

Faculty Senate Meeting

When: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 – 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), Charles Bryant (Business), Steven Rivet (COB), Abram Walton (COB), Angel Otero (Business Online), Don Platt (APSS), Razvan Rusovici (APSS), Manasvi Lingam (APSS), Kenia Nunes (BCES), Mehmet Kaya (BCES), Vipuil Kishore (BCES), Nasri Nesnas (BCES), Luis Otero (CES), Brian Lail (CES), Nasheen Nur (CES), Nakin Suksawang (MCE), Hamidreza Najafi (MCE), Joo Young Park (MTH), Nezamodini-Kachouie (MTH), Pallav Ray (OEMS), Angela Tenga (SAC), Gordon Patterson (SAC), Kim Sloman (Scott/BA), David Wilder (BA), Patrick Converse (PSY), Jessica Wildman (PSY), Julie Costopoulos (PSY), William Bowman (LIB), Csaba Palotai (APSS), Troy Nguyen (MCE), Gary Zarillo (OEMS), Spencer Fire (OEMS), Kevin Burke (SAC), Debbie Lelekis (SAC)

Senators Absent: None

Proxies: Brooke Wheeler [proxy for Senator Jordan Poole (Aeronautics)]

Other Attendees: Rudolf Wehmschulte, Raymond Bonhomme, Mary Bonhomme, Bob King, Paula do Vale Pereira, Rian Mehta, Nick Daher, Theodore Richardson, Roberto Peverati, Yasha Berchenko-Kogan, Chelsea Stripling, Jean Carlos Perez, Munevver Subasi, Tristan Fiedler, Rob van Woelik, Penny Vassar, Marc Baarmand, Nancy Garmer, Marius Silaghi, Marco Carvalho, Eric Perlman

Call to Order

Pres. Turgut called the meeting to order at 3:30pm. The recordings of the April 5, 2022 meeting were acknowledged and a motion to approve the minutes by recording was asked by Pres. Turgut, Senator Steven Rivet made that motion, and Senator Csaba Palotai seconded the motion.

Welcome & introduce: Interim President Robert L. King in the Faculty Senate and to provide a general update of our institution.

Interim President Robert L. King thanks the Senate for the invitation. Then says that first and foremost he was honored to have been selected by the search committee and recommend by the Board to serve as the Interim President. Interim presidencies are always kind of an odd thing because you have to come in and run the operation to a certain extent, and do the things that campus presidents are supposed to do, and at the same time know that what I'm really trying to do is prepare the University for whoever the permanent President will be. The search process for the permanent President is just

getting under way. The search firm that will conduct that is the Association of Governing Boards (AGB). They will have a search component. They are beginning the process by hosting a series of meetings on campus with faculty, students, administrators, and members of the Board. I suspect at some point they may come and talk to me. What they will do from that process is create a profile of the kind of person that collectively there is a consensus around in terms who that next campus leader might be. Once that's agreed to, the search committee in a process with the Board, will begin advertising and soliciting applications. My guess is that because of the quality of this institution, it will attract some very talented people from across the country, maybe even from across the globe, to be considered. They will go through the applications and come up, I guess, with a list of ten or twenty serious candidates they think are best of those applicants and will lead to interviews that occur, probably, off campus to begin with, maybe, a larger list of 8-10 candidates and then down to a group of, probably, three finalists who will be brought to campus for meetings and interviews. And out of that process somebody will be selected and if they accept then his hope is that selection will be completed by Feb. or March. That would give the person time to finish out their service for that semester wherever they are coming from and give that person and himself an opportunity to begin a transition so that when he completes his service on June 30th, they can step into the Presidency the next day and take on leading campus.

He thinks it will be healthy for the campus and he would recommend for the Board is to develop a really aspirational strategic plan. What does the campus want to be in 5-10-15 years? And then mapping out a process of how to get there. Part of that process includes this exercise going on right now of selecting the new President. He thinks the two can be nicely related. We can get some of that started, but not finalized until the University President is selected. But he thinks this effort with town hall meetings around campus will be helpful in getting there.

Addressing the initial question of Pres. Turgut on how's the campus doing right now? And, what do I see so far? He says this. He arrived July 11th with the campus very quiet place, very few people around, not many cars around, and few students. But toward the end of August, then all of a sudden the parking lots were full of cars and faculty had returned. Then the following day, incoming 1st-year students and their parents were unloading all their supplies. And away we went. We have an actual census coming out in about a week and a half, which will verify what we believe is the largest incoming class in the history of the University, close to 1000 new students. Most are 1st year students and some are transfer students from other institutions. The academic profile of the class is they have clearly been effected by the last couple of years of COVID. As you may have heard from national news, the reports of this national assessment of educational progress, which is an exam that's been administered every two years across the country to the fourth, eighth, and twelfth graders, paints a very unfortunate picture of learning loss for youngsters. But the test results have been reported so far for the nine-year-olds. I don't expect the picture to be much different for students who just graduated this past spring and students that will be considered for next spring in terms of their academic readings. And so, if there is one thing I could ask of all of you it would be in the first couple of weeks of school that we be particularly alert for students who

may be struggling and reach out to them, or have advisors reach out to them to do what we can to get them back on track. But overall, students that are here are all right. They are obviously motivated to study and in some of the most challenging disciplines. So overall their futures will be all right. But he thinks it is on us to make sure that if they are having some difficulties, we understand that some of that is a reflection of the last couple of years that they had to put up with.

