

# Faculty Senate Meeting

Date/Time: October 3, 2023, 3:30pm

Location: In-person in Hartley Room, with ZOOM link: <https://fit.zoom.us/j/98187817280>

## Minutes

**Senator Present:** Shawn Scott (Aeronautics), Jordan Poole (Aeronautics), Tolga Turgut(Aeronautics), Charles Bryant(Business), Abram Walton((Business), Steven Rivet (Business), Angel Otero (Business Online), Donald Platt(APSS), Manasvi Lingam(APSS), Csaba Palotai(APSS), Mehmet Kaya(BES), Vipuil Kishore(CCE), Alan Brown(CCE), Nasheen Nur(EECS), Sidhartha Bhattacharyya(EECS), Nakin Suksawang(MCE), Hamidreza Najafi(MCE), Joo Young Park(MSE), Nezamoddin Nezamoddini-Kachouie (MSE), Rob Van Woesik (OEMS), Pallav Ray(OEMS), Angela Tenga (SAC), Joe montelione (SAC), Kevin Burke (SAC), David Wilder(BA), Patrick Converse(PSY), Jessica Wildman(PSY), Marshall Jones(PSY), William Bowman(Library), Chiradeep Sen (MCE) Stanley Snelson (MSE),

**Senator Absent:** Gary Zarillo (OEMS), Georgio Anagnostopoulos (EECS), Wanfa Zhang (SAC), Kenia Nunes (BES)

**Proxies:** Don Warren (Proxy for Csaba Palotai)

**Other attendees:** John Nicklow, Grace Gamage, Nancy Garmer, Tristan Fiedler, Kaylee Erdos, Rudolf Wehmschulte, Nasri Nesnas, Jeffrey Richardson, Penny Vassar, Roberto Peverati, Rudolf Wehmschulte, Siddhartha Bhattacharyyam, Nick Daher, Mary Bonhomme, Jason Griggs

## Call to order

Pres. Brown called the meeting to order at 3:30pm. The minutes from April 22, 2022 and September 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2022 were approved. (The minutes from September 5, 2023 to be approved in November)

Senate Pre. Brown welcomed the President John Nicklow.

## Guest Speaker: President John Nicklow

President Nicklow's speech:

Just a few highlights. We were in this room about 40 or 45 of us yesterday. [We] spent 8 hours together, got to know each other very well, and talked through our mission, visions, core values, and some pillars of a strategic plan that it's premature to talk too much about.

Pres. Nicklow asked Sen. Pres. Brown for feedback from the group discussion during yesterday's meeting.

Sen. Pres. Brown says:

The first thing we did was talk about mission and vision statements and the university's core values, and core value number one, by pretty much everybody's consensus, was academic excellence. Most people who brought that up emphasized that it includes excellence in teaching. The other two that were consensus were integrity and innovation. And respect was in there. We were thinking of ways to innovate and then how we were supposed to do that in five years.

Pres. Nicklow continues,

There were different breakout groups. It was very productive and great to hear everybody's insight. Certainly, no one not necessarily agreement on everything, but it was important to hear all the different perspectives and then put something together that identifies who we're going to be and who we can be, who we are today, who we're going to be, and then a roadmap for how to get there.

What will we do each of the next five years from now? The way I've described it is it's intended to be a living document, an evolving document that will live on the website.

I'm not a fan of big, you know, 30-page booklets with your strategic plan because I know where those ended up. This will live on a website with metrics, measures, and targets and metrics behind it. That's my hope, and I hope to be able to share something with you, maybe in draft form, perhaps at the next Senate meeting, but certainly by the end of the calendar year to put this before the board for endorsement in January, right behind that, we are kicking off a master planning effort. One of the things that came out of yesterday's discussion is a timeline and some goals for a master plan. Critical to that are certainly academic spaces and classroom spaces that match what we foresee in terms of future growth, ensuring that our faculty have the right technology in the classroom, the right technology in their office spaces, labs, and so on.

You'll see that rollout. And then, last but certainly not least, is how to fund all that. The beginnings of a fundraising campaign are something you'll be hearing me talk about more and more over the coming months.

