

## **Faculty Senate Meeting**

When: Tuesday, October 4, 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), Vipuil Kishore (BCES), William Bowman (LIB), Pallav Ray (OEMS), David Wilder (BA), Kenia Nunes (BCES), Steven Rivet (Business), Jordan Poole (Aeronautics), Gary Zarillo (OEMS), Ersoy Subasi (Aeronautics), Angel Otero (Business Online), Razvan Rusovici (APSS), Jessica Wildman (PSY), Csaba Palotai (APSS), Charles Bryant (Business), Nasri Nesnas (BCES), Hamid Najafi (MCE), Don Platt (APSS), Julie Costopoulos (PSY), Nezamoddin Nezamoddini-Kachouie (MTH), Gordan Patterson (SAC), Spencer Fire (OEMS), Patrick Converse (PSY), Joo Young Park (MTH), Kevin Burke (SAC), Nasheen Nur (CES), Mehmet Kaya (BCES), Angela Tenga (SAC), Nakin Suksawang (MCE), Manasvi Lingam (APSS), Luis Otero (CES), Abram Walton (COB), Brian Lail (CES)

**Senators Absent:** Troy Nguyen (MCE)

**Proxies:** None.

**Other Attendees:** Tristan Fiedler, Sally Mason (AGB Search), Penny Vassar, Suzanne Odom, Theodore Richardson, Travis Proctor (Chair, Board of Trustees), Rob van Woesik, Kimberly Templeton (AGB Search), Anne Hoffman (AGB Search), Roberto Peverati, Nancy Garmer, Yakov Berchenko-Kogan, Mary Bonhomme, Vicky Knerly, Munevver Subasi, Paula do Vale Pereira, Raymond Bonhomme, Josko Zec, Nick Daher, Joy Patterson, Stephen Smith, Eric Perlman,

### **Call to Order**

Pres. Turgut called the meeting to order at 3:30pm. The minutes from the September 6 2022 meeting were approved via the recordings.

### **Update by AGB Search Team**

Pres. Turgut begins by explaining that this part of the agenda is an update by the AGB search team and with respect to the “FIT President Profile Draft” which we will focus on reviewing the Presidential attributes for the next FIT President, in particular, pages five and six of the document shared to the Faculty Senate by the AGB search team (i.e., the file “FIT President Profile draft approved Search Committee 9.30.22.pdf”). He notes that this draft has been consulted and endorsed by the Search Advisory Committee and the President Search Committee. Then he gives the floor to Ms. Templeton and Dr. Mason.

Dr. Mason begins by saying they have worked hard to put together a profile for our next President that will attract a wide and very talented pool. It’s important she says that we have a really good base of people looking hard at this position to make a decision as whether or not this is the position that would appeal to them and at the same time, our institution have the opportunity to look back at them and say: is this the right person to lead our institution at this time?

She states that her background is that she was a biology professor, moved up the ranks serving as Dean of Arts and Sciences for many years at the University of Kansas. She went on to become Provost at Purdue University for seven years and then served as President at the University of Iowa for eight years. As such she has some experience in higher education and hopes to bring some of that experience to help in this very important search. She also states that she is passionate about higher education and believes that we in the field deserve the very best leadership that we can find for our institutions which is critical today that we have that. She then lets Ms. Templeton introduce herself and walk us through the overview.

Ms. Templeton introduces herself as a principal with AGB search having joined the firm in 2018. She began her career as an attorney in a private practice large international law firm in Washington, DC. She transitioned to the nonprofit space for about a decade and then transitioning about ten years ago to executive search, first in the legal arena with an executive search and attorney consulting firm, then for a boutique organization serving mission-driven and higher-end institutions, and finally joining AGB search about five years ago. She then lets Ms. Hoffman, their colleague, introduce herself.

Ms. Hoffman introduces herself saying she has served as an executive search associate for AGB search for 12 years. Prior to that she was at another executive search firm that specialized in higher education, for eight years.

