

Faculty Senate Meeting
Tuesday, September 4, 2018

Minutes

Senators Present: M. Baarmand (PSS/1), K. Burke (SAC/1), P. Converse (Psych/1), H. Crawford (CS/1), I. Delgado Perez (COB/1), O. Doule (HCDIA/1), A. Dutta (COB/1), E. Guisbert (Bio/1), A. Huser (Lib/1), M. Jensen (MAE/1), U. Jones (Aero/1), V. Kishore (CE/1), S. Kozaitis (Lib/1), B. Lail (ECE/1), M. Lavooy (Psych/1), D. Lelekis (SAC/1), S. Murshid (ECE/1), A. Nag (PSS/1), B. Paulillo (Psych/1), L. Perdigao (SAC/1), D. Platt (ESD/1), P. Ray (OES/1), M. Silaghi (CS/1), E. Subasi (ES/1), G. Tenali (Math/1), R. van Woesik (Bio/1), N. Weatherly (SBA/1), R. Wehmschulte (Chem/1), A. Welters (Math/1), B. Wheeler (Aero/1), K. Winkelmann (Chem/1), D. Yuran (SAC/1),

Senators Absent: C. Harvey (SBA), M. Kaya (BME), D. LeVan (CS), B. Morkos (MAE), J. Park (DEIS), D. Sandall (COB), N. Suksawang (MAE), A. Walton (COB)

Proxies: G. Maul (OES) for P. Sahoo (OES), M. Wilde (APSS) for R. Rusovici (MAE)

Other Attendees: Monica Baloga (Provost), Alan Brown (Chem), Gary Burns (CoPLA), Kastro Hamed (DEIS), Jacob Ivey (SAC), Nasri Nesnas (Chem)

[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 April 17 (no. 137) meeting were approved.

Old Business

In the interest of time, Pres. Winkelman's report on the President's Retreat and bi-weekly summer meetings is provided as a summary attached to these minutes.

New Business

Discussion of Tenure Policies and Procedures draft -- document available at <https://www.fit.edu/faculty-senate/>

There was a Q&A session last week with Pres. Winkelmann about the draft of the policy that was released recently and faculty had useful feedback and questions, which were passed on to Dr. Baloga. See a copy of the summary of questions and responses attached to these minutes.

Sen. van Woesik asked for clarification on the timeline for this process. Pres. Winkelmann explained that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and a few other senators had met during the summer to work on the policy documents and he met regularly with Dr. Baloga to discuss the group's suggestions. There will be a vote held on October 2nd by the Faculty Senate to determine if the faculty endorses or does not endorse the policy currently under discussion. Pres. McCay would like for the Senate to endorse the policy before the Board of Trustees meeting in October.

Sen. Jensen asked whether or not the Senate will vote on this policy without knowing about the transition policy, and Dr. Baloga explained that the intent is to have that information out early next week. However, minimum performance standards for annual evaluations that occur post-tenure may not be decided on before the October vote. Dr. Baloga reiterated that program-level minimum requirements will be a faculty-driven process but will need input from the Dean and program chairs too.

Dr. Hamed asked for clarification on the program-level reviews and Pres. Winkelmann explained that an overall unsatisfactory rating on a faculty member's annual review would mean that the faculty member was not meeting program-level minimum standards for teaching, service and scholarship. This would lead to a development plan. After two consecutive years of receiving an overall unsatisfactory review, the faculty member would undergo post-tenure review. Minimum performance standards will be determined by each program.

Sen. Kozaitis asked about expectations for this first year of reviews since criteria was not expressed before the year began, and Dr. Baloga acknowledged that the process has been delayed, so it will likely be spring before the new system is in place.

Sen. van Woesik asked if the Senate could go through the details of the document and indicated that there was still a need for editing it to correct typos and punctuation errors. Pres. Winkelmann reminded the Senate that the intent of this meeting was to ask questions and get clarification on policy details from Dr. Baloga, but if there are editing suggestions, those can be forwarded to her.

