

Faculty Senate Meeting
Tuesday, September 18, 2018

Minutes

Senators Present: M. Baarmand (PSS/2), K. Burke (SAC/2), I. Delgado Perez (COB/2), A. Dutta (COB/2), S. Earles (COES/1), E. Guisbert (Bio/2), M. Jensen (MAE/2), M. Kaya (BME/1), V. Kishore (CE/2), S. Kozaitis (Lib/2), D. Lelekis (SAC/2), J. Park (DEIS/1), B. Paulillo (Psych/2), L. Perdigao (SAC/2), D. Platt (ESD/2), P. Ray (OES/2), D. Sandall (COB/1), M. Silaghi (CS/2), E. Subasi (ES/2), N. Suksawang (MAE/1), G. Tenali (Math/2), R. van Woelik (Bio/2), N. Weatherly (SBA/2), R. Wehmschulte (Chem/2), A. Welters (Math/2), B. Wheeler (Aero/2), K. Winkelmann (Chem/2), D. Yuran (SAC/2),

Senators Absent: O. Doule (HCDIA/1), C. Harvey (SBA/0), A. Huser (Lib/1), U. Jones (Aero/1), B. Lail (ECE/1), D. LeVan (CS/0), B. Morkos (MAE/0), S. Murshid (ECE/1), A. Nag (PSS/1), A. Walton (COB/0)

Proxies: T. Eskridge (COES) for H. Crawford (CS/2), G. Maul (OES) for P. Sahoo (OES/2), K. Nicholson (Psych) for P. Converse (Psych/2) and M. Lavooy (Psych/2), F. Yumiceva (APSS) for R. Rusovici (MAE/2)

Other Attendees: Ugur Abdulla (MTH), Georgios Anagnostopoulos (COES), Monica Baloga (Provost), Gary Burns (CoPLA), Marco Carvalho (COES), Christopher Chouinard (BCES), Ted Conway (BCES), Kimberly Demoret (APSS), Vanessa Edkins (Psych), Tristan Fiedler (BCES), Michael Gallo (COA), Kastro Hamed (DEIS), Jacob Ivey (SAC), Dan Kirk (COES), Chul-Ho Lee (CES), Ken Lindeman (OEMS), Nasri Nesnas (Chem), Korhan Oyman (COA), Gordon Patterson (SAC), Joy Patterson (SAC), Eric Perlman (APSS), Ted Petersen (SAV), Jean-Paul Pinelli (MCE), Ken Revay (BOT), Kim Sloman (Scott Center), Michael Slotkin (COB), Lisa Steelman (CoPLA), Robert Taylor (SAC),

[NOTE: The attendance report above will be included in the minutes for each meeting to include the numbers present during the 2018-2019 academic year.]

Call to Order

President Winkelmann called the meeting to order at 3:30. The minutes from the September 4 (no. 138) meeting were approved.

New Business

Nominations for Committee Chairs (Welfare, Scholarship, and TRI)

Pres. Winkelmann reminded senators to submit names for nominations for the open chair positions to be voted on at the October meeting.

Discussion of Tenure Policies and Procedures and the Tenure Implementation Model (transition plan)

Pres. Winkelmann welcomed Dr. Baloga and opened the floor for questions.

Sen. Burke asked for clarification about the timeline for Associate Professors, and Dr. Baloga explained that Associate Professors who have five years in rank (and are starting their sixth year) would be able to go up for tenure with the first group of Associate Professors.

Dr. Baloga announced that a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document was sent out to faculty and it will be uploaded to the Faculty Senate website. If there are any additional questions that need to be answered, faculty can send them to Dr. Baloga or Pres. Winkelmann.

Dr. Ivey asked if there has been any discussion of anticipated percentages of faculty that will likely go up for tenure and Dr. Baloga responded that there is no cap and those numbers will depend on each college, so it is hard to predict right now.

Dr. Nicholson asked if a faculty member who has already been at Florida Tech for three years would count those years when determining how long they have until they go up for tenure or if they would be considered to be in year zero now. Dr. Baloga explained that there will be a minimum of 6 years for Assistant Professors and the probationary period could be extended depending on where that faculty member is in terms of meeting the criteria of their college.

Dr. Nesnas asked who would be deciding if an extra probationary period would be needed and if Associate or Full Professors choosing to take that extra time would still be submitting the truncated materials (CV and statement) or the full dossier. Dr. Baloga said that the decision for extended time will be made together with the academic unit head, the dean, and other mentors, along with the faculty member because it wouldn't be a good idea to let that faculty member go up for tenure if the risk of failure was high. The faculty member has the choice to make but they should be prepared and mentored first.

Sen. Guisbert asked if current Assistant Professors in the tenure track would not be allowed to go up for either promotion or tenure until year three of implementation since these two processes are now linked. Dr. Baloga explained that Assistant Professors currently in their fifth year would be going up for promotion but will not go up for tenure for two more years under the transition plan because it would not be possible to evaluate all of the faculty at once. The priority will be on the Full and Associate Professors and there will be a lag for the tenure track process for Assistant Professors, but not for promotion in the teaching and research tracks.

