

**Faculty Senate Meeting**  
**Date/Time: November 7, 2023, 3:30 pm**  
**Location: In-person Board of Trustees Room, with ZOOM link:**  
<https://fit.zoom.us/j/98187817280>

## Minutes

### **Senator Present:**

Shawn Scott (Aeronautics), Jordan Poole (Aeronautics), Tolga Turgut (Aeronautics), Csaba Palotai(APSS), Madhur Tiwari (APSS), Manasvi Lingam (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), Stanley Snelson (MSE), Rob Van Woesik (OEMS), Angela Tenga (SAC), David Wilder(BA), Patrick Converse(PSY), Jessica Wildman(PSY), Marshall Jones(PSY), William Bowman(Library), Gary Zarillo (OEMS), Wanfa Zhang (SAC)

**Senator Absent:** Charles Bryant (Business), Steven Rivet (Business), Angel Otero (Business Online), Donald Platt(APSS), Abram Walton((Business), Chiradeep Sen (MCE), Pallav Ray(OEMS), Kevin Burke (SAC), Joe montelione (SAC), Kenia Nunes (BES), Georgio Anagnostopoulos (EECS)

**Proxies:** None

**Other attendees:** John Nicklow, Amanda Moske, Nasri Nesnas, Tristan Fiedler, Nancy Garmer, Rudolf Wehmschulte, Nick Daher, Heidi Hatfield Edwards, Penny Vassar

**Guest Speaker: Amanda Moske, Chief Data Officer at Florida Tech;**  
**President John Nicklow**

Amanda M. introduced herself and continued, I wanted to address the faculty Senate to give you an idea of what I do, what my team does, and where we want to go. And I think there were some questions about our U.S. News and World Report rankings, which we'll address. Hopefully, I can answer some questions for you. My official title is executive director of Institutional Research and Chief Data Officer.

To split that up, when you talk about institutional research, that is a unit primarily focused on collecting housing and reporting qualitative and quantitative data for the university. And it's typically used for policymaking, strategic planning, and reporting purposes. Our critical function is focused on reporting to the federal government and external entities. It's called IPEDS (Integrated Post-secondary Education Data System), and we're required to report data to it every year.

It's in three cycles. Each cycle has several surveys attached to it. Each survey, if we don't complete it, is a fine of \$67,000. When I say it's a critical function, let's attach a monetary value to it. It's also federally mandated. If we want to maintain Title IV funding, which is our financial aid. So again, even more money is attached to it. When you talk about a chief data officer, they are primarily focused on maintaining your data assets, making sure that there's high-data quality, it's used properly, and making sure that there is security associated with it, so that only certain data is accessed by individuals who need it for their job purpose. What's the difference between a CIO and a CDO? Why do we need a Chief Data Officer? When you think about it, your CIO is focused on your technology infrastructure. Your chief data officer is going to be focused on your data assets and using them for analytic purposes. A great graphic would be a sandbox. Your CIO builds the sandbox; your CDO is inside with the sand, playing around with it and building structures and stuff. We could expand upon that and talk about your chief risk officer. They're the ones that build your fence around it. I wanted to make sure we made that distinction because it's great for those two to work in parallel with one another. It's best that neither of them reports to the other because they hold distinct roles.

So, now that you know what institutional research is and what a chief data officer is, I wanted to give you some background for myself.

I hold two bachelor's degrees from the University of Missouri. I have two masters and one Ph.D. from the University of North Texas. I'm also a certified chief data officer through Carnegie Mellon, and I'm pursuing a second doctorate in educational leadership at the University of North Dakota. I started as a senior data analyst at the University of North Texas. I was there for about four years. Afterward, I took a leadership role as the director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness at Hartwick College. It's a private liberal arts college in upstate New York. And then I went to the University of North Dakota, where I was their chief data officer for five years.

During my interview with Dr. Nicklow, I knew that I wanted to come to Florida Tech, so that's why I'm here.

I want to talk to you about what I see as an effective unit and how we want to support faculty and faculty success. So, many of our offices are organized around functional processes. So, ensure that certain surveys are completed and data is submitted to IPEDS. But what you're seeing is a more effective office that is really focused on service units.

The service units are around, and institutions are provided with the resources that are necessary for them to be successful. It's a new shift and way of focusing, and it's really hard for institutions with small teams to provide that. I've sent a proposal to Dr. Nicklow of how I think the office should be structured and the different units that we need to focus on.

And then we are putting a strategy together for finding the funding for it and moving forward. And we're going to ramp up slowly over time. So, we will be functional-focused and then shift to the surface focus as we add more people to the team.

In terms of faculty focus. I see areas in which you need help.

For example, your faculty evaluations and making sure we tie it to student success. Also focusing on a faculty profile right now sitting out on the website.

We could expand that so we get more exposure, and we can talk about some of the great things that you're doing here at the university.

We can also support you through DFW rates and ensure that that data is provided to you much quicker and cleaner. That's really the faculty piece that I see us as helping you out.

Another area would be the democratization of data. What I mean by that is that you have access to the data that you need to do your job. You shouldn't be sending my team data requests for something you need every semester. There should be a report already available to you that you have immediate access to.

That way, you can answer the questions as needed. We need to wait until we really want to expand in that area and beef up the website. But again, put it behind a firewall so that you're logging in to access it. It's not going to be publicly available outside of key personnel. That's all I want to discuss regarding the team or the office. We plan to expand the number of members. We will also focus on some more training and then beef up our utilization of Power BI.

Any questions about that piece before we jump into U.S. News and World Report?

As you know, we did drop in our rankings. President Nicklow has already shared a breakdown of those indicators with the campus community.

We did see a massive change in the methodology and a variety of different ways.

We saw new indicators added. We saw indicators removed, We saw weights adjusted.

We also saw where the underlying methodology changed. So they shifted from, say, a two-year average to a four-year average or adjusted when they compared an enrollment number versus a financial number. That was a methodological shift. We also saw a huge shift in data sources.

In the past, they would use IPEDS. They would also use data that we reported directly to them. Now, they're shifting to more third-party data and using that as part of our ranking. This was the whole scale, the largest shift in methodology that we saw with U.S. News and World Report.