Beyond that, we are currently searching for a chief financial officer (CFO). Mike Jones, on the Interim Pres. King's 4th day, announced that he had decided to return to California, and so we are currently interviewing candidates for another interim position. It was our collective judgement that bringing in a CFO at this point in time would be wise for that person to come in with the understanding that it is on an interim basis so that when the new President is selected, if he/she wants to, can go in a different direction in terms of that person if they wish. We should have a person selected in another week or two.

The other thing I can tell you is that after a number of discussions with Dr. Carvalho and Chairman of the Board, we decided to reinstate the position of general counsel and we're actively in the process of searching for a full-time attorney who will serve here at the University. He's already seen a number of instances where we really need that kind of regular help, and it will be more sensible to have somebody on board doing that rather than contracting it out. For in a very high crisis situation, you want someone who knows the University well to be working with.

(Interim President King finishes and lets the Senate know he is ready to take any questions or comments)

Pres. Turgut says he has two questions. Number one, the CFO interim position will be a position for the next six to twelve months?

Interim Pres. King replies we are planning to have the term of the interim CFO overlap the new President's term about three months so that the new incoming President will have somebody here for their first couple months. Obviously that person will have been participating in the development of the budget for the next fiscal year and so be able to carry over and help the President.

Pres. Turgut asks: is it the same AGB search committee that we are using for that search?

Interim Pres. King replies we are actually using two organizations for that. AGB has provided us with some candidates and we're also using an organization called the Registry.

Pres. Turgut says that his second question is: What happened to our previous general counsel?

Interim Pres. King replies he doesn't know kind of the backstory. He does know that it was two years ago that President McCay decided to dismiss that person, but he doesn't know why. And the former President then decided that he would take on those responsibilities for managing the legal issues of the University. As you know, he (Interim Pres. King) practiced law for 20 years and that training is helping him right now taking on those responsibilities until we get a general counsel. But the things that are happening on a daily basis that require legal involvement such as, for example, matters involving HR issues, protection of a patent that one of our professors earned and may be infringed on so their working to see what they can do to make sure the patent rights are retained, we are selling a parcel of land and a building, and we are involved in forming a partnership with another institution. So all these things require the active intervention of lawyers. It takes more time to do contracts and documents as well as sometimes interacting with other lawyers than he has the time to devote to on a full-time basis. The other thing is given some of the difficulties that he understands that lead to the departure of President McCay, not having a lawyer here whose obligation is to represent the University as an institution, who report both to the President and the Board, but who understand that it is the University that is their client, is really important. And in the immediate past where part of the problem was the behavior of the former President, there was no place for that matter to be addressed much earlier than it did. And so that is the importance of this position and we have as well oodles of relationships with insurances (and insurance companies) that protect the University, its property, and its personnel, all those things plus title IX, HR issues, etc. are worthy of having a full-time general counsel.

Pres. Turgut reads off a question that was sent to him. Could you identify which property we are selling?

Interim Pres. King replies that it is a building not on campus, but on rivers edge.

Dr. Eric Perlman asks the question: Is this one person we are looking for general counsel or a firm that might have multiple lawyers that could support the University?

Interim Pres. King replies that it has been his recommendation to hire a person who would work for the University directly, who would be on campus, to get to see and know the people and the Institution. And as he said, this role is enormously important, where the attorney understands that as central to their responsibility is the representation of the University as an institution, which is their client and not the President, not the Board, per se although they are to provide their very best advice to both the Board and President, or to the working units of the University that may require some sort of legal help. The general counsel would be the liaison to any outside counsel that might be needed for more specialized legal expertise. He can see that right now we are using lots of outside counsel and the cost of that counsel are pretty high so if we tally up at the end of the fiscal year we will see we are spending an awful lot more on a variety of law firms than we would spend on a general counsel.

Senator Nakin Suksawang asks the questions: Who is involved in the strategic plan of 5-10-15 years, as you prepare for the next President, and that sort of thing that you mentioned? Can we provide any input that we can share?

