President's Report

Pres. Baarmand reported on the topic of Senate membership following the merger of the College of Engineering and College of Science. Provost Baloga had called a meeting for the chairs of university committees with representative memberships (e.g. Graduate Council, UGCC) as well as the Senate President back in January 2018. Following that meeting the senate membership was discussed in the February Senate meeting and was decided to table the issue until the fall semester 2018, so the merger will then be complete and all the details finalized.

Sen. Brenner, chair of the **Scholarship Committee**, reported that the recipients of the faculty senate scholarships were notified; one confirmed attendance at the honors convocation and one is yet to respond. Sen. Brenner also announced that Dr. Vipuil Kishore would be succeeding him as senator following the meeting.

Pres. Baarmand, chair of the **Faculty Excellence** Committee, confirmed that the recipients of faculty excellence awards have been notified of the honors convocation on April 12.

There was no **Wellfare Committee** report.

Sen. Arrasmith, chair of the **Technology, Resources, and Infrastructure Committee**, reported that the faculty senate website has been moved to terminal 4 and that training would be available for him and the incoming secretary. The committee plans to have a meeting in the early fall to discuss topics it will tackle in the upcoming academic year.

There was no **Faculty Handbook Committee** report.

There was no **Tenure Exploration Committee** report, other than the forthcoming item

and Whereas the faculty and senior leadership of Florida Institute of Technology desire to develop and implement a tenure system,

Therefore, be it Resolved by the Faculty Senate of Florida Institute of Technology that the university senior leadership, in collaboration with faculty, shall devise a te

Sen. Nesnas, however, was concerned that faculty participation was broadly put, as there are administrators who carry faculty titles and lines. What happens when the

Pres. Baarmand continued with the topic of post-tenure review, a mechanism to ensure faculty remain productive. This process will occur only in response to poor annual

Pres. McCay continued by expressing the need for a strong system if tenure were to be introduced, which he believed was crucial in today's world where many experts, in response to a series of assessments done across the country, do not believe private, non-elite institutions will survive. If FIT can reach the top 100, it will be among the top 30 private institutions. Tenure is the major occurrence needed to propel FIT forward. Peer rating, a poll of administrators at other institutions, is a telling piece of the US News rankings. A '5' net rating is the best, '4' is good, '3' is mediocre, '2' is troubling, and '1' is an indication to close. Currently, FIT nets 2.3 from peer institutions, which isn't even mediocre in their eyes. FIT produces graduates who are just as good, but the peer institutions do not believe that, and it hurts our institution. Many foreign governments will not sponsor international students unless the institution is ranked in the top 100. There must be a major, impactf

FROM THE FLOOR

Sen. Jones wondered if it would be helpful to have another poll of the faculty to see if the support for tenure has changed following all the discussions, plans, and motion for a resolution.

Pres. Baarmand indicated that the 3-year plan proposed by the administration will be revised in accordance with the outcome of the conference. Some provisions, like the 50% cap, will be removed. Of course, it needs to go back the administration for their review, but it can be sent to all faculty as well, so they can see how the skeleton of a plan is shaping up. The tenure committee should be able to distribute these revised documents soon, so they can be part of the discussions surrounding the resolution.

Sen. Arrasmith added that the intent is to make the plans consistent with the resolution, which encompasses items in the faculty's favor. The resolution is needed for the BOT, but the plans must reflect the resolution and will have a longer timeline before returning to the senate. We have to have faith that the

Sen.

Sen. Winkelmann returned to the timeline; there is no mention in the resolution of when tenure will be implemented and if we are bringing a second endorsement to the BOT in October, obviously the tenure system cannot be implemented for the fall 2018 semester. Some details may not be realized until the following spring. With the 3-year implementation plan proposed by the administration, with the first year involving full professors, the second associate professors, etc., there will likely be further developments throughout the 3-year process. Pres. Baarmand indicated that that had been his point exactly in the system being dynamic with faculty participation to the extent that this senate body can push for it.