But to do all that, you needed a plan that describes who we're going to be and our key pillars because I think when I'm talking to a prospective donor, I need to

be able to find alignment between their needs and or their interests and our needs.

And it's tough to define our needs if we don't know who we are and who we want to be, It was a really good discussion about R1 versus R2. Hopefully, you've all taken this survey; we had thousands of pieces between interviews and surveys. There was a major information intake, and we've learned a lot from it. But the R1 and R2 discussion was interesting. There were a few people who felt that we needed to be R1. The majority of the campus needed to learn what that meant or really needed to understand what the components of that are. We are going to put up a website that actually has the metrics on it so we can all identify. The agreement yesterday was, let's think about the next five years being a much stronger R2. Then we'll have that discussion again because we're about 32 million away from even meeting the minimum threshold per year in expenditure. So, we got work to do.

In a few weeks, we have a board meeting. I will be updating the board on our enrollment, and actually, about a week after that, I have the state of the university address on October 25th, and I hope you all come out to that. That's intended. That's a new thing that I'm bringing here. But it's an attempt to inform you and help communicate. I will be sharing honest, transparent information, the good, the bad, and the ugly. We're going to talk about what our enrollment looks like, our budget, our endowment, our fundraising progress, our research progress, and our rankings.

Some highlights are the things that they will talk to the board, and you'll see in the state of the university that we did bring in the largest first-year class, we believe, in the history of the institution, and not by a lot, but it broke that record. Unfortunately, we did not meet our goal, our budgeted goal for retention, and we're now at 77% retention. So, it is up from the previous year but did not meet our target. We have a lot of work to do in those areas. I'm working with Hamid, Mine, and the Deans; I think we have a lot of work to do in that area. Our students, our student retention rate falls quite short of a number of other schools, and our peers put it that way so that we can do better.

Update on the Provost search: In fact, the committee you want to have is able to view applications, which are now confidential, to work on paring the groups down. I think we have about 50 applicants that will be paired down to a list of semifinalists.

Some interviews take place, and then we'll identify a finalist group to bring to campus.

Hopefully, it will work out—some very good applicants. I told Kimberly I thought the pool might be larger; she and I chatted a little bit, and some of the political dynamics in the state scared people off. She just said what she told me, that's unfortunate. I reinforced and let her know that Melbourne and Florida Tech are

incredibly welcoming places, and as a private, we have some luxuries in the state. And I asked her to reinforce that. I'll leave that where it is.

One thing you might want to do about ranking is to invite Amanda Moske to a future senate meeting. She is the new chief data officer, replacing Jessica Ickes, and I changed that position just slightly; as the chief data officer, she dug into these rankings. We dropped 69 or 68 places to be number 269 now on the U.S. News and World Report rankings. If you know much about the U.S. News and World Report, ranking is algorithmic. It's based on various data sources, some of which are unverified third-party data sources. Let me just put it that way. This stuck out to me, and I'll show you a test slide of the state of the university, the course graduation rate, and the retention rate.

These are very important items that get a lot of weight. But class size, which we pride ourselves on, was removed completely. We went from 5% to zero. There are also some other pieces in the metrics that I'll share with you again later in the month.

One metric is a first-generation graduation rate and a non-first-generation graduation rate. You're one or the other. Well, according to them, our first-gen graduation rate is 19%, and the non-first-gen rate is 34. Now, I think our institutional graduation rate is 67%. Mathematically, that's impossible. This is the easy way to put it. We are digging into this, and you're hearing a lot of scuttle nationally. The president of Vanderbilt has been the most vocal. But what happened is a lot of privates and institutions do pride themselves on smaller classes, hands-on activity, and things of that nature. A lot of privates drop precipitously in this ranking. Some by much more than our drop. And then you saw a large public jump. And now the question a lot of the press is, why did you jump out? We were doing such great things. No, the methodology changed. I just want to be honest about that because I'm getting a lot of inquiries about that. That's important to us.

At the same time, another ranking that I don't think we get enough credit for is the Wall Street Journal ranking, which said we're number six in the country for student experience. And that's the one that's important to me because it was actually based on surveys of students and alumni. So, it's directly from them and not some algorithm. I have a lot more to share on that front. Do you have any questions for me? [No question was presented]

Senate Pres. Brown thanks Pres. Nicklow and introduces the next guest speaker, Grace Gamage.