Interim Pres. King replies that he would suggest that this is something the Board would have to lead and they use a process that is very much like what they are doing right now to develop a profile for the new President. I would host a series of town hall meetings around the campus, soliciting input from the faculty, students, alumni, the Board, and the Administration. I've spent a lot of time in my first couple of weeks here, meeting with representatives of some of the major employers that hire our graduates. I've started meeting with some of the political leaders, because in part, I want them to understand about this incredible gem of a university that they have in their midst, and also to pick their brains in terms of, particularly the employers, what they think they need out of our graduates. All of these, all of these constituents can contribute to building an idea or longer term sense of what do we want from this place. It could range from the community of this university and the Board says, we want to stay the same size we are and we want to focus on x, y, or z in terms of various disciplines. That would be one approach. Another approach might be to say we want to double the size of the university. Then what does it take? How many more faculty? How many more classrooms? Dormitories? And how would you finance it? He is not suggesting either one is the right answer, it could be more or less or something in between. The answer to his question is to use a process where the soldiers get to comment on what the plan ought to be, that is the way these things are typically done and certainly the way he would want it done if he were the permanent President.

(Pres. Turgut thanks the Interim Pres. King and moves on to next item of the agenda).

Update on faculty and academic related issues for the new academic year by EVP, Provost, & COO Dr. Marco Carvalho

Pres. Turgut begins by thanking and recognizing Dr. Carvalho, on behalf of the faculty and the Faculty Senate, for him and his office on their efforts in the last couple of years that he (Pres. Turgut) has had the experience of working very closely. He (Pres. Turgut) was one of the few people who always attended the coffee hours in the last two years, and so he has observed what we have done as an institution in the last couple of years in various platforms. So, in our coffee hours and in our Senate meetings, he's (Provost Carvalho) always attended, he's always made himself available, and we have to always give the credit where it's due. As the faculty Senate President-elect I have begun working with him directly and recently, after April 5th, I started working directly as the Faculty Senate President, with Dr. Carvalho and his office. His leadership has been very solid during the turbulent times. Over the summer, without having to go through a lot of bureaucracy, he took immediate action to help us with our request of aligning Spring Break with the Brevard public schools. That was very important. I always believe that constructive dialogue gets more done, and that was the route that I followed. Similarly, with the faculty salary adjustment, which we got the good news last Friday, thanks to

our top management, Dr. Carvalho and Mr. King, and it was approved. It's the first year, in the 8-9 years I've been here, that we are starting an academic calendar year with very positive news, and I really appreciate that.

(Pres. Turgut yields the floor to Provost Carvalho)

Provost Marco Carvalho says: Thanks Pres. Turgut for those kind words and thanks the Senate for the opportunity to speak with the faculty. There has been a number of issues that you all have been following what's been going on for the last several months. Those have been very challenging, but I am very pleased to say that the University is stable and strong. If there is a characteristic of this university, it is that we are truly able to get together address and resolve issues much better than any institution that I have ever worked at and, frankly, for most institutions that I know. Whoever is sitting on this chair when they assume my position, they will have the privilege to have the support that I had, because I truly believe that this is the nature of the university. People do come together, and people do resolve issues. It all goes well when we have a chance to talk and we have a chance to converse.

I would like to give you just a few numbers as a baseline. As discussed before, our census number is September 23 for the main campus and Sept. 24 for online. So what I'm telling you right now is not final, but a good indicator. It is true that we are bringing forward, quite likely, the largest class of the university. It's going to be about 970-980 students. This is what we are aiming for and likely going to hit. One important aspect to remember is that the overall undergrad population on main campus is actually declining, and it has declined from last year to this year. This is a combination of both the increasing the graduation numbers, which is a good thing. So as you increase your graduation, we've been working on doing that for the last several years, you have a greater exit. We used to have a six-year graduation rate of 60%. In the last two years, we came to 66% and 67%.

One other effect that actually is more concerning is the retention on the first year. This has likely been an effect of COVID. We do not anticipate that it will be gone this year, but will linger for another year or two. The reason for that is because we made the determination early on to allow for students to take pass no credit. Even though that allows for students not to be affected as much on the GPA perspective, but whatever they didn't learn carries over. We're going to start seeing these effects for the next year or two. So I do want to echo the words from Mr. King, which is like we should pay attention to close attention to our students, especially now because some of them are coming with a little bit of a unrealistic GPA, because of some of those variations on no credit. Also some are coming from high school as freshmen who've been remote for a number of years, it's important to paid attention to that.

Our number of on-campus students in the undergrad is 3326. Our on-campus graduate students has increase a little bit, which is a good thing. But what I would like to make a point is that we've always talked about our international population. We've been recognized, we were the fourth in ranking in terms of international students. That

number has been continuously declining. As a matter of reference, in the past 15-20% of incoming freshmen were international students, whereas in the last few years it has been around 8%, which means you will see a decline. We are replacing those students with domestic students. But another important aspect to note is that there is also a difference in rates, because international students normally have very little discount and they have a tuition pay which is higher than domestic students. So, as you shift those populations, even though you may be growing numbers, you do have a little bit of impact in terms of revenue. But the health of the University continues to be positive.