Sen. Delgado Perez referenced a comment Provost Baloga had made at the last meeting about faculty with an administrative function. The resolution and plans describe 9-month faculty, but what is intended for 12-month faculty with administrative roles who also teach and have other faculty roles? Pres. Baarmand replied that the administration's plan has administrative faculty going up for tenure first, but only for their faculty role, not for their administrative role.

Sen. Rusovici asked if there was any chance the BOT might delay the process, to which Mr. Ken Revay, chair of the BOT's Academic Affairs Committee, replied that there was no reason to delay with the plan to receive the endorsement and general plan on April 18 and then vote on April 20. The timetable, he said, allows for everyone to proceed before a full vote in October.

Sen. Lail highlighted that the resolution had a different purpose. The faculty have seen the plans from the senate committee and from the administration and have questions about them. The resolution states that the faculty have enough interest to move forward in continuing to develop the plans. The bulleted items consolidate points in the plans to guide the process of development. We are simply endorsing to proceed or not to proceed, not voting on the plans.

Sen. Nesnas returned to the suggestion made -2 (s) 2TcJ ET Q 0.24 0 0 0.24 18 583.92 (io) -6 (n)"-6

other institutions center on the language "with cause," not low publications, and Dr. Vipuil Kilshore added that the post-tenure review brought risks, but not benefits.

Sen. Winkelmann reminded everyone that from discussion with Pres. McCay, and tenure system the administration would support would have to have a post-tenure review system to address chronically low performance.

Sen. Matt Jensen asked if the resolution was for Pres. McCay or for the senate, to which Sen. Winkelmann responded that the resolution was put forward by the senate as support for a tenure system. If the resolution is not strongly supported, according to Sen. Winkelmann, it will demonstrate to the BOT that the faculty are unsure. There is hope that if Pres. McCay is passionate about tenure and if the resolution passes, that the BOT will be convinced it is what the university needs.

Sen. Matt Jensen then asked if there could be a vote to incorporate some of the changes that were suggested, rather than default to leaving them in. He wanted a formal process for making the changes to the resolution. Sen. Kozaitis wondered if poor could be substituted for "low," and Sen. Morkos asked if a separate vote could be made for that one word. Pres. Baarmand, however, thought that any word used would need to be defined.

Dr. Eric Guisbert noted that the post-tenure review would be a two-step process and asked if the decision would be granted by a committee of administrators or a faculty committee, to which Pres. Baarmand emphasized faculty representation in the committee was critical. These matters should be handled by faculty, he continued, the way they are considered best practices at other institutions. But the administration wants to have some oversight of this, so we have to allow for committees that include representatives from both parties. He did not see it as a two-stage process. Dr. Guisbert, however, cited that administrators would be handling the annual reviews that would trigger the post-tenure review. He asked if the language could be changed to specify that the post-tenure review

more subjective, and with that Dr. Dan Batcheldor pointed out that the Teaching Council was reviewing metrics.

Mr. Ken Revay drew a comparison. If he had a chronically low performer, as a manager, he would have to put a performance plan in place. While the employee could be up for

Sen. Arrasmith also reassured that there had been a lot of back and forth with the administration. The representatives for the senate advocated to get things in the resolution and the administration did compromise on some points. It would be foolish to believe faculty can name all the terms at this point. The administration needs to know they can still manage just as much as we need to know we have a say in these matters and are active participants. The plans will come back to the faculty.

Dr. Vipuil Kilshore asked about the October vote among the BOT. Will the criteria come back to the senate before then? Will anything be implemented in fall 2018?

Pres. Baarmand confirmed that, if approved, the core skeleton of the plan would be put into place, but many details regarding the criteria will develop in tandem with the 3-year implementation process. Whenever the system is put together and everyone feels it is complete, it should come back to the senate. We will not have a summer meeting, unless a special one is called.

Sen. Matt Jensen asked if the senate endorses the resolution, but does not like the resulting details, can the tenure system be voted down. Pres. Baarmand recalled that Pres. McCay had suggested that a tenure system could be created just for new hires, or, perhaps, the whole idea will be dropped. And with that response, 5.u 16 ( ) (j) 2 ( ) -2 18 (h)(e) -4 (