***Guest Speaker***

*Grace Gamage, University Ombudsperson* about the Florida Tech Ombuds Office, starts introducing the term Ombuds and her role at Florida Tech:

It's originally a Scandinavian term and is used in various countries in slightly different ways, but we have the same basic principles. I am a confidential,

impartial, independent and informal resource on campus for students, faculty, and staff, which means I'm an off the record office. So you can come to me or you can send a student or a staff member to me to talk about anything related to the institution. And we can talk about options they may have. For instance, you're wondering how to go through going to tenure track and you're not sure who to talk to. I'd be happy to help you figure out what office, what department you need to talk to and ways and options that could help you, maybe coach you. On having conversations, looking for opportunities to do publications or sending you to the right office that may help you more.

I need to know every policy and every process and opportunity on campus that I can.

I'm independent, except for being paid by the university. Nobody reviews any records.

I don't keep any. Everything is shrouded within 30 days from my office. My email was consistently wiped. No one has access to my calendar, so it's completely a closed space.

A closed office. So you can come to me with any issue and we can discuss that without anyone seeking to try to find out what's going on in my office.

The only thing that I do with those is I track trends. So if I'm seeing many of you, for instance, they are coming with somewhat of the same issue.

Then I bring that to an appropriate authority without your name to say, Hey, I think there's some growth we can do in this area. I do that quite a bit and I'm able to go to different offices, whether it's the president's office, the board of trustees, deans of colleges, financial or whatever department it is, and have those conversations.

Another thing is I'm informal. I'm not part of any formal process on campus.

I'm not part of a complaint process: I can tell you all the complaint forms we have and I can walk you through the steps on how to fill them out. I'm not a formal office, so if you want to put the university on notice, that's not me. I can tell you where to go, but that's. That's not me.

The last thing is, I'm impartial. So even though I work for the university, Sometimes the options that you have for your particular issue may not be in the best interests of the university. I'm not going to hide those options from you if that's an option that's available. But I also don't advocate or represent you. I often get questions about maybe like going with someone to Human Resources (HR) for a discipline process because that's a formal process. I cannot be a part of it and I can't represent you in a way as a representative or like a legal attorney. Other than that, I do a lot of coaching.

I work with you not just on problems, but maybe ideas. You have things you're seeing on campus that you would love to change. And we can talk about ways you can make those changes. But overall, I give you the tools to help me to make

a decision, even if it's nothing at all. I'm open to any questions. I'm the first time, a full time Ombuds that we have on campus.

Previously we had part time on boards that are other roles and that can be a conflict of interest. So, the university last year requested that we have a full time Ombuds.

I've been here a little over a year. I'll take any questions there.

Sen. Pres. Brown asks,

Once upon a time we had a faculty ombudsman committee and one of the questions the Senate needs to think about is whether that committee, which hasn't been active in about ten years, whether that committee should be re-staffed or abolished. How does your role compare to what that committee used to do, or that a new committee of the same type might do?

Grace Gamage responds,

I serve faculty and I do see faculty and on a regular basis, just like I see students and staff at the moment. Before I would think the committee probably was put in place because we didn't have an ombudsman, especially a full-time ombudsman. I could serve in that capacity if it's the choice of the Senate to get rid of it. If the Senate decides to continue that program, I think it would be important that I met with them on a regular basis to make sure they truly understood the principles of being an ombudsman.

Nasri Nesnas asks a question of whether we can stop by the Ombudsman's office in person.

Grace Gamage responds,

Of course. My office is if you know where the P1 33 library classroom, that pavilion in front of the library. I am right next door at 136. It's a completely separate office. I'm the only person there. So, it has an exit door and no one will know when you come in and out.

Most of my visitors come in person, so I do offer a phone. You can submit questions or email, but you know, that doesn't always mean it's confidential. Or you can do a Zoom video call if you need to. And they're Monday through Friday to five. And if you need an after hour, just let me know. And we can we can make that happen. Even that people off campus, if you prefer, or in a separate room, if you like.