Dr. Nesnas asked if the Senate is voting on all three documents together: the current policy under discussion, the transition policy, and the teaching-track policy. Dr. Baloga responded that there was only a need for a vote before the October BoT meeting on the document that is currently available. The Senate will vote to endorse/not endorse other policy documents but that may occur after the October 2nd Senate meeting. Dr. Nesnas pointed out that the details are missing without the college-level criteria and wondered why faculty have not been involved in establishing that criteria. It was acknowledged that current faculty will likely have more questions about the transition policy and college-level criteria. Sen. Baarmand reminded the Senate that discussion about the tenure policies should not be limited to Senate meetings and senators should get feedback from their units so they will know what to base their vote on. Senators were urged to organize meetings with their units quickly so that feedback can be brought to the next Senate meeting.

Sen. Dutta asked for clarification about whether the policy under discussion is for the new incoming faculty or current faculty. Pres. Winkelmann explained it was more applicable to new faculty; however, that there are parts that do apply to current faculty that choose to pursue the tenure track.

Dr. Ivey and Sen. Burke were concerned that the lack of information about the timeline and procedure for current faculty to transition into tenure would hamper the October 2nd vote on the overall policy. Dr. Baloga said that those details are still being determined but reassured everyone that the transition policy will be available next week so it can be discussed and senators can make an informed vote.

Sen. Perdigao discussed an endorsement of the system by the Senate as a good faith gesture now and asked whether or not there would be an opportunity for changes if the college-level guidelines were controversial. Since the college-level criteria are not currently tied to the overall plan, she suggested that an endorsement now wouldn't preclude that opportunity.

The leadership conveyed that senators should have enough information by October to be able to make an informed decision but there might be a few unknowns (like program-level minimum performance standards). It was questioned whether the BoT is interested in getting Senate endorsement on any other aspects of the tenure system and whether there is really any value behind the Senate's vote. Would it matter if Pres. McCay takes the policy to the BoT without faculty endorsement? It is not known what would happen in that case.

Sen. Delgado-Perez asked how faculty with admin duties will be handled under the tenure policy and Dr. Baloga explained that those details are still being discussed and have not been resolved yet.

Sen. Wehmschulte asked about the teaching track and the research track, and Dr. Baloga stated that all but one college has come up with criteria for a teaching track. Only one college has included a research track.

Dr. Nesnas asked if the criteria for transitioning faculty would be the same as for incoming faculty, since current faculty have not had the same resources that new faculty would have; Dr. Baloga answered that there would not be separate criteria. This was concerning to many because it could lead to very few current faculty receiving tenure.

Pres. Winkelmann pointed out that new faculty will begin with a statement of expectations and have 7 years, but current faculty will have at most 3 years prior to going up for tenure. Dr. Baloga responded that a current faculty member's body of work will be evaluated and Pres. Winkelmann argued that that work has already been evaluated and deemed good for promotion. Administration is discussing the needs of the current faculty for resources but those won't be in place before some faculty are going up for tenure.

Sen. Perdigao explained that in CoPLA the new criteria have been created with the expectation that resources and teaching loads may not change. If other colleges are raising the bar significantly then the issue of resources needs to be addressed.

At this point, Dr. Baloga excused herself to attend another meeting. Pres. Winkelmann thanked her for attending and answering questions.

Sen. Murshid raised the concern that faculty might be easily fired because they are not meeting these new requirements. Pres. Winkelmann reminded the Senate that there has been a lot of faculty oversight built into the process; for someone to be fired within 2 years, they would have to fail to meet the minimum requirements that their own colleagues created (for two consecutive years), and the AFTC (made up of their colleagues) would also have to decide that the faculty member is not meeting minimum requirements. There is an appeals process and other forms of checks and balances.

Sen. Jensen pointed out that if only a small percentage of current faculty get tenure, then those committees would be dominated by new faculty. The hurdle in endorsing the overall tenure plan is getting current faculty comfortable with the transition. Pres. Winkelmann explained that the AFTC will come into being immediately, will be populated by any current faculty of tenurable rank (Associate or Full), and will be chaired by a senator. Over the next 4 years those faculty get phased out and new tenured faculty will replace them.