Ms. Templeton explains that they have been working hard to create that document they shared with the Faculty Senate. In the first couple of pages are the leadership opportunities which they have heard through their listening sessions with various stakeholders and constituent groups as well as the input survey that had about 600+ responses to. What you see is a synthesis of the themes they extracted from all this. It will give an idea of what a new president might want to focus on and give perspective presidential candidates as much context about the opportunities at FIT as they can in a written document. This is the first step in their recruiting process. They will use this document to engage candidates, to be our ambassadors, and to help convey the opportunities that exist. So the first couple pages are an overview synthesis of the common themes that they distilled.

Referring to page five of the document, they have tried to distill a concise overview of the key qualifications, skills, experiences, and attributes the campus community seeks in our next president. She says that this is where they are looking to get your input.

The floor is then opened to the Faculty Senate. The following question is asked privately from the Faculty Senate: Who is on the Search Advisory Committee? President Turgut comments that we should be aware that there are actually two committees, the Search Committee and the Search Advisory Committee. Dr. Mason responds that she had assumed that those who were on these committees had been shared already with the campus, but if not then we should make that happen. Travis Proctor then say that if the Search Advisory Committee has not been shared they will work to get that to the communications team so that it is announced and included in the web page of "President Search". Another question is asked privately from the Faculty Senate: Can we have the Advisory Search Committee member list now, if possible? Travis Proctor responds with yes and he'll share it with the group.

Another question is asked privately from the Faculty Senate: Are these five bullets in order of importance? Dr. Mason responds: These are the top five bullet points reflecting the most important, but the five are not in any order of importance.

Another question is asked privately from the Faculty Senate: What kind of traits are we going to be focusing more on? Dr. Mason responds: Those top five bullets represent the most important ones and those are the bottom of the list are the less or additional points that will help. President Turgut asks the question: Were all outcomes of the surveys reflected in this document as much as possible? Dr. Mason responds: Yes, absolutely. They synthesized a lot of that information contained in those surveys and that is now reflected in the bullets that you see and in concise wording.

Mehmet Kaya asks the question: Do you have any candidates yet based on these surveys? Dr. Mason responds: We are optimistic we will soon. Individuals who are suggested via the survey will be contacted and encouraged to apply.

Brian Lail asks the question: What are the terms, like executive leadership, and terms of that nature which describe the leadership background, were the surveys indicative of a preference towards the academic leadership aspect of the background of a candidate, or is it just executive in the broader sense? Dr. Mason responds: There was a little of each. Certainly, there is a lot of interest and encouragement for someone with the executive academic leadership skills. And that they should be encouraged to apply, and they be looked at seriously. But we are also casting a wide net to entice the people with the skill sets that are consistent with what FIT needs now and in the future hence a very successful leader.

President Turgut asks the question: Is this draft profile reflective of a private nonprofit four-year institution of our size? Dr. Mason responds: Yes.

Another question is asked privately from the Faculty Senate: Is there any intention to include any tangible, measurable attributes, such as the duration of high impact progressive academic positions held? Dr. Mason responds: Yes, people who apply talk about their experiences, how they have been measured or measured on their own. The Search Committee will be asking questions like that too. A successful applicant is going to be able to answer those questions with evidence. My own background is in the sciences and the biological sciences. I'm very much a data-driven, analytical type person who takes very little at face value and wants to see the evidence before making any decisions.