So you just tell me what you need to feel comfortable and I will try to be there or make it that way. So as previously answered the question, I think before we got cut off about having the Ombudsman committee.

Obviously, I don't make any decisions. But if you decide to keep it, I think it would be important for the people who are in those on Ombuds Committee role to really

understand the principles of confidentiality, impartiality, independence and informality.

So I don't investigate things I don't deep dive into or try to go to different people to find out the background of stories or information.

I truly just give options. And if there's any kind of conflict of interest and the person needs to get not assessed as an ombudsman, and that can be possibly difficult in their faculty roles. There's a difference between doing so, doing something on the side as a faculty member and being a professional in the area. If they like to chat with me before taking on the role, don't really understand what it would be. I'm happy to do so and meet with them frequently.

But at this time, if you choose not to, I do encompass as a resource for faculty, so I would take the place of that. I did review the policy before I got here. With the exception of I think it's a slight investigations on it, but I'm not clear how much investigating they did. I would serve completely in the definition of that role.

Sen. Pres. Brown asks to see if there is any other question.

Sen. Turgut asks,

I think it's very important that we have an ombudsman office when it comes to employment realm. That is very important that there is an office for all the employees who have access directly in confidential issues.

I know it's unofficial, you said impartial and so forth, but when it comes to the faculty matters, there's also the faculty realm as well, which is a bit different than the employee matters.

I think that was the reason behind of having an Ombuds Committee in the past that constituted only from the faculty because there may be academic freedom related issues and certain issues with respect to the Senate, which cannot be related to an ombudsman office. So, my question is this where does your office report to?

Does it report to President or the provost or both?

Grace Gamage responds, I report directly to the general counsel at this time, though he does not have any of my records or see who's coming in, who's coming out, what issues I bring. I think most of our colleagues may not be familiar.

Sen. Turgut says,

I looked at the Charter as well. Actually, this is a good information session, and I would encourage everyone to read the Charter of the Ombuds Office because whatever decision we make, we should do it with accurate information and the correct information. The Charter says the board has access to all university officials and records as needed to carry out the functions of the office; there's a bit of a conflict there, even though it's off the record. But there is access to the official record. I was conflicted when I read that.

Grace Gamage says,

I can assist with that question. What that means is I don't keep records. What you bring to me is off the record, but I have the ability to review any records within the university if I need to, for instance, a student comes to me and they're having academic difficulties and I need to see if they're going to the student success center already or not. I can go in and see those records. It just whatever I may need.

There's a HR issue going on. I can ask for records, but sometimes the hard thing is that can hurt confidentiality. if it's about a particular person. If I ask for a record of a particular person in order to help them, then they know who's coming to see me.

The person that comes to see me, we talk about all of those things before I do any kind of request. Typically, I don't go and ask for major records, but I can if I need to if I need to review the board of trustees and what they're doing, I can do so. But I don't have the authority to make any decisions or change anything. I just make recommendations.

Another thing I want to add is that I'm not a Title IX or a Clery reporter. What that means is if you have a question on whether something you've heard about, got an email about what have you that you think might be Title IX or Clery, and you're worried about whether you need to report or not. You can come to me first and we can talk about it. That's happened many times. So if you're not sure what to do, how to do it, you're welcome to come to me or suggest for a student or other staff member that, you know, may be questioning that to me. I've had many students who have thought about going to Title IX, but they're scared of it. Data survey from them afterwards that if they hadn't come to me, they wouldn't have gone to Title IX. Because they came to me and we talked about all the different options that they might have there, they felt more comfortable to go there.

So that's an opportunity for you. The only time I break confidentiality is if somebody comes and says they're going to hurt themselves or somebody else. That's the only time I break it. You can reach me with the ext. 3038 or gamage at fit dot edu, or you can find me in the library suite 136. A lot of information that I just gave to you can always find on the website.