I've taken a deep dive into the data. I've noticed some anomalies. I have reached out to them in a variety of different capacities. There is the ability to submit a form. There's the ability to attend webinars. I've asked questions. I've also sent emails.

So, I am putting out the feelers to better understand some of those third-party data sources because there would be. Our data is being reported inaccurately. Not just our data but also that of other institutions. So more to come as I find out in that area.

I think one of the questions that Dr. Brown mentioned in his email was whether there was an underlying question of whether our rankings truly dropped because of the change in the methodology or if something was going on. Where we need to perform up to standard. I can state for certain that it has to do with that change in methodology. Our data has not seen wide shifts in retention or graduation rates or any other indicator that

would have been part of the old methodology. It truly is this new shift that caused us to drop the way that we did. I gave you much information there. Any questions?

Sen. Bowman asked questions, I'm William Bowman. I'm the library's representative on the Faculty Senate. The third-party tools you mentioned are being used for the rankings. I've been looking into that, as one of them is Elsevier?

Amanda Moske mentioned,

That is correct. That is for the faculty. It's like a faculty productivity ranking application. They expanded their company in their platform within the last few years. They were flying under the radar. Many people don't realize what they are doing. They now have what's called Scopus data. It's an API that collects all of that information because, in any publication, there's a piece of information we provide as authors. so one of them is our affiliation. And so that's what they're using to state whether it's affiliated with an institution or not.

But as you know, you may or may not publish while you're at that institution, but you're using them as your affiliation for various reasons. You may have worked at that institution previously. You were working with another faculty member, and two years later, you were finally able to publish. And so you kept that affiliation, and it might not accurately reflect where you currently are when it was published.

So, there are some little nuances. I know there's a lot of controversy around this company; it will take some time to dive into it and get more information on that piece.

Senator Bowman says, I'd like to know since the library does use Scopus extensively for the research end of things. Let us know if there is anything we can do to help you with gathering or anything like that.

Amanda Moske mentioned, I will do that. Suddenly, they have this massive platform that they're using, and now we have ranking systems that use it.

Senator van Woessik comments, It's a big concern. I noticed that 5% of the information is faculty citations in the new ranking. So it's not trivial.

Senator Turgut Says,

Welcome, Dr. Moske to Florida Tech, Congratulations on your job and your new position. Thank you for all the insight that you have provided.

Can you elaborate more on whether any other institutions, like Florida Tech, fell like 60 places altogether? I understand there were some metric changes and some assessment-related issues because I took a look, and I know my colleagues did.

We are now ranked 12th in Florida among nationally ranked universities.

We used to rank about eight or nine: Florida Atlantic passed us, NOVA Southern University passed us, the University of North Florida US, and even Kaiser University passed us. These are the kinds of questions that we are getting as well. The rankings

are very important for enabling us to recruit better quality students and where our university stands.

Amanda Moske says, I can't definitively answer that question for you, but I can look at the data to get a sense of those institutions with the largest gap in comparison to us.

Pres. Nicklow says,

I can follow up on that; in particular, private institutions, not all but many privates, fell into this, and some precipitously, like Florida Tech. The Vanderbilt President has been most vocal about it—a considerable drop. And you saw a rise in the lot of the large publics. If you ask their presidents, I'm seeing some communication among peers that, when your rankings go up, you're very proud of it no matter how it happened. They're attributing it to all the great things that they are doing. But I would go back to what Amanda said. There were a lot of methodological shifts as a result of the methodology change. With that said, we're going to work through that. We know what the metrics are, at least today. They may shift again without any warning. But I always will go back to those things that are out of our control. What we do control are those metrics, right? Nearly 20% of the ranking is the retention and graduation rate.

That's probably the biggest chunk right there. And yes, the big about metric components and some other things are all they all add up. We focus on the things we know we can change and let Amanda work on those things.

Amanda Moske says,

I want to expand upon your statement, Dr. Nicklow. When we talk about retention and graduation being essentially a bulk of the ranking there, we're getting measured on the same group of students in various ways.

So it's more than just the formal federal definition: full-time bachelor, degree-seeking students, first time in college.

Now we're slicing and dicing the data and getting fit a second and third time, looking at Pell versus non-Pell and the first Gen versus non-first Gen. We need to increase our retention and graduation rates because that is weighted even heavier Now.

Senator Kachouie asks,

Do we have any assessment about the financial impacts of all ranked since some of our international students come with their scholarships? Their sponsors let them get admission in the US, our top 200. We are not in that range anymore, and we will also get that financial impact. Is there an assessment about that?

Dr. Moske replied that she had not done anything about that but could look into the aspect.

Pres. Nicklow comments,

On that last question, financial impact. We all know that until next year when things transpire. We are up in an inquiries application and admits year to year, and we had the

largest freshman class in our history last year. The fact that we're still up this fall compared to last year is a very positive sign.

But at this point, it's preliminary. And to sign just a couple of updates, we are in the middle of the Provost search. The committee is working through some semifinalists. And then we'll bring me some recommendations for finalists to bring to campus. But I hope to do. The last week in November into December is when we're looking at that. So, you have those on that list. I encourage you to go to an open forum. I've set aside time for parts of the Senate and several members of the Senate to do that. Every constituency should have an opportunity to visit with the candidates and then a campus open forum.

Amanda mentioned risk management, and there's been a new appointment at the request of the Board of a Risk Management Steering Committee. It's a group of individuals that will be examining and prioritizing levels of risk across the institution, whether that be financial, cultural, human resources, whatever it might be, and then putting together mitigation measures to protect the institution.

A lot of large enterprises have this kind of thing in place. We had not.

And it's an important part of where we're going. The board agreed with that.

I'm going to go through these relatively quickly and then anything any of these or other items you want to talk about, let's do that.

Tomorrow, I will be working with the Board of Trustees Governance Committee.