Travis Proctor describes the list of those on the Search Advisory Committee: Carolynne Garutti – President, Student Government Association (SGA) & Graduate Student in M.S. Biotechnology, College of Engineering & Science; Austin Cassini, who is a senior computer science student, and Natalie Shah, a graduate student in the College of Business and is currently a Resident Director; Sarah Irizarry – Chair of the Staff Advisory Committee and Assistant Director of Facilities for Florida Tech's Charles and Ruth Clemente Center; Evan Olsen – Associate Director of Campus Dining; Muzaffar Shaikh – Chair elect for the Emeritus faculty and faculty emeritus in COES; Edward Kalajian – representing emeritus faculty and is faculty emeritus in COES; Fin Bonset – Chair of the Alumni Association; Gary Grant – Senior Vice President for (Development) Advancement; the four faculty members who serve on the Academic Freedom Committee: Rob van Woesik (COES), Gary Burns (CoPLA), Alex Vamosi (COB), and Korhan Oyman (COA); the four College Deans each serving on that advisory committee; Bill Potter representing the Emeritus Board members.

Tristan Fiedler asks the question: What type of length is "longer term" when you say a president for the long term? Dr. Mason responds: Five years plus is a reasonable expectation and a hope for every President coming into these positions. Our track record at AGB is 95% of people we have placed stay a minimum of five years in their positions. One of the things that we do as a search firm is we offer our services for free for a year following the search to help the new President and Board in the transition.

Gordon Patterson asks the following questions: What do you mean by a visionary? What is someone that is visionary? How do you know what, when you see it? How do you assess things like that? Dr. Mason responds: There is a subjective nature to this. We like to assess how people see themselves and describe themselves in the context of: what a successful outcome would be in five years from now if they were President of FIT? What they would look for as elements of success along the way? For me it's also about building a strong team and how they are going to do that because they have done it before. Every president she has ever known has been an optimist. Most are grounded in either pragmatism or cynicism. She describes herself as a cynical optimist. We will be impressed when we see individuals that can express themselves in ways that suggest they have thought deeply about these kinds of opportunities, what they mean, and how they would operator in a leadership position at a place like FIT. By their sharing

their experiences, things that have worked as well as those that haven't worked and how they coped and adapted. For them to be able to develop vision, strategy and innovation in this type of institution and this type of leadership role.

A point is raised privately from the Faculty Senate: There is not female representation in the Search Advisory Committee from the Faculty side, according to the list. Travis Proctor responds: Until you pointed that out it, it had not come to my attention as well. We asked for all members of the Academic Freedom Committee and I didn't pay attention to the fact that all the representatives are male. That's something we can look at and I'll get with the Dr. Turgut to maybe see if we can identify a couple of female faculty members that would may be added. Thanks for putting that forward. Tolga Turgut responds: It is important to note that The Academic Committee chair of our Board of Trustees is a female, namely, Dr. Svafa Gronfeldt.

Paula do Vale Pereira asks a question: When I see those bullet points, I basically see someone who is a great professor in a STEM field, but I don't see anything specific. Is there anything more specific or is this normal? Dr. Mason responds: Its normally like this. Just because they are a professor in a STEM field doesn't mean they would be qualified to do this type of position. But if you read between the lines you will see that it is more being asked for such as being an experienced and successful fundraiser, to meet people and ask for money for the things they passionately believe in. Also, being visionary in their field is also narrowly defined, we are asking in a much more broader definition of it.

Nasri Nesnas asks the following questions: How do we assess success? Who's doing that? How often/frequent? Is there going to be a probationary period? What if a bad selection is made? Dr. Mason responds: This is the Board's responsibility. They make the decision about hiring and how to evaluate and assess whether or not the President is being successful.

Razvan Rusovici asks a question: Is a level of remuneration envisioned by the search firm or settled already? Dr. Mason responds: Yes, we have some preliminary discussions about compensation. We feel confident the Board understands the importance of providing fair and comparable compensation, and we're going to help the Board look at what your peers are doing within Florida in terms of salaries as well as help them as they think about what they might be offering the individual that they would ultimately like to become the next FIT President.