For undergraduate programs, we continue to have our most popular programs begin space engineering, mechanical engineering, computer science, and the College of Aeronautics coming up strongly. On the graduate level we have business administration, computer science, and systems engineering as some of our top programs.

A very difficult matter is retention of faculty. This is not a problem that is specific to Florida Tech. This has been going on across the board not just in academia, across the board all over. It is natural. Some of the effects of this pandemic has created variations and a lot more mobility in the market, and we have noticed that. We have made very deliberate efforts to try to compensate and to try to recoup and rebuild our faculty. I want to give you a little bit of numbers on that which may be helpful. Our target is at this point about 315 faculty members that is based on our historical numbers and our populations of students. We are currently at 301. What that means is that we have not been able to hire enough faculty to be able to bring up to the full population. This is despite the fact that we hired 39 faculty this year and even with that we are still below the curve. That is not a matter of open positions and not a matter of us trying. The competition is higher. The challenges are still out there, and we are trying to strike a balance between being competitive with the hiring process and elevating the status of our current Faculty population. So the challenge is that once you're trying to address issues that are decade old, you don't have the privilege to go back and start raising and competing for new faculty, you have to take care of a full population of faculty that are already here and also the population of graduate students. So all those issues they come together at once, and what we try to do is to accommodate them in the best way we can. So we try to strike a balance where we can try to adjust the payment of our faculty to be competitive, and at the same time try to be as competitive enough on new faculty coming in. So I believe that some of the efforts that have been put in place, they're not necessarily correcting the problem, they're working on that direction. We're fully aware of that. I think that right now working with the Dr. Turgut and with the Board, we were able to get this 4% adjustment now, which we know it's not the full amount that we would like to have in place, but that was what the budget could accommodate. We continue to make some of these adjustments going forward and trying to work out and trade some of the priorities to be able to focus our resources on the faculty. If there is something that I've been asking and trying to promote as much as I can was to adjust some of the investment priorities to human resources, and what I mean by that is to be able to put in the human capital. One of the things we did recently was to try to modify one of the approved buildings that we were going to build on our surplus revenue to be able to shift some of these resources back to salaries. To me this is very important,

because if you can make that investment, the rest come from it, but it's a process and it takes some time. Right now, we have this adjustment coming up retroactive to the beginning of the term. We have the merit coming in January. But I've already spoken with Mr. King and others, to do a budget revision in early spring, which I hope we will be in a good position at that time to be able to revisit and try to accommodate other adjustments, both for faculty and staff at that time.

Right now, our population of faculty is in terms of ranking, is that we have 24% of our faculty are at the Professor level, 26% at the Associate, 36% at the Assistant, and the remainder are temporary faculty. By temporary, I don't mean adjuncts, I mean instructors and visiting which have year-to-year contracts. This population generally we want to increase the number of assistance to be able to bring up the flow, but it's at least not as imbalanced. I believe we're making progress towards the mix we're trying to achieve.

(Provost Carvalho stops here and takes questions)

Pres. Turgut asks: Pre-COVID we were around 330 faculty?

Provost Carvalho responds: No, 326. And the reality is that there is a mix of faculty that change, and that goes back into teaching versus research and some of those allocations.

Pres. Turgut asks: We had some faculty who opted to retire early, is that correct?

Provost Carvalho responds: That is correct. We had some that, after the voluntary retirement, left the University for some other reasons. Now the target for us is to try to bring this back to 315.

Pres. Turgut adds the following: I could also speak to the fact that in the Board of Trustees meeting that I attended, Dr. Carvalho was very vocal about the faculty resources, and I think that our Board of Trustees took that into attention. Also a couple of Deans (here on Zoom) as well they were witnesses of that. We highlighted this point, and this would serve well to our institution to be more competitive in the long run. But we have to always remember we are a private, I call it quasi-research at the moment not fully research although hope to be in future, institution.

(Pres. Turgut opens the floor to questions)

Senator Mehmet Kaya asks the question: In regard to our rankings, what do you think is the most important or what are the top things?