To update you, we have a very large board with no term limits. And no term limits for chairs of committees and so on. That has been the last board, meaning we had approval to make changes. Now, the rubber meets the road, and nobody wants the short term when you have to figure out how to implement that. So that's what we're meeting about tomorrow. We will look a little bit different. I'm also one of the things we're considering is taking our board of trustees and fracturing it into a true governance board and a philanthropic component because we have some board members, some trustees who believe they're on the board for a philanthropic purpose, and others who want to engage in governance and not that those things are at odds. But we want two people on the board to support where they put support their passion.

We are in the middle of our strategic planning. I have a draft that is private. The group of 40, the steering committee, should see that within the coming week or so, and we'll get some feedback and then take that to the broader community. And as you have feedback on that, let us know. It's designed to be a plan and to say, look forward, what is our vision? Back it up and say, what steps do we need to take over the next few years to get there? But we're not printing it anywhere, as I think I mentioned, where this is an evolving plan that'll be posted online using many dashboards that Amanda is putting together, and you'll be able to see our progress or lack thereof and where we need to pivot.

We are putting the final details on an RFP for a master plan that involves housing. As I mentioned in my state of the university, the housing is our bottleneck, so we have to get that done. But there'll be a broader effort around master planning where we'll ask for your input.

I hope you'll get involved. In terms of what this campus looks like in the future and how we can step there, how we can raise the money for it. Then, as the thing becomes last, I'm bringing a campaign architect to work with advancement in the spring and January. The idea here is to begin assessing and doing a feasibility study about what our campaign should look like and what the case statement should look like. And building out a hopefully, I don't want to give a number. I don't know if it's 50 million or 200 million. I am still determining what that looks like. It depends. This is why you do a feasibility study to understand your donor base and what they might look like and do some good screening. It's a detailed process, just like a research project.

One final thing tomorrow. I'm also presenting the idea of creating a research institute to the board. It's called Florida Tech Research Institute. This institute is either wholly owned or independent but affiliated with an institution. The purpose is to conduct classified research for the federal government. The reason we're going down this route is that we are currently compliant with it and have the ability to do classified research. Ultimately, I'm responsible and liable to ensure all the safeguards are taken. The challenge in today's world is how can I be sure that some officers across the way might have a graduate student from one country working next to somebody else. How can I ensure that nothing is being communicated? Classified being shared. I can't. So, there are better models to conduct this kind of research. So, we're creating this separate entity to conduct classified research. One of my early questions was how much do we do? We must do much classified research. Right now, we have zero classified contracts. So it's a good time to do this, but there are many things and much evidence. Part of me thinks that one of the reasons we have so little classified research is that we need to have this kind of separation. It will benefit us long term. Hopefully, it will benefit you and your research enterprise.

I mentioned this to Alan Brown, and it is something for you all to discuss. I never want the whole Senate meetings to go on unwelcomely and suppress any discussion. That's not the purpose. The purpose of my attending is to hear you also exit and allow you to talk freely and so on. Now, one of the things you might consider is inviting the deans to invite the provost because they need to hear. We all need to hear what issues you have not responded to. That's not ours; this is your meeting. But it is sometimes nice to hear what the issues are and what you're thinking about. And if you choose not to do that, that's fine. That's your prerogative as well. But Al brown would bring that to us separately. So my approach has been very I've seen a lot of different senates. The best is a partnership where we hear each other and dialog occurs. But it's ultimately your meeting. What questions do you have about those items or anything else?

Senator Jones comments:

In my primary role as a forensic psych, I spent the first decade-plus for COPLA working with the best contract. I'm fortunately or unfortunately versed in the history of that. The one concern that I do have is the agreement we had on the use of the videos. When we did stuff from the beginning, that was more of the talking head to where we ended up today. We have evolved into a student-centered, interactive approach, far better than what I understand to be the process if we change partners. However, there are so many classes that it will take us a couple of years with our current faculty to redevelop those. When we've tried to do the redevelopment on campus between the elevator, you get the sound in our studio and the need for more studio resources and personnel. We have, with the best of intentions, only sometimes properly resourced that to what we would hope for our student experience.

The other aspect I wanted to mention on the student experience is the new undergrad advising campaign, which I realize across campus that advising at its various stages is bad. It works for some, but smaller programs, like the forensic side, were built on that mentoring coaching model. For us to succeed with this new model, there needs to be more dialog and more interaction in those processes to ensure we're not unintentionally setting students and the new advisors up for some challenges. Just a few of the nuanced programs on campus may apply to that.

President Nicklow comments,

I'll take the second one first. I couldn't agree more. I do want faculty to view the faculty as a mentor. You engage, you talk about careers. I don't want to be in charge of determining which general elective qualifies you. Those are details that there are better people to answer than me. That's an academic advisor. As a faculty member, don't ask me about financial aid. I'm not qualified to answer those questions. That's your advisor who can connect you. But as a faculty member, mentoring is very important, and then it is by discipline. Take those points to your chair. I'll mention those to Hamid and Mine Subasi; we also have many things to work out in that model. But it ensures your voice is heard on behalf of your department.

If we stay with this, we have to redesign the courses anyway because they have to go through a refresh. And I don't know what that looks like, Academic partnerships are quite different in that you own the course, you teach the course, and you probably would talk about, at least, most of the models I've seen where you would get a certain maybe overload compensation or some compensation to develop that course in an online fashion or redevelop. The reason I can't just jump to a recommendation here is, we have a terrible contract. Yes, in the revenue share, but most importantly, you all don't own the course, but they don't either because we share it, which is the same as saying nobody owns it. Neither of us can use it. And we're talking about how we could have it. Or do we want to purchase it? I am still determining what that looks like, how much it would be, or if it's even possible so that we could at least that would help in this transition add more. We will get to a point where we have enough information to decide.



I know that we can't absorb all of this in-house right now and maintain the numbers. I can tell you that the AP (Academic Partnerships) is also interested in our virtual Florida Tech programs. They would like to take that. That makes me excited and nervous at the same time, and I am excited that those programs can be marketed on a national level in a much stronger and more cost-effective way. We're talking about the volume of students. The downside of that is the revenue share. So I have to double the number of students immediately to break even compared to what we're doing today. There are many pieces to this. Again, I encourage you to stay close to your chair or Dean on these issues and make some recommendations. Everybody's got a different opinion based on their experiences with Florida Tech. It's certainly complicated.

