shared with everybody. By the way, we have been discussing on this for the last three months. This is not a last minute resolution that is put on the floor. It can pass or it cannot pass. That's okay. And that's what we are discussing on for three months. He reads it: Whereas Faculty Handbook 1.4, Bylaws Article II, and section one states that members of the faculty, voting by academic unit for their individual representatives, shall elect members of the Faculty Senate for a three year term. And I also on a side note, I want to also say, I wish there was more views brought on the Senate floor in the last three months, when this was a up for discussion. The third one is the resolution passed in the Faculty Senate on January 9, 2018 states, a two-year term for the committee chairs that would replace the current practice of ad hoc selection without input from Senators. There is no limit for number of terms for Senators, Senate officers, and committee chairs. It says Senate should provide the opportunity and be more inclusive for any full-time faculty, who are willing to serve and contribute in the Senate. Senate should reflect all voices, a good balance of experience (for institutional memory) and new energy (new ideas and dynamism) is ideal. Having no turn limits create bottlenecks in the Senate, where the new faculty hesitate to come forward and volunteered to run against the well-established faculty, who have more of a name recognition. Many universities have term limits and encourage a healthy balance rotation among their faculty, serving at their Faculty Senate. This would provide more of an opportunity to enhance productivity and effectiveness of our Senate. Therefore, be it resolved, that: Resolved, that Senators Senate officers (President and Secretary), and committee chairs to have maximum of two terms to serve, these two terms can be served consecutively, excluding the Senate officers; and be it further resolved, that no Senators to be permitted to serve on the Senate more than six consecutive years, except to fulfill the position of the immediate past Senate President; and be it further resolved, that no person may serve as Senate officers (President and Secretary) consecutively excluding the President elect, which is a unique case who serves one year in that role and then assumes the responsibility of the Senate Presidency with the adjournment of the last regular Senate meeting scheduled for first week of April; and be it further resolved, that Senator elected as officers of the Senate are exempt from two consecutive terms term limits until they no longer hold an officer position. At that point, the Senators may serve out any time remaining on their current terms, and then are subject to ineligibility; and be it further resolved, that no person may serve in the Senate more than aggregate of 10 years. So this is the resolution that has been put forward.

Senator Nakin Suksawang says with all this is that you're putting a resolution that is pretty much written by you, right? With very little feedback from all the faculty Senators. Maybe we might agree at some point, but there are many things we might disagree with. And nobody talked about any of that stuff, right? I mean all this wording are never

discussed. So yes we did talk about term limits. In fact, what is on the resolution he thinks is inappropriate to even have a vote on that. But if you say we should vote on whether we should even have a term limit that is a different mode. You want us to vote on this resolution when we just saw it today. We did see the PowerPoint last time, but this resolution, I think came out like two or three days ago, right?

Senator Walton says he had the same concern. Because I have faculty who asked, when a vote even was taken to consider whether or not, this would be something that the Senate should even pick up. So now, all of a sudden, we show up with a resolution that's ready to be voted on. When was an actual vote taken to even consider that this was something that we should be building? Is there even a committee that produce this, or did you just write this up?

Pres. Turgut says he will get to both questions. To start with, this was discussed at the Executive Committee level a few times. Senator Suksawang, you are one of the members and we did discuss it, and also on the Senate floor. We discussed it, too. The resolution was shared with you guys last Friday via email. And, by the way, I'd like to refresh your memories in the last several years that I've been a Senator. There has been many resolutions even put forward one night before, and was wordsmithing done on the floor. So we have to be mindful of what has been happening in the Senate floor. I just wish there would be more discussion about this since we go back and look at all the agendas that I have been sharing with you. By the way, in the Senate floor, I will challenge anybody can say that I have not been fastly sharing all the information with you and all the faculty via the factory distribution list. All the recordings have been posted within 48 hours maximum and the minutes of meetings other than the September minutes have been there available. So in terms of openness and sharing everything that's another matter. What we can do at this point is, I'm going to end this debate now, because I didn't open the floor for a discussion. I just asked if there was any questions. That's okay. What we will do is I am going to extend it. I took all the discussions. Everything went on the recording and I would like you guys to thoroughly take it to your constituents to faculty, and I'll look for ways to, maybe to take this to a vote on our next meeting.