Provost Carvalho responds: There are several elements that build up the ranking, we have been focusing on specifically those that we can address. Right now, what hurts us the most, when you look at the different matrix, is number one resources. And that's both faculty resources, that's not just the salary, it's also what you put in terms of

development, sabbaticals, etc. There is also a reputational ranking that hurts us a lot. Let me qualify that reputational ranking. It's not the fact that people rank you low, it's if people don't rank you, you're also hurt by it. So if you are very good, but you're not known or recognized or not ranked, you do poorly. So you don't necessarily find yourself in a situation where people go and say, Florida Tech is weak, that's why we have a low ranking. We have very little response, so clearly there is problem there. On faculty resource, one of the things that has been happening is that we didn't do ourselves a lot of favors awhile back, when we are doing corrections of faculty salary by doing supplementals, adjustments, and second contracts. All those things basically don't show up when you report your numbers and they prevent you from actually raising the salaries, which is a bad strategy because you're not getting any recognition or credit from these on rankings. And I think that one of the things we need to do as a university is to try to recognize that the more we can focus in directing the resources to the institution and reverting those with permanent pay to the faculty, the better we will be. We'll be much better doing that than if you actually have a lower salary, but find a way to compensate for it by doing, for example, consulting. If we can find ways to bring those resources through the university that can reflect in a more permanent and higher salary, we all benefit and this is something we've been trying to do.

Senator Kaya responds thank you and asks: Is there anything that faculty can do to contribute to that?

Provost Carvalho responds: Yes and I'm glad you asked. There are very simple things that we can do that make a huge difference. For example, when you're talking about retention and graduation rates and time to graduation, a lot of the students that actually fail to graduate on time being 4, 5, or 6 years graduation rate. They don't necessarily do that because there is struggle. They do that because they don't pay attention. They go back on the last year, and they figure out I'm missing one more class, I'll take the next semester. For many of them that doesn't make a whole lot of a difference. But when you cross that one semester, you completely change your numbers. So one of the things that we started doing from my office was I build the lists of those students, and I give it to the Deans, and I tell them that these students are approaching graduation. If you just meet with them, and you talk to them and see what's missing, maybe with just some advice, this student graduates on time. Very rarely is the case that these students do that because they are aware of the problem, and they just can't make it. It happens, of course, but that's not nearly as common. So advising that means a lot. If we can take the moment to actually understand these students, and often if you don't know to best advise them just get them to somebody who can help because that means a lot and makes a difference.

The second thing is we don't as a team take advantage to help our own image. We can do better on that and I sincerely believe that we are much better than we say we are and we're much better than we believe we are at times. And I say that because I've heard and been through, multiple times, hiring processes where you have an extremely well qualified fact that they are passionate, they are engaged, they want to participate, but then they meet with our faculty, and they get such a bad impression sometimes from the institution, because sometimes that the person doesn't believe

themselves. They see the problems rather than the opportunities. I believe we can do better in elevating ourselves, and that will pay itself out many times over. When I meet with my peers and others, very often people have a concept of Florida Tech which is better than we often have of ourselves. It's something hard to change and we've been trying to change. We can do better. As I mentioned many times, we are all faculty. We come into administrative positions because we want to help the institution, and then we need to go back to our faculty positions and give someone else the opportunity to do that. Because if people can have this vision and they can understand the potential of the institution, I sincerely think we can all be better. We can all understand better the strength of the institution and the strength of us as a collective. So believe in that, and promote that because that will help us all.

Senator Kaya responds: Thank you. I think one thing that would help and can be done is to convey this message to all the faculty, to make sure that each faculty is aware of these.

Provost Carvalho responds: Yes, you're right. And trust me when I say that communicating better is something that we all strive for. It's not easy. If I could count on your support for this or one of the things that I would really like to ask your help is if you see a problem, if you see something going wrong, and if you believe there is an area or something that is not working, then the best thing you can do is to reach out and bring this forward. Because you will see that 9 out of 10 times those things can be resolved very quickly. And many times there are not even issues, rather they are just misunderstandings. But because we are all busy, we're all underwater trying to resolve many issues at the same time, then we miss that opportunity, and then very small issues become big issues. So if there is something we can do better, it's exactly this. Trust me that I will always welcome anybody that reach out to me and say I have a problem, I'm concerned with this, or why is this decision being made? I'm happy to have that conversation anytime rather than hearing someone else's opinion about some of the decisions that are being made, because often may not be necessarily accurate.

Pres. Turgut responds: Thank you. I also believe in open and bona fide dialogue is the route to success all the time. Just going back to touch underlining something about advising. I think it is an area that some of us do very well because they enjoy advising. Some of us though I don't think fully grasped the implications of a student graduating 6 months later, it means 6 months later employment. If the student realizes that they come and tend to blame the advisor and the institution, which is very key. I can attest to this from our College of Aeronautics, because if one of our flight options students graduate six months later, that's six months later in their seniority for a lifetime. That impact them enormously. Therefore, there are a few tricks when it comes to advising. Prerequisites, co-requisites, Gen. Ed. Courses, the first two years, you know in accreditation it says to us the first two years they have to be taken. When we clear those, there is less scheduled conflict. That's where the problem arises for them in later graduation. That's very important.