Pres. Brown thanks Grace Gamage and address about Faculty Senate Officer Election *(to be held in November)*

Nominee for President-Elect:

Dr. Nakin Suksawang

*Nominations will remain open until the October 31 Executive Committee meeting.*

### **President Reports**

Senate president Brown begins by saying:

The search committee for a permanent Provost met once to discuss methods, and will consider applications in the near future. I met with the Interim Provost twice. On the 11<sup>th</sup>, we planned to bring four topics to the President the next day:



(1) R1/R2; (2) revisiting of tenure implementation; (3) restoration of gift and endowment accounts (“3-funds”); and (4) the Ombudsman Committee. Gift and endowment accounts were “swept” (cleaned out) at the end of the last fiscal year, to the consternation of faculty. The Provost has promised these will be restored, and the President is on board: the questions are when and from what source. But we didn’t get to present these issues, because the President took sick. I met with the Provost again on the 25<sup>th</sup>; we spoke mostly about the Instructor Track proposal, and I reported that Senate reaction is mixed. The Strategic Planning committee met all day October 2, as President Nicklow discussed.

Sen. Pre. Brown ends his report and calls for Committee Reports.

### **Committee Reports:**

1. Academic Policies – Sen. Kishore (including “guidance” on office hours):

Sen. Kishore begins the committee report,

We had one meeting earlier after the previous Senate meeting and have four members in the committee, including myself: three from COES and one new member from COPLA, Dr. Marshall Jones. We are still looking for members from CLB and from COA.

The topic that we discussed during our meeting was on drafting a guidance document for office hours, I wanted to open the floor to the Senate or maybe have the senators reach out to me directly by email with any thoughts that they have on all this.

I was essentially we would like to draft a document that would then be brought up to the Senate for feedback on what should be the guidance for office hours so that students can find help from professors when needed. Any comments?

Sen. Marshall Jones comments,

Of course, office hours are important. But what sparked this request was students who had complained to the dean of students that they weren't able to meet with their faculty during office hours. My question is, why aren't the departments looking into whether or not those particular faculty, if they truly were or were not available, and if so, why aren't they being dealt with in that capacity? We as faculty Senate should certainly support students being able to reach their faculty, but it seems to me the majority of faculty have systems that work, and the more prescriptive we get, I think we risk breaking something that's not broken.

Sen. Nesnas says that he concurs with Dr. Marshall Jones’s comment.

Sen. Pre. concurs: I have a system in it and I have office hours. But most of my interaction with students outside classes in review sessions.

Sen. Kishore added his comment,

When I spoke to the other faculty in my own program, I got input about, back in the day, there was a requirement that faculty have X number of losses that was depending on how many credits you're teaching. I'm not familiar with that because I was not actually, I don't have office hours as many as I should have based on the courses on teaching. And I was with news for me at that time. So that's why I think we need to discuss this if this is needed. I do agree with Dr. Jones as well. Maybe there's a need for this document, but if everybody thinks that we can leave it as is and let the department's handle it, we can definitely do so.

Sen. Pres. Brown says,

We might want to make a general statement that. Faculty should be available to their students outside of class without trying to be without trying to say you'll spend 20 minutes per 30 seconds of class or something like that.

Sen. Tenga says, reluctant to be overly prescriptive.

Sen. Pres. Brown says, I think everybody who's spoken with likewise be reluctant to be overly prescriptive.

Sen. Suksawang comments,

One more quick comment is we also have to be very careful because this also affects adjuncts. Most of them don't have office hours, but they do meet the students after class on campus. So when you're making a decision, it should not only reflect the people who are here. When you're making the policy, please make sure that you look at everybody collectively and not just from the point of view of the full-time faculty.

Sen. Kishore continues, I'm not sure if a guidance document is prescriptive or not, but we can move forward based on what the consensus is.

Sen. Pre. Brown suggests that somebody could look up the appropriate material in the faculty handbook and see what's there.

Sen. Kishore says the committee can look at the document.

## 2. Administrative Policy Committee report.

Sen. Kaya begins s the committee report,

We met as the Administrative Policies Committee on September 28 and discussed the structure track proposal, and some points were made. A yellow highlighted [ from the proposal] says the criteria and process promotion would be identical to that of the current teaching track faculty, except that there's no requirement for research. The criteria for promotion of the teaching track is different for different colleges.