Sen. Baarmand explained that the tenure committee will also take some time to populate with tenured professors and Dr. Baloga agreed that it was important to start the tenure process with the Full Professors in order to get those committees populated.

Sen. Earles asked if there was a legal reason that Full Professors couldn't be grandfathered in, and Dr. Baloga responded that there was not, but Pres. McCay and senior academic administrators had decided not to.

Sen. Guisbert expressed the idea that if tenure is implemented as it has been proposed, some faculty will leave or retire early. He asked if the administration has gathered any information on the potential numbers of faculty that might leave. Dr. Baloga said that this was the first she had heard of that. Sen. Earles argued that the university would have accreditation issues if that happened, especially in engineering.

Dr. Baloga apologized for having to leave early in order to attend another meeting. Pres. Winkelmann thanked her for attending and answering questions.

Discussion of new college promotion and tenure criteria

Invited Guests:

Dr. Baloga, Provost

Dr. Carvalho, Dean of College of Engineering & Science

Dr. Gallo, Professor in College of Aeronautics (representing Dean Korhan Oyman)

Dr. Steelman, Dean of College of Psychology & Liberal Arts

Dr. Slotkin, Professor in College of Business (representing Dean Ted Richardson)

Dr. Miller, Dean of Libraries (unable to attend)

New promotion criteria documents released by each college are available on the Faculty Senate's website: <https://www.fit.edu/faculty-senate/>

Pres. Winkelmann introduced the deans and their representatives and invited each to give a brief presentation, so that all senators will have an understanding of the goals and how the promotion and tenure criteria were determined for each college.

Dr. Steelman, Dean of the College of Psychology & Liberal Arts, explained that there is an internal committee that manages the promotion process and it is made up of senior Full Professors. During the promotion process, they have helped to facilitate the dossier preparation for faculty members before those get passed on to the dean. This committee met last spring and during the summer to work on the new guidelines for both the tenure track and non-tenure track. These criteria have been presented to the faculty in the college, but the process of getting

feedback and input on the final document is not completed yet. It is expected to be finalized soon.

Dr. Slotkin, a Professor in the College of Business, was given the task last spring to revise the standards for promotion in anticipation of this process of tenure. The old guidelines needed to be tightened up and made more concrete. All of the Full and most of the Associate Professors met bi-weekly during the summer and looked at three benchmarks schools aligned with their disciplines standards. Under the new guidelines, there will be a better build up from the annual faculty evaluations and better clarity on the minimum standards and faculty responsibilities to achieve tenure. Faculty received the draft of the new criteria in early August and there was no negative feedback. The new criteria is posted on Faculty Senate website.

Dr. Carvalho, Dean of the College of Engineering & Science, explained that the motivation to look into their criteria was to improve the ranking of the university, to create consistency between science and engineering, and to find way to make progress that could be sustained over the long term. The process started with the Associate Deans and department heads. The dean presented to each department individually. For metrics, seven benchmarks schools were selected as reasonable targets. The criteria for the tenure track was based on the typical faculty member with 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service as their load. Next, two parallel tracks were established for teaching and research. For the teaching track the expectations are based on 80% teaching and 20% service; scholarship is optional. For the research track the expectations are based on 80% research and 20% teaching. Research has the expectation of funding.

Dr. Nesnas argued that it was important to gauge how many faculty will want to go on each of these tracks and asked Dr. Carvalho if he had tried to get an estimate. Dr. Carvalho responded that it was difficult because the only way to gauge is by what people are doing now; from this perspective, in most departments, 60% of faculty on average could achieve tenure under the criteria. He expects that percentage could increase because there are current faculty who would be able to meet the new criteria once they have more resources under the new system. Dr. Carvalho asserted that the new criteria will enable COES faculty to focus on certain areas and free up other areas; those focusing on teaching can take on a higher load and enable others to pursue more research. He emphasized that it was the job of the promotion committee to ensure that the faculty member has the best possible chance to be promoted/tenured and discuss every possible opportunity to help them meet the requirements.

Dr. Gallo, a Professor in the College of Aeronautics explained that the criteria for his college was developed by a four-member committee at the request of the dean. All committee members are Full Professors. The promotion-tenure guidelines for the traditional track are still in draft form, but the promotion guidelines for the non-tenure teaching track have been reviewed and approved

by college faculty. The criteria were grounded in the model of academic professionalism for their field -- Kern's Domains of Professionalism.

Sen. Baarmand brought up the concern that many faculty members have about titles and asked how this will be addressed with teaching-focused faculty versus tenure-track faculty. Dr. Carvalho responded that the words "Teaching" and "Research" would be in the titles for Assistant, Associate, and Full professors in those tracks. Dr. Oyman did not know if that had been finalized yet, and Dr. Gallo said it was his understanding that it was going to be consistent across all colleges for these other tracks and that it would be voted on by the Senate and put in the faculty handbook. Pres. Winkelmann explained that this topic came up over the summer and until the criteria is in from all of the colleges, it is difficult to know what the roles will be for teaching, research, and tenure-track faculty, so titles will still need to be addressed. Dr. Baarmand clarified that the new titles would be for new faculty only.