Pres. Turgut reads out loud a private question from the (Zoom) chat: The vast majority of the recent hires were from COES, but COPLA and COB have not even been a replacement level for the past few years, including the fact that the salary for replacement faculty have not been increased, but were cut significantly for some positions by over 20-30K. Thus, how can we be competitive as an institution when the only college that is receiving priority is COES?

Provost Carvalho responds: I will give you some numbers. First, 69% of our students are in COES and 55% of the faculty are in COES, and they do teach general education. It's not necessarily the case that COES has been given priority. You look at the number of people that have been lost, and they have been proportionally behind that college as well. This is by far the largest college. In terms of the salaries, there is some misconceptions, for instance, that the highest paid professors in this university, if you were to look by college, is the College of Business. So when you actually look at the percentages, they are not necessarily just straight out in the way that they are being represented. There is a lot of competitiveness and the replacement of lines, they are aligned with the current positions. What we are trying to avoid is to creating the salary compression problem that we are trying to resolve right now. Some of the challenges is that if you look at the way that we're trying to properly save the salaries is to elevate the baseline for the current faculty, and we have the positions being replaced on top of the average, they actually above those averages, because we anticipate the average raising. I don't know exactly what's being referred to as the 30-40K reduction in particular cases, unless the example being taken is of a professor that retires, and then an assistant professor is being hired in that place. I'll be happy to discuss if the person would like to bring those forward to me, or be happy to discuss and look at exact numbers.

Pres. Turgut says thank you and adds that across the university there are some disparities because there are different industries, post-pandemic picking up. We have open positions at the College of Aeronautics, there is nothing to blame our institution. I'm in the Search Committee myself, we are looking, but the industry picked up and the income levels have gone up so we are not as competitive to hire at the moment. We are trying and hopefully the right people will come and it may be at a different rank. We had top-ranked faculty retire early and we are trying to replace them with what we can find.

Provost Carvalho replies that he would like to make one more point on this. We have to remember is that about two years ago, one thing I was very strict about was the hiring process for the faculty is through the faculty. You will not find any professor that was hired without coming through a faculty committee. I have not allow anybody to come into the ranks of the regular faculty without going through the Search Committee. But the downside of that is that it is a process. If you lose a faculty member today, then you will not be able to replace that person immediately. It does happen that you lose a faculty member today and the Dean may choose to put a visiting professor in place while they search for a regular faculty replacement, but that is not in any way replacing faculty with temporary faculty. The process allows the faculty to choose their peers, which is absolutely important, and not just their peers but also their Deans and so on

and so forth. We have to recognize that unfortunately we will never be a perfect system until we can recoup our faculty population. We will be struggling a little, we have positions open yet we many of them have not been filled because we didn't have the demand. Thus, please as we go through this, let us try to recognize some of these effects and let's work together to see how we can mitigate them, so they don't affect our process as at least as possible.

Pres. Turgut thanks him and then reads out loud a private question from the (Zoom) chat: The University's web page is both a portal for recruiting students and an image of how we perceive ourselves as an institution. The recent changes in the web page are cumbersome. Do you have any thoughts on the current web page and how can we enter a process of devising both a welcoming and functional portal?

Provost Carvalho replies: Yes and I do. One of the challenges we've always had in our pages is that they've been devised in house and they are never perfect. This time the Marketing Department subcontracted consultants to recommend the page, and they work with the Marketing Department to recommend the website. I have my own personal perspectives on this, but I am not a marketing person, and I will not feel qualified to make that assessment. There are people here which are much more qualified than I am to make recommendations on that. And I urge you to do that by bringing it up to the Marketing Department as they want to do the right thing. They've contracted this group. They consulted with them. They did the implementation recommended by them. They had multiple sessions, including enrollment management. And yes, I heard criticisms about the site, maybe more than accolades, but nevertheless, they've been through the process to try to do the best possible job. They are absolutely open to the help and they are not doing that on their own. They are trying to get consultants who are trying to get support, they will welcome your support, and in his opinion thinks you can help improve it.

Pres. Turgut thanks him and adds: I think constructive criticism when it comes to marketing, is always welcome, because I could speak as an expert because I was a chief marketing officer of a multi-billion dollar company before so there is no right or wrong in marketing. What is right today may be wrong in three years from now or three years before, i.e., the market is always fluid. We have colleagues here from the College of Business who would attest to this.

Provost Carvalho replies: I would ask you, we do have a group in the Marketing Department, they are really open to this and so if you have recommendations, please bring it to them.

Senator Nakin Suksawang says: Thanks so much for the 4% increase, it is good news. But he thinks there will be some colleagues who will have questions about Equity pay. I remember last time you mentioned that if we do the 4%, we might not be able to do equity. So my question is will we still continue with equity? And if so, is that going to be done this year, next year, or what's your plan for that?