Senator Jones comments,

I sent a recommendation to the chain of command for some studio resources that may be interested in partnering and a contractor to build some of the stuff, which we would retain the IP and take advantage of some of their unused capacities. Have you had the opportunity, or did anybody share that with you?

President Nicklow responded that he had yet to receive it but suggested everyone send any recommendations to him.

Sen. Pres. Brown asked to see if there were any more questions.

Senator Bowman asks, Regarding the housing master plan you were talking about, as well as your increasing enrollment, how do we see that going in a few years with the coming demographic shifts? Do we expect to be still experiencing some growth there?

Pres. Nicklow responds,

I'd be less certain if we were a different school. But I like our odds, given our STEM focus on technology-driven programs at different levels in different colleges. But they're in such high demand. That's where students there are many arguments, as you might read every day in your newsletters, about the value of higher Ed and the demographic cliff. One of the things that excites me is that, again, the demand in STEM-driven fields is not going away.

I also like how diverse of a population we are, both in terms of race, ethnicity, and origin, but also in terms of the level. We have a large online population; we have undergrad and grad, and we're in better shape than many of our peers. If we were a small liberal arts college right now, I would answer that differently. And it's not anything against small liberal arts colleges, but it's just a different environment out there.

Senator Poole comments, I'm in the College of Aeronautics. We have our biggest incoming freshman class ever. And with registration this week, we noticed that most of our classes filled up in 5 minutes on Sunday night alone, completely capped. The problem is that many of them are computer-based courses, and we don't have any more space. So, with this growth in the master plan, is there anything for expanding facilities

down the road? Not even for flights, but I'm talking about airport design management, like AutoCAD.

Pres. Nicklow comments,

This is why we need a master plan. We can't grow without it. We're out of more limited classroom space and limited housing. Like I told a couple of deans where we need more faculty. We're a tuition-driven institution. We need to increase our number of students and invest in faculty, and that's the way you go. But that's easier to do if you have the capacity. This is why we need a master plan; it's not a comment on our history with a beautiful campus. It's some great infrastructure and some not-so-great infrastructure. But there has to be a broader vision: is this the area where we will invest more in academic buildings and infrastructure? Where are we going to focus on housing? And that'll be the housing area again. If you notice, at least the old parts of the campus are very fragmented. When you have half a unit in one building happen to the unit in another building, that doesn't promote teamwork or collaboration.

These are all going to be part of the master plan discussion.

Senator Kachouie comments, it's good that we could increase the number of students, which is a record number. It's good to know what the plan worked out for marketing in that way at the same time and what our plans are for our future strategy. Let's say the big picture is to improve the quality of the students as well since one of the factors for students to get better students is ranking. It's not going to result in the short term, rather than trying to better what we can do in the short term to bring more or improve the quality.

President Nicklow comments,

The quality of our students has not changed immeasurably, at least over the last few years. When we took a dip in retention, you can add lines up pretty well with COVID and the pandemic. We have a little bit different students today than we did not even just a few years ago. There are experienced juniors and seniors through COVID-19, and their math preparation was impacted. And the way I've always looked at this, and it's just a personal opinion, is I could take it. I could sit back and wait and say, I only can teach the most selective students. Retaining the best, the top students is easy. It's easier than teaching the students you have. And with just what you said, with the demographic shift and everything happening, we have the students we have now. I am not suggesting we admit unqualified students. We're not changing our admission criteria, but we're going to have the students we have. When I look at the data, Mine Subasi and Hamid are taking who's being retained well. Who's not going off the log? Is it academic? Is it financial? We have far more students, really good students, but they have a mental challenge or a mental health challenge, and it was probably one of the students I never had to study in high school. And in my first semester, I thought, Holy, physics. Well, I had to figure it out. And we have a lot of those students, and it's playing out differently today than pre-COVID. My point is that I certainly don't want to sacrifice the quality that we're admitting at all, but I can tell you we're going to see the effects of COVID. Some people say the

next four years, we'll see it for the next twelve, and it will play out in different ways. I'd encourage you to think about today's students, who are all different than when we were in college. How do we support them? Some of this is what we do as faculty, but some is what Rodd Newcomb does in the Student Success and Support Center. Some of it's through the Care Network and Dean of Students, McMahan. We're doing more outreach and support than many of our peers. But certainly, Higher Ed as an industry is doing more outreach because we have to. It's just that the students expect it to be a need. I won't take up any more time. Thank you all for your time. And please, if you have any comments, suggestions, or questions, bring them to me.

Sen. Pres. Brown asked to see if there were any other questions. [No question was asked]

### **Call to order**

Pres. Brown called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm. The minutes from September 5, 2023, to be approved:

Sen. Pres. Brown requested a motion to approve the Minutes of the September 23 meeting, which was sent out last month.

Senator Turgut comments,

Before you proceed with the motion, there's a technical modification that needs to be made so we continue to be consistent as per Robert's Rules Voting procedures in Section 45 for the 12th edition of Robert's Rules (45:2) **One Person One Vote** *"It is a fundamental principle of parliamentary law that each person who is a member of a deliberative assembly is entitled to one—and only one—vote on a question"*[the statement was checked by the secretary].

This is essential for me to bring. So we don't set up an inconsistent precedent going forward. It's never been done in the past. When I read the rules of meetings, you wouldn't believe it, but I read it going back to about nine or ten years. This is important for counting, counting integrity, voting integrity, and encouraging more participation and engagement by faculty. And one person, one-vote rule is very logical.

That's why they must have it in Robert's Rules, and it is within reason.

So because in the September minutes, there's one of us. It could be anybody: a proxy for two other senators, one senator, or a proxy for two other senators. So, I believe that section should be modified. Can I move to modify the Minutes, as discussed, to go forward?

Sen. Pres. Brown asks, what exact modification do you wish to make in this meeting Minutes?

Sen. Turgut replies, It's not the right process technically to have one-person proxy for two other senators in the same meeting, so the weight becomes three votes. I mean, there is the one-person, one-vote rule.