Senator Palotai says that he has to agree with Senator Suksawang on a number of points. My concern is that in the resolution there are some items that I have no idea where they are coming from, and I will name an example. Here you're saying in the resolution that the junior faculty is scared to come forward because of the name recognition, and they are just not coming forward. They are not applying for the position. They are not challenging the current Senators. Is there any data to back this up before I put my name on to this thing that I agree with it? Because I don't know where it's coming from. I have not seen anything like that in my department. I'm not saying that it's not true, but I would like to see some if I'm voting on that. I like a number of things on this resolution, and I don't like others. I'm not challenging that my question is, is there any evidence? The junior faculty are scared to come forward and put their names into the race?

Pres. Turgut replies let's make a word correction, not scared, but hesitant.

Senator Palotai replies, is there any evidence they are hesitant?

Pres. Turgut replies: Yes, there are, because people are now leaving in general. And that is the usual concern among all the universities. That's why the healthy mixture is a balance of the experience, and also new faculty joining the ranks. You are aware that we have a one-third turnover of faculty in the last few years. So one-third of the faculty are new in the last three years. This is related to the problem.

Senator Kishore says I agree with Senator Palotai that to the contrary in my program, every time that a Senator completes the three year term the email goes out. And if someone's interested, they say their name, and there's no hesitancy whatsoever. I'm not sure what the hesitancy would be to put your name in the hat. So I don't agree to that bullet at all unless there is some evidence that proves otherwise, because there is no such evidence that I've seen in my time here.

Pres. Turgut says we'll stop the discussion at this level, and please discuss further and we will revisit this, and it has been discussed for like 3 months worst case scenario will go to it, and the vote will be by roll call, and it will be recorded because we are a representative body, and this is a policy change related issue.

Senator Suksawang says that he wants to make it clear that if you want to bring this resolution up next time that his will be the resolution we will be voting on just one vote not voting line by line for the whole resolution?

Pres. Turgut says that yes, with maybe 1% change because that concern, and I agree that was brought up. That's legitimate.

(Pres. Turgut calls on Senator Lail for a last word due to the time being 4:46pm)

Senator Lail there appear to be concerns that was brought forth. But what's been referred to as discussion was quite limited, and I would suggest that a sense of the Senate might be valuable to take right. Now, that's an informal vote, not a formal vote to get a sense of the Senate regarding whether there's interest in pursuing this topic of term limits for the Faculty Senate. I move that we take a sense of the Senate on that very question.

Senator Suksawang seconds that motion.

Senator Walton says we should vote on whether this something we even want to consider before we just ram a resolution out.

Pres. Turgut says that please, as the presiding officer of the Senate meeting, one of my duties is to not put forth a frivolous motion. This sense of the Senate does not have any binding issues. It has been done before, and basically you take it to your faculty, and

we're all representing them. And now we come and vote all together. I am not calling for a motion at this point.

Senator Lail says you don't have to call for a motion.

Pres. Turgut says I am not putting it on the floor because it's not one of the Robert's rules.

Senator Lail says you are incorrect procedurally, but you may do as you want.

Senator Razvan Rusovici says that he doesn't think it's a frivolous motion. The term frivolous is a little bit of a demeaning term. When it comes to certain procedures, I do not see the concerns of the Senators as being frivolous.

Pres. Turgut says it is noted and that he just wished that all these discussions would be brought forth in the previous meetings.

Senator Lail says that there have been some views shared that deserve to be respected. Everyone present right now has an equal opportunity to share their views and I encourage everyone to do so. But I don't think it is appropriate to simply dismiss the views you don't like.

Pres. Turgut says he's not dismissing anything, he's giving more time and that is the difference. Because we have one third of new faculty, that is our demographics. And I don't think that we have much representations on the Senate floor from that demographic and that's why I am not going forward with that sense of the Senate motion at this point. And I did not put it to a vote. I did not even call for a motion to go for a vote. If we are talking about procedures, I said, this is the resolution on the floor. I asked for questions. I entertained all the questions and all the discussions it is recorded. And then it will be available to all the faculty until the next meeting.

Senator Lail says that is fine. But to be clear, there's a motion on the floor, and I understand your response is to ignore that motion. Am I correct?

Pres. Turgut says it has not been seconded.

Senator Walton says that it was about 30 seconds ago. You can try to ignore it again, its been seconded.

Pres. Turgut says ok that he is going to do a roll call vote for the sense of the Senate. What is it, can you be more descriptive? Because a motion of the sense of the Senate isn't a proper motion. Please say it again so that it goes into the recordings.

Senator Lail says: Does the Senate support moving forward, considering implementing of term limits in the Faculty Senate?