For example, in the COES, yes, there is no expectation for research. So, that highlighted area needs to be revised at least or reworded. There has to be there has

to be a difference between this tractor track and the teaching track besides the terminal degree criteria.

The colleges have different promotion criteria for teaching track. For example, when you look at the Senate website for a COA, there are some options for instructors, and it describes a path for promotion; whether or not it's implemented or currently in process is there. So that should be clarified. So, inputs from different colleges are different. I talked to Dr. Harris about this, and perhaps we can invite him to one of our meetings so he can give us a better perspective.

The proposal says that this will not impact the existing teaching-track faculty. However, there are some concerns. They do understand the good intent, but they want to make sure that everything stays the same in terms of their title and the contracts because that's different from how it was decided when we decided on tenure or teaching track.

Se. Pre. Brown says, It sounds the committee needs to discuss it some more.

Sen. Kaya responds that the Senate can discuss it. I brought up the point: there needs to be a distinction between the instructor faculty and the teaching faculty. Because there was some input from one of the colleges saying that we don't have any more teaching track faculty, but I assume that needs to be corrected. Some clarification and rewording of the proposal may be necessary.

Sen. Jones says,

One of the goals for this academic year is to look at tenure and promotion 2.0. I would like to know if this should be wrapped into that bigger conversation. For instance, you know, I know, talking to my colleagues and the School of Arts and Communication, they have some master's level folks who have not had the opportunity for promotion. So, if we were to look at something and say in this proposal from the Harris strike, the term degree people, then there may be some discussion about what we title. The concept of giving folks a passive promotion makes a lot of sense. But what further complicates the issue is each college is different in their teaching track, whether there is an expectation in time, given the scholarship and given the last three or four years of the rankings in here and things being solid and changing on a quick notice, I think people are properly gun shy and with the best of intentions. Now, how might that change down the road? And if we look at it as a complete package in that review, it may make better sense.

Sen. Turgut says,

I think it's a very good idea to invite Dr. Dean Harris as well because he's the one who has been advocating this. And from the written memorandum that I'm seeing, it's not even addressed officially to the faculty senate. It is from the dean directly to the interim provost, Dr. Rassoul, at this point.

Sen. Pres. Brown says, that's right. Dr. Rassoul gave it to me.

Sen. Turgut continues,

Because this has more implications than what we take from its face value as well. It goes back to the academic ranks, which are defined, in fact, in the handbook 2.1. So, introducing a brand new track like this also introduces new titles. So it is a deeper and profound issue than we are seeing in the facade of it. As far as I remember, there were faculty members who were in the Senate or working full-time at that time, and everybody knows that the colleges had the freedom to come up with their own promotion criteria. It may not be one size fits all. So, the colleges have the freedom to revisit their criteria and reflect it to the Senate as they like. That goes for COES as well. If COES wants to revise their promotion criteria, they are welcome to do so. Then, that is reflected in the faculty Senate per our policies, and then we seek the endorsed endorsement of the faculty Senate.

[A question from Chat]: Can we clarify if teaching track faculty is a term we should be using versus non-tenure track?

Sen. Turgut says,

She's right to bring this point because we made a mistake as the faculty senate. The true intention was to call it a non-tenure track from the beginning and then focus on teaching because there are three components where people get promotion or seek promotion. There, it is teaching, scholarship, and service. There's a lot of weight to do on the scholarship side as well. So we made the mistake of beginning to call it among ourselves as just teaching as it implies that they only do teaching and nothing else. This is not accurate. So we need to call it non-tenure as Embry-Riddle does that have tenure track, non-tenure track the same titles. That is what we had as well for our FH 2.1.

Sen. Pre. Brown says,

I'm hearing two ideas that I think will help move this one forward. Number one is to the Senate chat with Dean Harris, if he's available, when he's available. The other one that we roll the instructor track into the discussion of updating tenure implementation.

Nasri Nesnas says,

As some of you may remember that this came up a few years ago during my Senate presidency. And the name might have been different. It wasn't called was back to what was written in the guidelines, which was teaching professor. It was going to be a promotion path there without scholarship. And the main idea is that not all faculty here are doing research, and so everyone should have a path for promotion.