Sen. Guisbert asked what the expected numbers are for how many current faculty will go up for tenure. Pres. Winkelmann responded that it is unknown at this time because not all colleges have released their tenure criteria, but there have been speculations anywhere from 20-60%; however, not all will be going up at the same time. Sen. Jensen explained that Dr. Baloga had mentioned last spring that the administration thinks that 2/3 of the faculty will choose the teaching track. If most faculty go up for tenure then it would cause staffing problems for teaching courses at the program level. There was a concern that some departments will be negatively impacted if this leads to a lot of faculty leaving because they don't get tenure or seek employment elsewhere.

Pres. Winkelmann speculated that the teaching-track will have some flexibility to allow faculty to continue some type of research program, but course release time would probably require a grant. There was a discussion of titles and how that could affect the ability to get grants. Pres. Winkelmann reiterated that current faculty will not have their title changed except at the HR level. New faculty will have different titles for teaching versus tenure-track. Sen. Jensen asked if there are other universities with non-tenure track faculty who use the same titles and Pres. Winkelmann responded that yes, there are some that do, and others that distinguish between teaching and research faculty. Sen. Welters asked if teaching-track faculty would still be able to supervise PhD students and Pres. Winkelmann said that hasn't come up but he will ask Dr. Baloga.

Adjournment

Dr. Maul proposed that we adjourn the meeting and Sen. Delgado-Perez seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Lelekis, Faculty Senate Secretary

Summer 2018 Updates

I participated in several meetings and events with the administration this summer. None were as consequential as tenure but there are some items that you should be aware of.

President McCay's annual administrative retreat featured three major topics. First, there is a new branding initiative underway that will better capture Florida Tech's drive to become ranked among the top 100 national universities. This will result in many small adjustments in how we advertise ourselves but one noticeable change will be a new logo to replace "High tech with a human touch." This topic is still under discussion and changes are being planned now.

This year marks Florida Tech's 60th anniversary. There will be many events to commemorate this milestone and the administration hopes that faculty will participate in as many of them as possible. Deans are handling most of the events that might involve faculty so you will likely be hearing about this more in the near future.

Several goals were set for the 2018 – 2019 academic year. Panels will work on achieving these goals. The administration recognizes the need for improving faculty salary in order to attract and retain faculty. They also want to promote students' success in student competitions related to their field of study and future careers. Our advising system, from academic alerts to graduation check-ups, was noted as an area that is in need of improvement.

I am serving on the Academic Panel, which Provost Baloga chairs. This panel meets at least once a month and is currently addressing the following issues: a new system for academic alerts, a second-year advising model, and a new system for checking students' progress towards graduation. A separate task force was created for each of these issues and members of the panel joined one task force. I am part of the task force for a new system for academic alerts, which is chaired by Brian Ehrlich, VP of Online Learning. We are investigating new software and policies that will enhance student success by providing advisors with useful information about their advisees' academic performance in a timely manner.

President McCay is organizing a series of seminars for all members of the senior administration in which we learn about one aspect of the university in depth. So far, we have attended seminars about recruitment, fundraising, and administrative computing (Banner). The purpose of these seminars is to make sure that everybody understands how important aspects of Florida Tech operate. Here are some important items that should interest faculty:

- When you discuss financial aid with any potential students living in Florida, make sure that they are aware that the Bright Futures scholarship applies to Florida Tech.
- Admissions have made significant improvements in recruiting methods during past 10 years and they are now implementing more data-driven approaches to recruitment, resulting in a process that is more user-friendly and efficient for staff and faculty involved in recruitment. Faculty can help by promptly reviewing graduate student applications.
- Donors sometimes want to fund research projects so faculty need to update their research webpages and faculty profiles.

- Faculty can help identify potential donors. Contact Gary Grant (VP of Development) for more information if you have a potential lead.
- Faculty who travel should contact Gary Grant to arrange meetings with alumni. I did this and I had a one-on-one meeting with an alumnus. It was easy and very enjoyable.
- Donors sometimes want to coach capstone project teams. Contact Gary Grant if you are advising students on a senior thesis or capstone project and you want to develop industry connections.
- During the next three years, Florida Tech is moving from Banner to a new administrative computing system called Workday. It is much more useful and user-friendly.