Al Brown says that it is just a point of information and no vote would be to not move forward with the discussion of term limits. Correct?

Senator Lail says yes, let's make sure this is framed correctly. It's voting on whether we bother to take this further back to our constituents, and actually give everyone a time to review this resolution anymore. Do we proceed? Yes, we proceed to entertain the resolution to (Pres. Turgut jumps in)

Pres. Turgut says just a second. As a representative body, we are not going back to our constituents with a sense of the Senate (Senator Lail jumps in)

Senator Lail says that is what a sense of the Senate is. It's an informal vote of those present.

Pres. Turgut says that's not the right way to run this Senate by informal voting. I'm totally against this.

Senator Lail says you can ignore it if you want, but we should know what the sense is. I think there's valuable information to be obtained by doing that. It's your call to do as you please.

Pres. Turgut says thank you for that respect, as I respected previous presidents as they conducted business on this floor as well.

Senator Ersoy Subasi I have been listening to the discussions, and I see both of those against and supporting arguments from the floor, mostly opposing arguments. I think we are not being fair when we accuse the Senate President, not giving us enough time to discuss these matters with our colleagues. It has been three months since this has been discussed. This has been brought to the Senate floor and we had time at least, to talk to our faculty and our colleagues about whether they support the term limits or not. It's my understanding that the executive committee included in the discussion since the beginning, and they have seen all these discussions. They were supposed to have it in their own private meetings. I think we are not doing any good service to ourselves. We should just listen to each other a bit and see why this is on the floor. Why all of a sudden we started to argue on this. There is a simple solution for this one. If we all oppose the resolution, vote no. We have done that before in the last minute meetings as well. We have dropped resolutions during the meeting, and we vote on that by changing the sentences by changing the words. We all know that we all remember that. And right now I don't think we are being true to ourselves. I don't think being fair. So please note that, and when we discuss things we try to be constructive. Just take a deep breath and see where this decision is going to go.

Senator Rusovici says as you know we have a lot of stuff involved here and a lot of emotions. I feel that emotions on both sides are very strong. We keep going on with the discussions as he doesn't feel that a rushed motion will be beneficial.

Pres. Turgut says thank you. At this point. I am not a believer of the sense of the Senate on a prepared resolution which has been discussed for three months. However, I am willing to extend it. I am not putting it for a motion to go on a vote on this. That's where we should leave it at. Then go back and then revisit it to your own research, if you like, about other institutions as well. There has been many changes in the last 10-12 years in this institution and in higher education. So this is just the new reflection of this.

Senator Suksawang says see the problem is not this it's that (Pres. Turgut jumps in)

Pres. Turgut says I'm sorry I did not open the floor for discussion. I am stopping it as the presiding officer. I can do that. I am not voting on anything.

Senator Suksawang says but you are going to ask us to vote next time and I'm curious about next week if we're going to have this again? Voting on the resolution as is? But we already made so many suggestions to you yet you say we are voting on the same resolution. What is the point of that?

Pres. Turgut says there wasn't much suggestions other than the one he heard from the Senator from the Library to make an amendment.

Senator Suksawang says a few other things were talked about such as the term limits. They talked about it was difficult logistically.

Pres. Turgut says we have to stop you there. I will send out information in advance on this.

New Business

President Turgut brings up the following piece of new business.

Faculty Standing Committee Chair elections: Call for nominations for Chair Faculty Excellence Awards Committee, Chair of Academic Policies Committee, and Chair TRI (Technology Resources and Infrastructure) Committee.

This is a call for nominations for Chair for faculty excellence awards which is up for renewal and Senator Julie Costopoulos is welcome to run again. Also this is a call for nominations for the Chair of Academic Policies Committee and Senator Vipuil Kishore is welcome to run again, and I know that he has applied. We also have a vacant Standing Committee which is the Technology, Resources, and Infrastructure (TRI) Committee. We will do these elections in the April meeting. Finally, the Senate officers elections for President and Secretary, this is an open call for nominations, and they are elected for one year.

The nominations should all be emailed to Pres. Turgut and they will stay open until the previous day of the April 4, 2023 Faculty Senate meeting. We would like to have vision statements like the last couple of years as a tradition.

Tolga Turgut asks for a motion to adjourn.

Senator Julie Costopoulos responds. Motion to adjourn.

Senator William Bowman responds. I second the motion.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:59pm.

Respectively submitted,

Aaron Welters, Faculty Senate Secretary