## **Old Business**

### *Committee Reports:*

1. Academic Policies Committee: Senator Vipuil Kishore said nothing to report.
2. Excellence Awards Committee: Senator Julie Costopoulos said we got confirmation that the faculty excellence awards will be funded again with \$5000 for the award this year.
3. Welfare Committee: Senator Nakin Suksawang said nothing extra to report.
4. Administrative Policies Committee: Senator Razvan Rusovici said nothing to report at this moment. Dr. Turgut reminded Senator Rusovici that he had stepped down at the April 5, 2022 meeting after the President elections. Senator Rusovici appeared not to remember and President Turgut said that the records could be checked and verified.
5. Scholarship Committee: Nothing to report at this moment.
6. Technology, Resources, and Infrastructure (TRI) Committee: Nothing to report at this moment.

*President's Report:*

President Tolga Turgut discussed that he has been very busy with the President Search Committee trying to contribute as best as he can, advocating for all the FIT faculty and making sure that our contribution is well made for the FIT Presidential Profile draft. He has been observing that there is a misunderstanding among some faculty with respect to the faculty salary adjustment that we recently received as a four percent faculty salary adjustment. The merit raise is a different matter and taken care of always after January based on the evaluation by faculty's supervisors, their department heads, and college Deans from which the merit raises are defined. In the last nine years we never got a faculty salary adjustment. The impact of faculty salary adjustment is very important because it impacts on everyone's social security, 403 B and summer pay. We did have a one-time bonus a few years ago, but a onetime bonus we received a few years ago does not have the impacts of a faculty salary adjustment. Therefore, this faculty salary adjustment is a big and good win for us. Additionally, we will receive the merit raises after January as always. Regarding the equity adjustment for the faculty, there is a big chunk of faculty who are on the lower end of the pay scale. We need to bring those faculty pay more to the middle (i.e. median). That is a bit of a longer-term process that we will hopefully begin working on more with the Provost office, depending on the financial situation of FIT, after the New Year.

*Response to open calls and a brief response on the importance of committees:*

We have had open calls for a quite several committees. Because, according to the resolution that was passed in January 2018, the Committee chairmanships are limited to two years, and we must call for elections. We did make calls but got limited interest along with the disruption with last week's storm. Thus, I thought it best to extend it to the next Faculty Senate meeting and for these reasons the call for nominations is still ongoing.

We have the (re)election for the (Chair of) Academic Policy Committee, Administrative Policy Committee, Scholarship Committee, and the Technology Resources and Infrastructure Committee (TRI).

Pres. Turgut reflects on why we are not getting so many volunteers for these very important committees especially since these chairs get to be part of the Faculty Executive Committee which discusses the agenda to come before the Senate meeting each month. He underscored the importance of these committees where any faculty can have the opportunity to serve and leave a legacy behind by their contributions as a service to our institution. We must have elections for our Senators from within our departments and make it as transparent as possible. But he is aware that some elections are not held, and this doesn't give faculty the opportunity to volunteer. As sitting Senators, it should be our number one priority to promote a culture of people coming forward and share everything being discussed at the senate level within our departments. After all, serving in the Faculty Senate should be perceived as a privilege and an honor for all the faculty. And all circa 300 full time faculty are well qualified at FIT to be senators, committee chairs, members and Senate Presidents.

I just wanted to make this comment, to hopefully increase more participation of people wanting to be Senators, more participation of people wanting to come forward and be Service Committee chairs. And for those who would like to volunteer, please send me your statement of objectives with respect to the committees that you are volunteering for so I can share this with the Senate, and we can hold elections for the next Senate meeting.

## **New Business**

### *AFTC Charter Revision:*

The shared document is the recommendation, from the AFTC members of which there are four of them, regarding a more comprehensive charter. I would like everyone to take this back to your departments and colleges and share it with your faculty so that you can come back with feedback on this new charter. The AFTC is the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee, and it is among the more important committees.

At this point President Turgut opens the floor for discussion on this charter that he shared with us.

Nakin Suksawang asks a question: The charter came from AFTC or whom? Tolga Turgut responds: From AFTC, the whole committee and based on the discussions and debates from last year in November 2021 meeting.