Sen. Guisbert asked if teaching loads will go up substantially for faculty who do not qualify for tenure. He also asked if there are any estimates by the administration about the effects of what the implementation could be. Dr. Carvalho said he does not think that the faculty who do not qualify will leave the university and he has heard from faculty who welcome the opportunity for other options besides research.

Sen. Jensen asked Dr. Slotkin how CoB chose the schools for comparison when developing their criteria. The CoB examined AACSB-accredited schools similar in size (both students & faculty), resource constraints, and academic reputation.

Dr. Nesnas asked if the Provost and/or Deans could ask faculty for a non-binding answer about which option they plan to pick (teaching, research, or tenure track). Dr. Nesnas suggested that this would provide the colleges with crucial data for planning purposes.

Sen. Earles asked if each of the colleges did a survey of the faculty for their opinions and whether or not they would go up for tenure or leave. Dr. Steelman responded that CoPLA did not do a formal survey, and she did not expect there to be a large amount of people leaving. Dr. Slotkin said there were just informal conversations with people in CoB, and he did express concern that there would not be enough funds to hire a lot of people if faculty chose to leave. Dr. Oyman urged everyone to wait and see the final version and communicate feedback during Senate meetings.

Sen. Jensen asked Dr. Carvalho what resources will be available to current faculty given that some of the schools listed as competitors are significantly higher in ranking than Florida Tech. Sen. Guisbert expressed concern about the teaching track because the details are still unknown.

Dr. Carvalho reiterated that there was no intention to limit research for teaching faculty who wanted to continue to pursue that. Sen. Guisbert asked if teaching faculty could expect to maintain their lab space with just a slightly higher teaching load. Dr. Carvalho responded that no one will tell teaching faculty not to pursue that type of research.

Dr. Hamed asked if teaching faculty would have their salaries adjusted and Dr. Carvalho said he has not heard anything about modifications to salary or contracts if faculty choose the teaching track; Dr. Oyman also said he has not heard anything about that being determined yet. Pres. Winkelmann explained that in the framework for the tenure model which was presented to the Board of Trustees in the spring, it was stated that current faculty would retain their titles and contracts.

Dr. Nicholson asked why anyone would want to choose the teaching track if they will have to teach more for the same salary and have less recognition and resources. Dr. Carvalho responded that the expectations are higher for the tenure track and faculty will be evaluated on those requirements; if a faculty member thinks they can make the best contribution to teaching, then they should choose that option instead. If a faculty member chooses the tenure track and doesn't meet those expectations, then they are underperforming.

Dr. Nesnas asked if Full Professors will have to meet the criteria for Associate or Full Professor for tenure, and Dr. Carvalho replied that the Associate Professor criteria is the criteria for tenure.

Sen. Jensen asked if there was a sense of how many of the current Associate and Full Professors would meet the new guidelines and Dr. Carvalho said that it varies from department to department.

Sen. Guisbert asked if it was common at other universities to have a large number of non-tenure track faculty. Pres. Winkelmann said that research universities typically have 60-70% tenured or tenure track faculty and 30% lecturers and non-tenure track faculty. Sen. Guisbert wondered what impact it would have on our reputation and ability to recruit students if most of our classes become taught by non-tenure track faculty. It has been a selling point for students to come to Florida Tech where they can take classes from faculty members who they could also work with potentially on research. Dr. Carvalho reiterated that non-tenure track faculty can still participate in research; they just aren't being required or evaluated by that.

Sen. Earles asked if there is a protocol in the Senate to request that a survey of faculty be done to see who plans to go up for tenure and who plans to choose the non-tenure track option. There was some discussion about the survey that was done last year which indicated that the majority of the faculty supported tenure, but there was not a specific question asking if faculty planned to

go up for tenure or not. Pres. Winkelmann explained that since the criteria isn't finalized for all colleges and the information about the teaching track isn't out, some people might not be able to make that decision yet. Dr. Nesnas asked if the deans could just ask their faculty to answer and then the deans could report what percentage of each college plans to go up for tenure. Sen. Guisbert argued that the important number is how many will choose to leave or retire early and it isn't likely that anyone would tell their dean that information.

Sen. Jensen asked for clarification on what the Senate will be voting on at the October 2nd meeting. Pres. Winkelmann explained that it was requested that the Senate vote to endorse the policies and procedures document; if the Senate wants to vote on the transition plan, the college-level criteria, and the teaching and research track policies, at that time then there can be separate votes on those too. Sen. Jensen questioned the value of the Senate voting on the other documents after the BOT meeting, and Pres. Winkelmann said that if it is possible, then the Senate can vote on everything on October 2nd.

Sen. Earles asked what the administration has given up in order to get the Senate to endorse the tenure policy. Pres. Winkelmann argued that the policy document is significantly different now than what it could have been thanks to the administration listening to feedback during the summer discussions. For example, the post-tenure review was more contentious and there was a wide-range of examples that were examined, but through recommendations made by the Executive Committee of the Senate, the most draconian were avoided. There was faculty involvement in the process.

Adjournment

Dr. Maul proposed that the meeting be adjourned and Sen. Baarmand seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 5:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Lelekis, Faculty Senate Secretary