Sen. Bowman asks, would such a change alter the results of any votes?

Sen. Pre. Brown says there is no change in the results of the votes.

Sen. Scott asks, how could you ever vote by proxy because someone proxies for two, I don't understand.

Sen. Pre. Brown comments that one is just there because we've got a senator with a partial conflict.

Senator Turgut comments,

We can have proxies, but that has been customary and tradition for the senators. If a senator cannot make it to a meeting, they email the Senate president and secretary to designate another faculty so that complies with the one-person, one-vote rule. That's what we did. So, going back, we have been consistent with that, going back to ten, 15 years.

I checked Robert's Rules, and it's one person, one vote. In that meeting, one person was voting for two other members. Therefore, three votes can be counted. If you're a shareholder in a public company and sitting on the board because you are in charge of the shares, your vote percentage goes up in a representative body here. We deliberate it, and we vote. So, this may not be an issue now, but it will set precedence in the future. This is very important.

Sen. Pres. Brown says I take it to **a motion for removing the reference to proxies.**

Is that correct?

Sen. Turgut replies, Yes

Is there a Second?

[Sen. van Woesik seconded]

Any discussion?

[No Discussion].

Sen. Pre. Brown asks,

Is there a motion to amend the minutes, a provision we have reviewed?

**[Majority in favor of amending the minutes: Motion to amend passes]**

Sen. Pre. Brown confirmed —the motion to amend the minutes passed and asked to proceed with another motion to adopt the minutes as amended.

Is there a motion to adopt the minutes as amended?

[ Senator Bowman motioned]

Is there a Second? [ Senator Turgut seconded]

[ No discussion]

[Majority in favor of approval of the minutes as amended: Motion to approve the minutes as amended passes]

**September minutes: approved as amended (with the removal of the reference to proxies)]**

For the next agenda item, Pres. Brown addressed the Faculty Senate Officer Election (to be held in December)

*Nominee for President-Elect: Dr. Nakin Suksawang*

Pre. Brown mentioned that as the executive committee discussed and decided to wait at least a month so that more candidates can be nominated (Dr. Suksawang agreed to it).

*Nominations will remain open until the November 28 Executive Committee meeting.*

### **President Reports**

Senate President Brown begins by saying:

There will be a memorial for Jay Lally on campus this Saturday, November 11<sup>th</sup>

At the last Senate meeting, we discussed a proposal for a Family-Leave policy; a couple of days after the last Senate meeting, the Staff Council asked me for a meeting, and it turned out that they, too, were working on such a proposal. I'd heard at the October strategic planning meeting that the Diversity Council was also working on such a proposal, and I heard a little later that HR was also working on a Family Leave policy. I told all the groups about each other, and we now have a policy. The policy calls for four weeks' paid leave, which is a big improvement on zero; it's less than what the state system provides and the Welfare Committee requested. So, we may get a proposal requesting further improvement over time.

The President described progress in the provostial search. I have met twice with the Interim Provost and once with the Provost and the President. The first meeting with the Provost was mostly preparation for the meeting with the President, the major topic of which was the R1/R2 issue. The second meeting with the Provost was yesterday, the 6<sup>th</sup> of November; we discussed the R1/R2 issue and the Ombudsman Committee, and he urged us to make proposals for modified tenure implementation if we desire any.

The Inauguration Committee meets every week or two, and planning is going forward. I attended a meeting of the university Patents Committee, which considered three proposals.

Sen. van Woesik comments that the Senate and the AFTC should work together like last time if an amendment is needed.

Sen. Pre. Brown replies that this is not an amendment to the AFTC charter. This is an amendment to Tenure implementation.

Sen. van Woesik comments that if there is a proposal for any changes in the case, I suggest you get together with the chair.

Sen. Kachouie comments, I don't know why this is urgent. Why do we need to talk about more pressing issues than that and with the ranking and everything else? It isn't the right time to visit that Tenure Implementation.

Sen. Pre. Brown mentions that the interim provost is interested in it. Helping fix this if you can while he's still in office is a short time;

Sen. Kachouie replies, what is broken that you need to improve?

Sen. Pre. Brown mentioned,

Due to the two proposals:

One proposal is that Senior members of the teaching track should be permitted to apply for tenure at specific intervals with the right to return to the teaching track afterward, which still needs to be done.

The other proposal I've heard is that it would take much care to work on a path from tenure to performance in the duties of a teaching track faculty member.

A couple of the candidates from the office Provost said they had such cases at their schools, and we would need to look into that, but this is not a proposal that was intended to rush anything but the proposal to get something moving. Another possibility would be to look at Tenure criteria for the different colleges. At least one got rejected last time, but it was implemented anyway.

Sen. Kachouie comments,

If there is any change to the tenure system, that would benefit the people who didn't get the tenure, and the university will not be open to lawsuits. If you changed that, the criteria for which you let some people go, and you are now lowering it so they can say that's okay, what happened?

Sen. Pre. Brown replies that he does not know.

Senator Turgut says this is a profound subject and shouldn't be rushed. The AFTC Charter was revised in a very detailed way with the work of the Senate and the AFTC committee together for three months last year. The AFTC needs to be involved in this kind of policy revision with the Senate because it is the body that will approve it in the end. And that's their involvement. A very detailed and sophisticated matter like this should not be rushed. I agree with Sen. Kachouie's comment that we have other pressing issues. For example, we keep calling it a teaching track. It's not a teaching track but a non-tenure track. That track is called the Non-Tenure Track with Focus on Teaching, and it's also defined in that policy. There's one-third scholarship, one-third service, and one-third teaching for that track. There should be accurate descriptions.

We kept on calling it a non-tenure track, like many other institutions. But somehow, it was labeled at the last minute as a teaching track. We have to get rid of that label. It is not a teaching track. It was not a teaching track because we're creating stratification, which can lead to discrimination.

Sen. Pres. Brown says, I'm hearing that I need to talk with Interim Provost about the action item.