Eric Perlman says that he is particular glad to see that promotion and tenure is directly mentioned in the charter because one of things he has noticed being on the Promotion and Tenure Committee is that we have made some decisions that were not in agreement with what was recommended by the Deans and then in some cases the Provost agreed with us and in some cases not, and I think that one of the purposes of the AFCT should be to hear those appeals.

Tolga Turgut says that when it comes to making recommendations with respect to policies that are concerning the faculty the endorsement still comes through the Senate, they just don't report directly to the Senate because there are confidentiality matters that cannot be reported by default. This is an important function. Now what is happening is they are recommending that the reporting goes to the Provost and to the Faculty President. This is a key aspect.

Brian Lail asks the questions: Could you clarify what the intent is in prohibiting Senators from being AFTC members? What is the perceived conflict of interest, of having faculty or Senators associated with such a process? Tolga Turgut responds: It's not actually totally being detached from the Senate at all on the key issues. The recommendations with respect to policies still have to be endorsed by the Faculty Senate (the legislative side of the policies). But when it comes to the day-to-day operations there would be a conflict of interest in matters to be discussed. Brian Lail asks the question: So, by day-to-day operations you are referring to the appeals aspect? Tolga Turgut responds: On the confidential aspects, yes. Brian Lail asks the question: The outcomes of those having a reporting requirement that only goes to the administration from that committee. Is my understanding correct? Tolga Turgut responds: Yes.

Eric Perlman says the intent was essentially patterned after a number of universities that had a parallel committee and any reporting would have to respect confidentiality. I think the one big conflict is that somebody that is on Promotions and Tenure Committee should not be on the AFTC.

Tolga Turgut says that the Senate is a political body and so having any senators on the AFTC would have it involved in politics and that could be a conflict of interest. We all remember that in the past for one year the AFTC Chair and the Faculty Senate President were the same person. That is a mega conflict of interest.

Nezam N. K. responds: In that case, to avoid conflict of interest, I believe that Deans, department heads and program chairs should be excluded as well since they could cause even more significant conflict of interest if you are excluding senators.

Tolga Turgut responds: That's how the new recommended charter reads, no administration. The Senators are taken out so that there will be zero bias. The goal is to target maximum impartiality at AFTC which was the original idea in its foundation as well.

Nasri Nesnas asks a question: What about members that have been in the Administration, what language is included to address that? Tolga Turgut responds: Nothing at the moment but serving in the past should not exclude you for either administrator or Senators to be fair. Nasri Nesnas responds: There is clear a distinction between having served as a Senator and having served as an administration.

Vipuil Kishore asks the question: Are we voting on the AFTC charter in the next faculty senate meeting? Tolga Turgut responds: Yes. But we will debate prior to voting. But the feedback that you bring from your constituents must be representative of the faculty as well not just personal. I don't like to rush any vote, but if we feel it is not ready to be voted on next time then it will be postponed.

Nezam N.K. says that it seems from before it was only Senators could serve on the AFTC and now its only Faculty but not Senators can serve which is far from where we started. Also, if you get elected to AFTC while being a Senator you should resign as Senator to avoid conflict of interest.

Nasri Nesnas says that he understands there has been a shift from the original charter that is very different from the current charter, but he doesn't have an issue with changes. His concern is that AFTC was set out to have five members and in the new charter will still have five members, but now it only has four members who are making dramatic changes. He is not even sure if there is a chair or if they have elected a chair. Tolga Turgut responds: No not yet as there is a call for nomination. Nasri Nesnas responds: I think that they should proceed in the order of assembling the AFTC before revising a charter.

Tolga Turgut recommends that we reread the new charter and the old charter. Also watch a couple of recordings where this was debated. Then inform our constituents.

Tolga Turgut asks for a motion to adjourn.

Senator Gordon Patterson responds. Motion to adjourn.

Julie Costopoulos responds. I second the motion.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03pm.

Respectively submitted,

Aaron Welters, Faculty Senate Secretary