And I think the main mission behind this instructional track is to provide instructors some job security as well as some path to promotion. In my opinion, you know, we're not we shouldn't be living in a bubble. We should really look at

other universities that have been doing this for quite some time, and certainly not just in Florida, because Florida is a bit different from other universities in nation. I think there are a great number of universities in California that and Northeast that have a path for promotion for all instructional faculty. The names, the titles might be different, but the fact that we don't have that for instructors here is unfortunate, considering how much dedication they provide for the university and the students.

Sen. Pre. Brown says,

The need for a promotion path for instructors, I think is clear. And we also had this funny group in the middle who do. More teaching than the tenure track people and less teaching than the instructors and a little bit of research. There are also promotion criteria for the different colleges in the appendix.

Sen. Turgut says,

All in our program on our Senate Web page, there is the promotion guideline for every track for each college. I hear what Dr. Nesnas is saying. He had brought a resolution just literally 18 hours before the Senate meeting about promoting the instructors. But the argument back then was the same. There is an example where there's a pathway to get promotion from instructors to the non-tenure track, being an assistant professor already with College of Aeronautics. So that's also available there.

Sen. Pre. Brown suggests, it's clear as a Senate we need to do some more work on this issue. Shall we start by having a chat with Dean Harris and see what we get out of that?

Sen. Jones says,

What always bothered me with our tenure discussion is at the point in time in which someone is hired or for the old folks who were grandfathered one way or the other. You said at a point in time what your track is. So let's say we hire a new faculty that really haven't had the opportunity to establish a research line, and they come here and they're good colleagues and they're working with faculty, and then all of a sudden they develop something we're forcing our hand in that they either have to go somewhere else to explore a more scholarly track or they're locked in by our rules and do a tenure, a non tenure, which we could also call the teaching track. I think we need to keep that in mind as we're revisiting this.

Sen. Pre. Brown says,

a relatively small school and as a private, I thought we ought to be able to be flexible enough to encompass everybody. But the system as it is now doesn't do that.

Sen. Jones continues,

We need to explore the motivation and the purpose of tenure in the first place. I think what was anticipated and the unintended consequences may not have been what anybody envisioned when we kicked off this case a few years ago anyway.

3. Excellence Awards Committee report.

Sen. Wildman says No reports.

4. Scholarship Committee Report.

Sen. Kachouie says, No report.

On a separate note, Sen. Kachouie comments on Office Hours, I agree that departments can and should handle it. I don't think that is an item for our faculty senate to have more pressing issues. As a matter of fact, in our Departments of Mathematics and Systems Engineering, We have extended office hours, and there is no problem. I don't think that for a single complaint, they couldn't find a faculty.

5. Technology, Resources, and Infrastructure Committee Report.

Sen. Poole begins the committee report, we met for the first time last Thursday (9/28) and discussed a few major concerns, namely the printer issues we've all been experiencing. Next task is to reach out to I.T. personnel and ask a few people to join our next meeting, which should be in the next couple of weeks. Also, anyone from your departments, if you have any concerns that you would like to bring to my attention, please just reach out to me directly so I can bring that to discuss at our next meeting.

6. Welfare Committee Report:

Sen. Suksawang begins the committee report by saying, we learned that H.R. and the university president were looking to revise this Family Leave policy because there's currently none. We decided to provide some feedback from the Senate's point of view. As I presented at our last meeting, other universities in Florida have at least eight weeks of paid parental leave. I've submitted the resolution document, but we can either wait to discuss it at our next meeting or now.

Sen. Pres. Brown suggests him to discuss now.

[Sen. Suksawang shared the screen: [of the Resolution to Establish a Minimum 8-Week Paid Parental Leave Policy]

Sen. Suksawang continues, this is for the entire faculty and staff because we learned that you can not discriminate against anybody. That definitely would have a cost impact on it. Essentially. We try to argue that the university should at least adopt eight weeks of paid parental leave. This should be applied to everybody. If anybody have feedback, or you can take it back to your faculty and see if they agree or they don't like it, that's fine. Hopefully, we can vote on this next month.

