

Tuesday, November 5, 2019

M. Baarmand (PSS/3), M. Browning (Aero/3), K. Burke (SAC/2), P. Converse (Psych/3), H. Crawford (CS/3), I. Delgado Perez (COB/3), A. Dutta (COB/3), E. Guisbert (Bio/3), A. Huser (Lib/3), M. Kaya (BME/3), V. Kishore (CE/3), S. Kozaitis (Lib/3), B. Lail (ECE/3), D. Lelekis (SAC/3), G. Maul (OES/3), R. Mehta (Aero/3), A. Nag (PSS/2), H. Najafi (MCE/2), N. Nezamoddini-Kachouie (Math/1), J. Park (DEIS/3), B. Paulillo (Psych/2), P. Ray (OES/3), R. Reichard (OES/3), R. Rusovici (MAE/3), M. Silaghi (CS/3), E. Subasi (ES/3), N. Suksawang (MAE/3), T. Turgut (COA/3), N. Weatherly (SBA/1), D. Yuran (SAC/3)

C. Harvey (SOBA/1), M. Lavooy (Psych/1), T. Nguyen (MCE), D. Platt (ESD), D. Sandall (COB/1), A. Walton (COB), A. Welters (Math/2), K. Winkelmann (Chem/2),

D. Yuran for J. Ivey (SAC/2)

Kastro Hamed (COES), Edward Kalajian (Emeritus), Nasri Nesnas (COES), Rodd Newcombe (ASC), Lisa Perdigao (Honors College), Ken Revay (BoT), Rudi Wehmschulte (Chem)

Pres. Lail called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm. The minutes from the Oct. 1 (no. 148) meeting were approved.

Julie Shankle, Vice President for Online Learning and Off Campus Education  
Brian Ehrlich, Vice President for Enrollment Management

*Process Improvement for online degree program administration: age requirement*

When the Florida Tech Online undergraduate programs were launched in 2008, an age requirement of 21 was placed on applicants to those online programs that were also offered on campus. The policy has changed slightly over time but remains in place for applicants aged 18 or 19 applying to five of our AA degrees in business, the AA Liberal Arts, and seven BA programs in business. It offers no beneb BMM



8. Task Force for reallocating senators: Sen. Silaghi brought a summary of conclusions to distribute to senators and these will be discussed at the December Senate meeting.

*President's Report*

Pres. Lail reported on the Board of Trustees meeting from October. The number of tenured faculty approved from each college is as follows:

5 in COA

5 in COB

25 in COES

15 in CoPLA

Associate Professors are being reviewed now.

- Any member of the faculty, staff, or administration can propose a revision (addition, change, removal) to a policy in the Faculty Handbook,
- A senate committee/task force will investigate the proposal and discuss it with the provost,
- The committee/task force will bring the proposal to the Senate for discussion,
- The senate can approve the proposal by majority vote,

Pres. Lail sent an email to Senators prior to the meeting summarizing the changes made to the draft of the resolutions. He opened the floor for discussion.

Dr. Hamed asked if the university level committee will just be checking to see if the college committee followed the policies correctly since the main purpose is for procedural oversight. He confirmed that the people serving on the college level committee are the ones who should be doing the assessment heavy work.

Dr. Perdigao raised a question about what opportunity would be available for the university level committee to ask for more review if the college level committee did not approve the candidate but the university level committee thinks they should have.

Sen. Burke pointed out that the university committee has access to those same documents as the college level committee so they can see the justification of the decision made by the college level committee. They could point out that a candidate is being denied even though they did appear to meet the college's criteria. Pres. Lail said that the focus is on process and also uniformity to ensure that each candidate is being treated in the same way and being judged by the college's guidelines.

Sen. Turgut pointed out that the AFTC is the arbitrator to review cases if needed. The college level committee is focused and narrow in that it looks at the criteria for their college's tenure requirements and the university level committee is diverse (containing people from many disciplines) and they are meant to function as an oversight to catch cases of bias.

Sen. Baarmand echoed Sen. Burke's point that the university level committee will have access to all of the candidate's materials, including the Dean's letter. Dr. Nesnas asked if the university level committee votes on whether the procedure was followed or if they vote on whether the person should be getting tenure or not. Pres. Lail clarified that it is a vote on whether the process was followed or not. The university level committee serves as a check and balance.

A question was raised about the possibility of a candidate to go around the college level committee and request that their materials go to the university level committee even if they didn't get the endorsement of their college. It was pointed out that all tenure applications go through all stages starting with the college level committee, and Pres. Lail thinks that will be true of the regular promotion process too, meaning that someone can't pass by the college level committee without them seeing the materials first before going to the university level committee. You can no longer self-nominate yourself directly to the university level committee. Dr. Nesnas confirmed this statement. He also clarified that there is a distinction between people under the transition plan and newly hired tenure-track faculty. Current faculty will be advised either to go up for tenure, delay, or do the teaching track, but newly hired faculty will not have that option because they will have to go up for tenure.

Pres. Lail explained that it is important that the college level committee will be checked by the university level committee to make sure that procedure and uniformity were followed. Dr. Nesnas described the difference between the university level committee and the AFTC, which

only engages when there is an appeal. Pres. Lail emphasized that these discussions are important and he asked senators to take these issues back to their units to get faculty input so we can continue to discuss it until we are satisfied before there is a vote on the resolutions.

*Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee (AFC): Proxy vote*

Michael Gallo (COA) — withdrew from committee (A replacement for COA will be voted on separately at a later meeting)

Kunal Mitra (COES)

Jean-Paul Pinelli (COES)

Michael Slotkin (COB)

Patrick Converse (CoPLA)

A motion was made for a collective vote and seconded. A vote by show of hands was taken and all of the candidates were approved with no abstentions.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Debbie Lelekis, Faculty Í