Provost Carvalho replies: So the plan for the equity is to do that that at the beginning of spring, but that will require a re-evaluation of the budget. Let me explain why that is the case. With the departure of President and while I was active President during that time, we made a number of modifications in short term of major expenses so that we were able to free up resources to provide support for personnel, both faculty and staff. Now through those transitions we also had a change of CFO and several other changes in higher administration. Hence, the budget needs to be reevaluated to ensure that the resources are there for this and the expectation is that we will do that in early spring. So the idea and my full intention is to work as diligently as I can to be able to support an equity for the faculty and staff in early spring. The staff at the lower pay levels, they already had the process started, but not the full staff group. So we need to do that once we are able to re-engage with the finance for the evaluation in spring. But the intention is to do that separately from the merit.

Provost Carvalho asks Pres. Turgut for a chance to make one more comment that he failed to make in his remarks as he thinks it's important to note. Pres. Turgut says, of course.

Provost Carvalho says: To keep everyone updated, we are in the final negotiations with our agreements with the Burrell College of Osteopathic Medicine. We're working on a final contract with them. This is not public information, I'm sharing this with the faculty. The negotiations are handled by the Finance Office. They will be finalized by the end of the month. That being the case there is the potential for the school to be active on campus in 2024. They will be utilizing some of our physical space on campus. I've already had some of the discussions with the Deans in the last meetings, and the Deans are working with some of their individual groups to try to accommodate that. So please follow that, and hopefully, we'll be able to announce that publicly. But all the indicators are that the school should be signing up on this month to be active in 2024.

Pres. Turgut thanks him and then reads out loud a private question from the (Zoom) chat: Please explain why, if the Social Security Administration made a COLA increase of 9%, we only made a 4%, is the intention to give another 4-5% next year, or will we continue to stay behind?

Provost Carvalho responds: The intent not to stay behind. We know how important it is to be competitive and to recognize our faculty, this is something we think about all the time. The problem is that we are not a line item in the budget for this state, we depend on our own revenues and depend on the things we generate. We have a limited number of resources that do come primarily from tuition and we have to balance that. We try to make changes that enable resources to be redirected to faculty. We've been doing that for the last two years, and if you notice that reduced the number of higher level administration and we made a number of structural changes to try to move resources to this. But unfortunately we do not have the flexibility to be indexed to inflation, because we are tied to revenue. Hence we are bound by those constraints. Many of you have seen the battle we're going through in terms of reducing sports, well these are the trade-offs. These are ways that people find to try to allocate resources from one place to

another, so faculty can be better paid, and others can be better paid. These are not easy decisions, but they are very important decisions that we are doing to be competitive and try to grow. Thus, the answer is that we are trying to go to that level and beyond, if we can. But that is limited by our ability to generate the resources for it.

Pres. Turgut thanks him and asks: The question was phrased as COLA, but what we got is faculty salary adjustment?

Provost Carvalho replies: Correct. And the reason why we make that differentiation is that we can't index a raise to the cost of living, because our revenue is not tied to it. So our ability to be able to do this is tied to our ability to generate revenue which is the good news because if we are able to do the things we talked about elevating ourselves, helping our colleagues, developing some of our abilities to collect more resources, philanthropic resources, if we can do that then we can go beyond that.

Pres. Turgut asks: To further clarify, the next attempt when revisiting the pay raises will be related to equity adjustment?

Provost Carvalho replies: Correct. The equity adjustment has two components to it. It has to do with the alignment within differences within our own population which addresses issues such as people that was hired a while back with a smaller salary so that even though they've been getting raises every year, they never catch up, so the compression issue. There is also equity in terms of the competitiveness of us and other programs which are comparable to us. So we look at both aspects in terms of equity and our next opportunity to do that will be the budget re-evaluation in early spring.

(Pres. Turgut thanked Provost Carvalho for his time and participation, then Provost Carvalho leaves the meeting)

Old Business

Committee Reports:

Pres. Turgut asks if there are any committee chairs would like to bring anything to the Senate floor at this time and there was none.

President's Report:

Pres. Turgut reports on what he has been doing during the last few months. I have been very active as of the month of April. With the invitation of the Board of Trustees, I am serving at the President's Search Committee with the announcement going up April 20, 2022. Simultaneously, I have worked on updating the Senator list to get a better picture of where we are with the Faculty Senators and those are updated on our web page. Currently what you see there is the most up-to-date Senator list. Recall, Senator's terms are for three years. And if you want to be active in the Senate then you have to be

elected or reelected by your departments. I like to keep track of that and keep it as current as possible so that everyone knows openly how many years each of us has been serving in the Senate.

Over the summer some concerns came by the Executive Committee, thank you to Senators Julie Costopoulos and Nakin Suksawang, about the spring break alignment. We brought it up to the Provost office, and that was immediately put in place without spending too much time, directly with open dialogue, and they were very responsive to this.