Sen. Pre. Brown asks, Is there further discussion of this resolution at this time?

Sen. Turgut says, Principally, this is good for the faculty and staff. Procedurally, we have to vote on this next meeting. Can we revise all the other universities to most universities? Because someone may come back and say, did you really check all the other universities? And from Florida and also not to include the staff are affected.

We are not the administration. We are the faculty senate. We have to go with our mission. Our mission does not include looking out for the best interest of the staff because these staffs are non-faculty.

Sen. Turgut says,

There is this kind of a staff committee [Staff Advisory Committee] which can advise on these issues. Our mission is to represent the faculty concerns and interests to the administration, institutional agencies, to participate in our institutional governance and to advocate for faculty rights and well-being. They may come back to us and say, Why are you putting your resolution for the staff? That's the administration's purview—nothing against the staff. I would like them to get this right as well. Obviously, we're not against that.

Sen. Suksawang says,

I talked to the policy on this and they said they can because faculty are technically staffs, the university employee. So I was even asked, Can we just make it a faculty? They say they can't do that. It's against our policy. If you want to change the language, you remove the staff. That's fine. But, based on my conversation with HR, If this were to be enacted, let's say they adopt this, they have to do for both faculty and staff; otherwise, we violate the law.

Sen. Rivet says, I'm not sure that would violate any laws. That's not HR policy. If they if they can point to the chapter and verse of the law, then okay, we'll leave it.

Sen. Suksawang says, if there is any, for the next couple of weeks, we'll get a final version [of the Resolution to Establish a Minimum 8-Week Paid Parental Leave Policy] and send it to you.

Sen. Pre. Brown says, we can have a discussion next time we can vote on it. Hopefully, we can vote next time. Is there a discussion of this issue? Hearing none will take will hold it over the next month and take it up as all business then.

### **Old Business**

Resolution about Ombudsman Committee:

“The functions of the former Ombudsman Committee are now performed by the Ombuds Office. Therefore, there is no need for a separate Ombudsman Committee. The Faculty Handbook should be revised as follows: the Faculty Grievance Resolution Procedure (sect 4) should refer to the Ombuds Office instead of the Ombudsman Committee, and FH 1.5.7 should be blank.”

[To be discussed in November]

### **New business: R1 vs R2 discussion**

Sen. Pre. Brown says, The Sense of the Senate is summarizing what we'd been discussing about the R1 and R2 issues.

Sen. Turgut says,

I think we need to include the definition of R1 and R2 so that the faculty is well informed because R1 Carnegie is defined as a doctoral university with very high research activity, and R2 is defined as a doctoral university with high research activity. We are in that category. We're in the category of high research activity. Some of our peers in that category are Air Force, Institute of Technology, American University, Arizona State, Bowling Green, Brigham Young, Creighton University, DePaul, Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, Florida Atlantic, Illinois Institute of Technology, Loyola, and Miami University. Finally, Nova Southern from FL as well. The list goes on like this. We are already a high research activity university. The faculty is not aware of this definition. We are a high research activity. The other category is doctoral/professional universities. D/PU, And we are in that. We are in R 2. And we are a private university with a STEM university.

That is how we have to look at this situation. And among the R 1, as we discussed last time, you know, it's the endowments even of the universities that I told you are like two or three times or five times more than us, by the way. And they all rank higher than us, given that we've fallen to 69.

Sen. Pre. Brown says,

No other comments? There is an immediate sense that the Senate did not intend to have a vote this time. It was in case we wanted to amend it next time. Okay, well. Senators, please take that to your departments and get more. My original idea was to have a full faculty poll right after the November Senate meeting to disclose our recommendation.

Let me take the two discussion items in reverse order: Preliminary discussion of possible modifications in implementing tenure. I just remembered that Interim Provost Hamid Rassoul asked us for suggestions. Go to your departments and see the faculty's suggestions—general topic rankings and finances. The president covered much of that.

## **Adjournment**

You're hearing none. The motion to adjourn.  
[Motion by Sen. Jones. Seconded by Sen. Kishore].  
The meeting was adjourned at 5:03pm

Respectfully submitted,

Joo young Park, Faculty Senate Secretary