### **Committee Reports**

#### 1. Academic Policy Committee Report from Sen. Kishore

Sen. Kishore reported two items:

One is that we had a request from the Dean of Students on a document that he needs feedback on. The document is about Course-related disruptive behavior—a guidance document for that. I will be sending this document to the Senate via email. The same way as I did for the verified absence guidance document a few weeks ago, like a couple of months ago. So, he needs feedback to be given directly to him. If anyone on the Senate would like to read through it and if there are any changes that they recommend, they could reach out to the dean of students directly. The second item that I would like to bring up is the Office Hour guidance, which we discussed on the Senate floor last month. We've come up with a conclusion based on the feedback that we received that the department and program, individual departments and programs have to address the office of guidance for their faculty. And that would not be anything coming out from the Senate. I also sent you a short paragraph that was shared by Dr. Marshall Jones with me, which I shared with you at the Senate Executive Committee meeting. This could be discussed here now if needed or sent to the provost as an outcome from the Senate.

#### 2. Administrative Policies from Sen. Kaya (Instructor Track)

Sen. Kaya reported that the committee agreed that certain clarifications should be made regarding the non-tenure track and instructor track.

#### 3. Excellence Award Committee -Senator Wildman

Sen. Wildman reported that she reached out to the Provost's office to confirm the cash awards affiliated with the awards this year, and there is a change and she delivered the statement directly from the Provost's office per agreement with Dr. Nicklow: *The Faculty Excellence Awards are now up to \$ 2500 for professional conference travel expenses. The expense can be for the faculty or students for professional development, so I wanted to make people aware of that change.*

#### 4. Scholarship Committee- Sen. Nezamoddini-Kachouie

Sen. Kachouie had no report

5. Technology and Infrastructure Committee-Sen. Poole

Sen. Poole had no report

6. Welfare Committee– Sen. Suksawang

Senator Suksawang reported,  
Currently, one of the biggest challenges with the committee is figuring out the dataset. If we can get support from the university to see if they can collect other data from other universities. It's discipline-based, and there's a big gap between male and female pay scales, for example.

As Sen. Pre. Brown remarks on the FLMA resolution, Sen. Suksawang says, the intended purpose doesn't mean the universe had to adopt minimum. Now the question becomes, why shouldn't the minimum be 14 weeks, which is the nation's standard for private institutions? One thing we have to remember is that this resolution focuses on Family Pay only. It does not address a bigger umbrella, which is the FMLA, the current FMLA here, which is a twelve-week leave at our institution.

So, the maximum you can take off part of the FMLA is 12 weeks.

Should we address that now? We certainly could. And that's a separate resolution altogether. This resolution asks if you need to have a leave for childbirth or to spend some time with your children for the birth of a child, you get paid a minimum of eight weeks. Where the eight-week pay comes from, that's the one that is used by all the others for the institution. So it could be better, but that's where eight weeks come from.

Do you want to amend that? We could certainly welcome changes, but the wording, at least for me, was talking of the minimum of eight weeks, which meant that we would like more, but eight is the minimum because that, at least comparatively in recruitment, would be the same as others. We want you to be compensated for eight weeks at least. That's what this resolution is about.

Sen. Pres. Brown asks if there is a motion to move to Family Leave next on the agenda since it is out of the agenda order.

Do we have a do we have a motion to consider the resolution on Faculty Leave next?

So moved [ Motion by Senator Bowman] Is there a second? [Seconded by Senator Turgut] **All in favor.**

Sen. Suksawang says that the resolution has already passed but asks if there is any discussion.

Sen. Palotai comments,

We would like to have the original text referring not only to faculty but to faculty and staff. This would not change any of the benefits except that this would also apply to the staff.

Sen. Pres. Brown asked if there was a motion to amend them.

[Sen. Palotai motioned]



Sen. Pres. Brown asked if there was a Second for discussion of the amendment,

Sen. Turgut comments,

During the last meeting, I suggested taking out the staff because the staff has their own representation problem.

Sen. Palotai says,

If you go in with a resolution supported by the entire body of faculty and staff, then we have a stronger case to allow us to make a resolution.

Sen. Turgut says, we try to represent other stakeholders. We have to stay true to our Senate mission, which clearly says the faculty's interest in businesses and not in the staff's interests. Yes, we are staff at the same time. But the faculty Senate staff has their own way and understands that.

Sen. Palotai comments on Sen. Turgut's why it weakens the resolution if we include staff and saying, I understand what you're saying, and I'm not arguing that. If you put back staff, it does not weaken the resolution at all.

Sen. Pre. Brown says, Is there further discussion of the amendment?

Sen. Kachouie asks, I have a quick question. You said that the four different entities are working on similar things, it should be some agreement or consistency?

Sen. Pre. Brown says that would be nice, but HR says we have the power; it's done.

Sen. Turgut says we passed the resolution; it was brought to them before the discussion. So now that was passed. If it needs to be amended, it can be amended.

I also suggest joining the staff council because we represent the faculty here. We have to stay true to our mission. Our mission is to represent faculty concerns and interests in the administration and institutional agencies to participate in our institutional governance and advocate for faculty rights and well-being. I am sure they have a mission within themselves as well. You can join forces and sit down with HR Later.

Sen. Bowman says, I recall from a couple of months back when we discussed this before that something was mentioned about HR not being able to differentiate between faculty and staff when making policies like this, which is why I think that if we were to pass a resolution like this, ultimately, it probably doesn't change much either way, whether or not we see faculty and staff or just faculty because whatever policy was made in the long run would essentially be for employees. That is my understanding of the way it works.

Sen. Suksawang says the point is that this resolution has nothing to do with whether or not the policy has already been set, which is four weeks. This shows that there is strong

support from the faculty and staff that they should think about the four weeks and change it to eight weeks to be more competitive. When the institution recruits, the faculty will check about childcare and medical rights.

Sen. Pres. Brown asks If the welfare committee minds taking the resolution back and revising it.

Sen. Suksawang agreed to do so.

Sen. Pre. Brown asked if there was a motion to table the whole issue.

[motion to table it by Sen. Scott and seconded by Sen. Jones]

Sen. Pre. Brown moved on to the next agenda about the resolution about the Ombudsman committee.