Faculty salary adjustment, which was discussed, this was also part of his meeting with the Board of Trustees. He relentlessly brought it up, repeating it like 5-6 times about the faculty resources. I am very relentless one pursuing what comes from our Faculty Senate.

I attended the new faculty workshop as the Faculty Senators and I provided insight to our incoming new faculty, so that they would have first that information about the mission of our Senate, the policies of our Senate, what the committees do, and so forth.

I also attended a couple of meetings with respect to retirement Funds Investment Committee. Senator Brian Lail was attending this last year, and then I took over. I attend a couple of meetings that was about our 403b, how it is invested. I wish I could give good news, but you know the market, they have not been doing very good for the last year, but overall they are still positive according to the information he has been provided. Faculty Senate President is not a voting member.

The Board of Trustees has announced listening sessions, which was his suggestion to have university faculty listening session, for tomorrow at 9am. And I have discussed with them the opportunity to have a listening session also in the Faculty Senate floor in our October meeting.

(Pres. Turgut opens the floor to questions)

Dr. Eric Perlman says: It seems to me that this is a very limited opportunity for the faculty to give input on the search process, even at this early stage. And I'm actually very concerned about this, because I think that one of the problems that we have had in previous searches for Presidents and for Deans is that there has been very little opportunity for faculty input. I think we need a lot more opportunity than what currently exists for faculty input.

Pres. Turgut responds: One thing is the surveys they sent out. Secondly, the resolution we sent forward has gone directly to the Board of Trustees, which describes the expectations of the Faculty Senate in writing as a resolution (see also the April 5, 2022 Faculty Senate meeting). In the President's Search Committee I have advocated for that. We will also have a faculty listening session, one tomorrow, there was one today which was open to all campus communities, plus a survey and a listening session, to be confirmed, in the Faculty Senate. I was also informed about the previous search in 2001-2002, currently there are two or three Board of Trustees who have been in that role in that Search Committee as well so they have first-hand knowledge.

Senator Gordon Patterson says that there was a Search Committee in 1986-1988 that brought in Pres. Weaver and then in 2001 the University launched a formalized search parallels the search going on right now.

Pres. Turgut says that when our Senate secretary completes the minutes in writing as well, we will add the resolutions that passed too so that everyone is well informed.

Dr. Eric Perlman says: I appreciate those things and I am informed on those things as well as keeping up with those meetings. But it seems to me that there is still not very much opportunity for faculty input at this stage and I am concerned about that. Also I am concerned that there is not sufficient faculty representation on the Search Committee, in particular, on a college by college basis.

Pres. Turgut says: That is the decision of the Board of Trustees. We are a private university, and they wanted to proceed via their voting, to have a limited Presidential Search Committee and have a search advisory committee, which I am advocating to have more faculty representation in that. Please feel free to bring your concerns up via the listening sessions and the surveys. That's what those are for.

Senator Mehmet Kaya says: We have the tools to provide the feedback, but how much of these will be considered by the Search Committee or the Board.

Pres. Turgut responds: Thank you for that. At the moment at the Presidential Search Committee, only the Faculty Senate President, who represents the entire faculty, is there. With respect to the Advisory Search Committee, they are going to have more representation of the faculty and other constituents, and these are well described in the announcements. Also, they have hired a firm that is going to process all the data gathered. Within a month, at the end of October, the Board of Trustees will finalize its profile of the candidate. Looking at other institutions of similar size, our process is very transparent.

Senator Kaya says we can nominate an internal candidate as well.

Pres. Turgut responds yes it's in the survey question, so you can do that even.

(Pres. Turgut moves on to new business)

New Business

President Turgut brings up the following piece of new business on a call for nominations.

Call for nominations for Chairs of Academic Policies Committee, Administrative Policy Committee, Scholarship Committee, TRI (Technology Resources and Infrastructure) Committee, and AFTC membership from COES:

Pres. Turgut says: Based on our policies from a resolution that was voted on in Jan. 2018, the committee chairmanships are for two year rotations and must be Senators (the members to the committees can be non-Senators). You can seek re-election and others are welcome to self-nominate or be nominated. Thank you for all who have served. The four committees seeking chairs are Academic Policies, Administrative Policy, Scholarship, and TRI.

For the AFTC membership, this is a call for nomination, it doesn't have to be a Senator, but does have to be a tenured faculty from COES. They get elected and serve for three years.

Senator Kaya asks: Does this last one have to be a tenured faculty or does it also have to be a full professor?

Pres. Turgut responds: It has to be tenured faculty.

Tolga Turgut asks for a motion to adjourn.

Senator Steven Rivet responds. Motion to adjourn.

Senator Julie Costopoulos responds. I second the motion.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:59pm.

Respectively submitted,

Aaron Welters, Faculty Senate Secretary