Academic Panel meetings, the President's seminar series, and the retreat follow-up meetings will continue during the academic year.

Responses to Questions about Tenure Policies and Procedures (August 24, 2018 Draft)

Faculty have raised the following questions about the Tenure Policies and Procedures draft after its release. I spoke with Provost Baloga about these issues. The faculty questions and my summary of the answers provided by Provost Baloga are given below.

Kurt Winkelmann
Faculty Senate President

1. *Section 1.4 says that a faculty member is granted tenure in a college, not the university. What happens when a college changes or a department moves from one college to another? The concern is that if a faculty member is involuntarily transferred to a new college, then the faculty member would lose tenure.*

Section 1.4 will be revised to clearly state that faculty retain their tenure status in the new college. The policy will continue to say that faculty are given extra time to readjust to the new college's criteria.

2. *Will administrative faculty be considered for tenure?*

Yes, there will be a policy for that in Section 1.3, which is being developed.

3. *Will there be limits or caps on the number of tenured faculty within a college? Faculty are concerned that deans will not recommend faculty for tenure due to the need for faculty to teach classes despite the faculty candidate's qualifications for tenure.*

There are no quotas and no limits to the number of faculty who can be tenured within a college. If a faculty member has an unusually high service or teaching load that prevents him/her from achieving the tenure criteria then the faculty member needs to work that out with the dean. This is related to the issue of the Statement of Expectations, which is discussed in the next question.

4. *What is the relationship between the college-level T&P criteria and the Statement of Expectations? Which one determines the faculty member's annual review rating and progress towards tenure?*

The SoE describes what the faculty member needs to do to achieve tenure. In most cases, the SoE will be identical to the college T&P criteria. For a faculty member who has an unusual mix of teaching, scholarship, and service responsibilities, the SoE must clearly state how the expectations of that faculty member differ from the college T&P criteria or tenure policy (e.g., the SoE can say that a faculty member gets an extended pre-tenure period). The SoE is the most important document for judging a faculty member's progress towards tenure and it is the basis of the annual reviews.

5. *How will a small college handle the need for tenured faculty to serve on AFTC, PTR committee, CPTC, and UCFPT? There may not be enough tenured faculty for all of those committees and there are restrictions on whether a tenured faculty member can serve on multiple committees (e.g., a faculty member can't serve on PTR and AFTC when handling appeals).*

The college's AFTC member should not be on any other tenure-related committee (CPTC, UCFPT or PTR) because AFTC hears appeals. A faculty member could, if necessary, serve on a combination of CPTC, UCFPT, and PTR. Even though the faculty member might have a "double vote" on a tenure case by serving of CPTC and UCFPT, the UCFPT is large enough that the faculty member's influence would be minimal. Such a situation is not ideal but is adequate.

6. *Faculty requested that members of CPTC and UCFPT be chosen by faculty rather than by deans and that membership not include department heads, associate deans, etc.*

The policy currently states that all CPTC members must be tenured faculty but some academic unit heads would consider themselves to be faculty so the policy is ambiguous. The composition and method of selection of current college promotion committees varies widely among the colleges. Both faculty and an administrator (e.g., academic unit head or associate dean) should be involved in the committee. This issue will be discussed among the Provost and deans.

7. *How will we handle changes in availability of research funding, grad student enrollment changes, etc. for a pre-tenure faculty member? Should there be additional extenuating circumstances added to the examples given in section 2.1.2.3.4? How do other schools handle this issue?*

If there is a significant change in the availability of funding (e.g., a federal agency changes its funding priorities) then this could warrant a change in the SoE.

8. *Can the description of the pre-tenure period (after the first year) be changed from "probationary" to simply "pre-tenure"? A probationary period is a temporary designation with an uncertain future. Neither is the case for assistant professors with three-year contracts. Our current system calls the first one-year contract a probationary period but does not continue to use that term for later contracts.*

The use of "probationary" for describing the pre-tenure period is very common and is used by AAUP.

9. *The pre-tenure three-year contracts are not rolling contracts like they are now. We don't have a problem with that but I didn't know if you had noticed it.*

This is different than our current contract system but there will not be any problems with this new timing of contracts.