The resolution says,

*Dissolve the functions of the former Ombudsman committee, now performed by the Ombudsman Office. Therefore, there is no need for a separate ombudsman committee. The faculty handbook should be revised as follows. The Faculty Grievance Resolution procedure should refer to the Ombudsman Office instead of the Ombudsman Committee, and FH 157, which defines the Ombudsman Committee, should be blank.*

Sen. Pres. Brown says, If there is some time urgency on this one, Mark Archambault is trying to bring the practice and faculty handbook into concordance for SACS purposes.

Sen. Turgut says,

When we had the executive committee meeting back on September 26, there were two resolutions. And then there's only one resolution.

Sen. Pres. Brown says, we stand at your request to believe they wanted the second one taken out.

Sen. Turgut says, No, in fact that our constituents need to be informed about the difference in what is on. But so far as what was done by this committee and because the scopes of the Ombudsman committee and the Ombudsperson are totally different, for example, I'll take a quote from the Ombudsman Committee Charter.

It says that “ three senior faculty members are appointed by the chief operating officer to serve as an ombudsman committee to hear grievances that a faculty member does not feel comfortable pursuing through the usual organizational structure, i.e., Department Head dean, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Chief Operating Officer, or the President. And Ombuds person is an unofficial office and it is for the employment realm.”

That was the comments I made. This committee is for the faculty and faculty issues. There may be issues that the faculty may feel comfortable going directly to this committee for anything. I would like to see this committee be re-enacted.

Sen. Pres. Brown says, that is a statement opposing the current resolution, if I hear it correctly because the current resolution would abolish the committee.

Sen. Turgut says, the other resolution you had proposed in the executive committee was keeping the committee as it was.

Sen. Pres. Brown asks, Is there further discussion on the current resolution?

Sen. Suksawang comments, In the faculty handbook that refers to the Ombudsman committee, Whether we want to abolish it or not, we have to put something there. I've never seen a model like us: We have both the Ombudsman Committee and the Ombudsman Office. And I'm not 100% sure if the Ombudsman Committee is truly a third party with an ombudsman office because that's their primary function. We could propose to have something under the grievance committee. Let's say you either go through the chain of command or the normal chain. If that doesn't satisfy you, you can talk to one of the existing committee members. But now, because we have an ombudsman office, you can technically talk to them as well. If you want to eliminate it, which is fine.

Sen. Pres. Brown comments, the way the resolution reads the grievance procedure would refer to the Ombudsman office instead of the Ombudsman.

Sen. Pres. Brown says some time ago, when was under the old contract system, Faculty could request a Senate review of their actions taken on their contract. Anybody ever requested review of was non-renewal and what we would do was we would appoint a grievance committee. The grievance committee would consider it and recommend it to the Chief academic officer. That was removed some years ago because the former president McCay didn't like it.

Sen. Turgut added on the comment and saying, it still exists on the Faculty Senate Grievance Committee that can be set up by the faculty Senate President per page 2.9.2 by either a grievance committee. We are trying to eliminate the standing committee, which is the ombudsman committee. The Ombudsman committee, as it's written right now, It's appointed by the provost but it doesn't report anywhere. In contrast, the Ombudsman office is an independent section of the office that functions outside the existing administrative structures and reports directly to the President of Florida Tech for administrative and budgetary purposes. So that is for administrative and budgetary. Why are we trying to abolish something where we're going to have a new Provost soon? Members will think that the Ombudsman Committee should stay in place because it's already a standing committee. We should not vote on this because I didn't discuss this with my college or constituents or what would be the implications of that?

Did anybody discuss this on that committee being abolished as a standing committee and everything that it does on the paper to the member's office? We haven't.

Sen. Pres. Brown says the Senate had this resolution available for at least one month, maybe two months, and suggests the senators vote on it.

Sem Kachoue asks, Can it be postponed until we have a new provost?

Sen. Pre. Brown says, Mark Archambault needs us to move one way or another to put together is to bring the handbook into practice in concordance with SACS.

Sen. Bowman says that if our handbook says one thing and we are not doing that thing, then SACS can ding us for not following through with what we say we do.

Sen. Jones says, when we didn't have a person and we didn't have a voice and nobody knew where to go, who to talk to. And it was an unfortunate period of time. I think if we are on the side of keeping it, it's two options. based on what our old ombudsperson shared with us last time, certain things are in there, previews of certain things. And I don't see if all we're trying to do is reconcile what we say is what we do and have them both as options, that it's just additional options that a person can choose which option they may want to take advantage of.

Sen. Von Woesik says, we shouldn't be voting for this at all, and we should leave it for the next provost because we have a standing committee, an ombudsman, and there's no reason to abolish the committee when it's already standing. That's what Marshall Jones is saying. So is Tolga.

I'll take that as a motion to table it, as is their second.

**[motion to table it passed] with the intent that the ombudsman committee be repopulated.**

### **New Business:**

Sen. Pres. Brown says,

Next, Sense of the Senate on the Carnegie classifications is in the agenda on the last page. We discussed the R1/R2 classifications in September. And we've had it in discussion in departments ever since. We are a doctoral institution now. There are only two classifications for doctoral Institutions: R 1 & R2. If you fell below the qualifications for R2, you're not a doctoral institution at all. Your master's institution, whether you have little, little bitty doctoral programs or not, is well above the bottom of that. The minima are 5,000,020 doctorates.

We're now at 17,000,060 doctorates. Where we get 60 doctorates from is the side program. But they count on we are below the median of the R2. We're going to be for the next some period of time proceeding to improve ourselves or trying to improve ourselves within the R 2 group on. I tried to call attention to some things here.

A mistake that's been made in the past was to point from above and say achieve without providing resources. So, I put in here that growth in research must be driven organically by the availability of institutional support, chiefly from an endowment. Expectations must be commensurate with the resources available. Top-down imposition of goals without adequate support is an unworkable model. By 2040, if all goes right, we may be ready to assess—specific measures needed for R1 status. The definitions are going to change in a year. Even more important, there must be no compromise in the top-quality education that is our financial lifeline, our uniqueness, and our identity. High-quality students must be recruited. Regardless of track or teaching load, all faculty hires must be effective educators. There will be a continuing need for top-quality, effective educators.

It was reported very recently last week in the Chronicle specifically that in 2025 the math behind the Carnegie classifications will be greatly simplified. This business of having ten metrics will go away. It'll be very simple: 50,000,070 doctorates for R1. That's it. Those standards. No standards on. So I don't believe those changes affect either our current standing or our course forward. We are still R2, too. We're still below the median of R2. We are not at the rock bottom of R2. We're above it. We're a long way from R1. 2040 is a little optimistic. But it's going to depend on fundraising. The old per-cap metrics are gone. The critical thing about that, why it matters is that the denominator of the old metrics was assistant and associate professors. Now, what that did was it incentivized administrators to put people out of those ranks who needed major funding. That incentive is gone. The push to do away with non-tenure tracks should decrease or disappear. I made that point to the provost yesterday and he did not disagree.

I proposed this as a sense to the Senate that had nothing to do with how authoritative it was supposed to be. We are an advisory body, so nothing we do is all that. Nothing we do is definitive. It was a call in the sense of the Senate because we could make last-minute adjustments, which we did last month. So. Is there a discussion?

Sen. Turgut says,

It feels like we are, in a way, expected and pressured to comply with having an overall objective of R1 for some reason. But I would like to remind everyone that the role of the faculty Senate in shared governance is to participate in the development of policies and decision-making that affect the institution. Sometimes, this may include not agreeing with them.

Yes, at the end of the day, we recommend we advise, but that doesn't mean we should not do something that we are not fully informed or misinformed or try to catch a goal with a lack of information because a nonbinding sense of the Senate should not handle an important matter so strategic like this, but perhaps by a task force if possible, because it requires investigation, informing and educating the faculty, not just the senators here, but everybody. In the past, we have used the science of the Senate as

an exploratory service. And handed to the top management university administration in a way that reflects the consensus of the faculty. They took that and used it right away as the formed opinion. I don't think we are ready to form an opinion about what is going to be the pros and cons of R1 versus R2 we had just the chief data officers say We dropped down from 202 to 265. The most obvious thing is, yes, everybody shuffled around. I understand, but everybody is exposed to the same changes as well. Was there any other institution that went down 65 positions? That is the key message. And we got the rankings. Without climbing the rankings, our revenue will not increase.

Our endowments will not increase.

It took the form of a sense of the Senate as well. But we always tried to make the point that let's make a reality check. Where are we? And there's always this question in the board of trustees: where do we want to be when we grow up? My worry is they will take this sense of Senate as soon as it's voted on, saying that the faculty wants to target being R1. Let's pivot all the resources, build more buildings and more dormitories, and maybe stop some of the positions. We have budget issues already. I'm sure you are aware. Now, with the online programs changing and so forth, there are many challenges ahead. So I question: is this the number one priority, and should this be done this fast?

Sen. Pre. Brown says,

One thing this does not commit us to do is go R1 right away. It says let's work on our team for 20 years and look at it.

Sen. Von Woesik says, that's a problem as well. I mean, it's 17 years away, 2040. You put a date on something. it's a problem. You know, if it sounds like we're going to build this university, we're going to grow the buildings, we're going to put all the resources that we have into the growth, the physical growth in this building. And what will happen then is that all the money that goes into research and startup will disappear. And the only way we're going to get to R1 is to have excellent faculty with start up and budget grants, and they publish. So we can shoot ourselves in the foot here if we're not careful to say, well, we want to stay R2. But if we want to quickly get to R1, that that's it's a problem. So I agree with Tolga. I think this needs a task force. This needs a lot of thought and from a lot of different perspectives because it's not that straightforward.

Sen. Pres. Brown asks to see if there is any discussion about it.

Sen. Kachouie says, So the thing is that 2040 is 17 years away. But if you put it in the hands of the task force, they may say that in 2030, ten years earlier. At least now, we have the opportunity to provide some feedback since you need to know what the task force is coming out of. And it's not the faculty senate anymore. So if they have asked us about this, it is good to provide some feedback but not put a date. If the medium endowment for R2 is this before, we at least get the median endowment. Absolutely. That is the median number of the PhDs. Then we can we can start this discussion. But if you don't have any number displayed to date, I don't know.

Sen. Turgut says, the school you discuss—Colorado School of Mines with an endowment of 300 million. The alumni base is key to being over 100 years old as a private institution, a public university, or a state university. Those are the thresholds.

Sen. Kaya says, since you're discussing setting targets for 20 years or 17 years to become, why don't they also set a target for becoming maybe top 115 in terms of the rankings? Maybe that should be our priority than becoming R1

That could be discussed when you set a target; then, everything is focused on that.

Well, I can tell you why this is becoming R1 puts us. What? How does that change our rankings? There have been a lot of efforts in the past with the promise that it will improve our rankings from merging to what you have. But its target to at least become under 200 would not be. That shouldn't be 20 years later, it should be within two or three years. Let's go down on the two hundred to keep our reputation.

Sen. Pres. Brown says,

I can tell you where the issue of R1 versus R2 came from. It came up in the presidential interviews last winter. There was somebody who asked a standard question: what about our goal? The three finalists who had not been presidents before said to stoke the research engine and do it as fast as we could. The two who had been presidents before, President Nicklow, they said. As a campus, you need to talk about R1 and R2 and determine Where you want to go. And that's what we've been trying to do this fall.

Sen. Pres. Brown asks to vote.

Sen. Turgut says, I want to put a motion to postpone it indefinitely.

Sen. Scott says I don't know about the indefinitely but postpone.

Sen. Pres. Brown asks Sen. Turgut if he could drop that word indefinitely and put a motion to table it.

[ Sen. Turgut motioned]

[Sen. Scott seconded]

Senate Pres. Brown asks for a motion to adjourn.

[Motion by Sen. Scott]

Pre. Brown responds, Is there second? [Sen. Park seconds, All in favor with No oppose]

Meeting adjourned.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:25 pm.

Respectively submitted,

Joo young Park, Faculty Senate Secretary