

**Faculty Senate Meeting**  
Tuesday, September 18, 2018

**Minutes**

**Senators Present:** M. Baarmand (PSS/2), K. Burke (SAC/2), I. Delgado Perez (COB/2), A. Dutta (COB/2), S. Earles (COES/1), E. Guisbert (Bio/2), M. Jensen (MAE/2), M. Kaya (BME/1), V. Kishore (CE/2), S. Kozaitis (Lib/2), D. Lelekis (SAC/2), J. Park (DEIS/1), B. Paulillo (Psych/2), L. Perdigao (SAC/2), D. Platt (ESD/2), P. Ray (OES/2), D. Sandall (COB/1), M. Silaghi (CS/2), E. Subasi (ES/2), N. Suksawang (MAE/1), G. Tenali (Math/2), R. van Woelik (Bio/2), N. Weatherly (SBA/2), R. Wehmschulte (Chem/2), A. Welters (Math/2), B. Wheeler (Aero/2), K. Winkelmann (Chem/2), D. Yuran (SAC/2),

**Senators Absent:** O. Doule (HCDIA/1), C. Harvey (SBA/0), A. Huser (Lib/1), U. Jones (Aero/1), B. Lail (ECE/1), D. LeVan (CS/0), B. Morkos (MAE/0), S. Murshid (ECE/1), A. Nag (PSS/1), A. Walton (COB/0)

**Proxies:** T. Eskridge (COES) for H. Crawford (CS/2), G. Maul (OES) for P. Sahoo (OES/2), K. Nicholson (Psych) for P. Converse (Psych/2) and M. Lavooy (Psych/2), F. Yumiceva (APSS) for R. Rusovici (MAE/2)

**Other Attendees:** Ugur Abdulla (MTH), Georgios Anagnostopoulos (COES), Monica Baloga (Provost), Gary Burns (CoPLA), Marco Carvalho (COES), Christopher Chouinard (BCES), Ted Conway (BCES), Kimberly Demoret (APSS), Vanessa Edkins (Psych), Tristan Fiedler (BCES), Michael Gallo (COA), Kastro Hamed (DEIS), Jacob Ivey (SAC), Dan Kirk (COES), Chul-Ho Lee (CES), Ken Lindeman (OEMS), Nasri Nesnas (Chem), Korhan Oyman (COA), Gordon Patterson (SAC), Joy Patterson (SAC), Eric Perlman (APSS), Ted Petersen (SAV), Jean-Paul Pinelli (MCE), Ken Revay (BOT), Kim Sloman (Scott Center), Michael Slotkin (COB), Lisa Steelman (CoPLA), Robert Taylor (SAC),

[NOTE: The attendance report above will be included in the minutes for each meeting to include the numbers present during the 2018-2019 academic year.]

**Call to Order**

President Winkelmann called the meeting to order at 3:30. The minutes from the September 4 (no. 138) meeting were approved.

**New Business**

*Nominations for Committee Chairs (Welfare, Scholarship, and TRI)*

Pres. Winkelmann reminded senators to submit names for nominations for the open chair positions to be voted on at the October meeting.





feedback and input on the final document is not completed yet. It is expected to be finalized soon.

Dr. Slotkin, a Professor in the College of Business, was given the task last spring to revise the standards for promotion in anticipation of this process of tenure. The old guidelines needed to be tightened up and made more concrete. All of the Full and most of the Associate Professors met bi-weekly during the summer and looked at three benchmarks schools aligned with their disciplines standards. Under the new guidelines, there will be a better build up from the annual faculty evaluations and better clarity on the minimum standards and faculty responsibilities to achieve tenure. Faculty received the draft of the new criteria in early August and there was no negative feedback. The new criteria is posted on Faculty Senate website.

Dr. Carvalho, Dean of the College of Engineering & Science, explained that the motivation to look into their criteria was to improve the ranking of the university, to create consistency between science and engineering, and to find way to make progress that could be sustained over the long term. The process started with the Associate Deans and department heads. The dean presented to each department individually. For metrics, seven benchmarks schools were selected as reasonable targets. The criteria for the tenure track was based on the typical faculty member with 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service as their load. Next, two parallel tracks were established for teaching and research. For the teaching track the expectations are based on 80% teaching and 20% service; scholarship is optional. For the research track the expectations are based on 80% research and 20% teaching. Research has the expectation of funding.

Dr. Nesnas argued that it was important to gauge how many faculty will want to go on each of these tracks and asked Dr. Carvalho if he had tried to get an estimate. Dr. Carvalho responded that it was difficult because the only way to gauge is by what people are doing now; from this perspective, in most departments, 60% of faculty on average could achieve tenure under the criteria. He expects that percentage could increase because there are current faculty who would be able to meet the new criteria once they have more resources under the new system. Dr. Carvalho asserted that the new criteria will enable COES faculty to focus on certain areas and free up other areas; those focusing on teaching can take on a higher load and enable others to pursue more research. He emphasized that it was the job of the promotion committee to ensure that the faculty member has the best possible chance to be promoted/tenured and discuss every possible opportunity to help them meet the requirements.

Dr. Gallo, a Professor in the College of Aeronautics explained that the criteria for his college was developed by a four-member committee at the request of the dean. All committee members are Full Professors. The promotion-tenure guidelines for the traditional track are still in draft form, but the promotion guidelines for the non-tenure teaching track have been reviewed and approved

by college faculty. The criteria were grounded in the model of academic professionalism for their field -- Kern's Domains of Professionalism.

Sen. Baarmand brought up the concern that many faculty members have about titles and asked how this will be addressed with teaching-focused faculty versus tenure-track faculty. Dr. Carvalho responded that the words "Teaching" and "Research" would be in the titles for Assistant, Associate, and Full professors in those tracks. Dr. Oyman did not know if that had been finalized yet, and Dr. Gallo said it was his understanding that it was going to be consistent across all colleges for these other tracks and that it would be voted on by the Senate and put in the faculty handbook. Pres. Winkelmann explained that this topic came up over the summer and until the criteria is in from all of the colleges, it is difficult to know what the roles will be for teaching, research, and tenure-track faculty, so titles will still need to be addressed. Dr. Baarmand clarified that the new titles would be for new faculty only.

Sen. Guisbert asked if teaching loads will go up substantially for faculty who do not qualify for tenure. He also asked if there are any estimates by the administration about the effects of what the implementation could be. Dr. Carvalho said he does not think that the faculty who do not qualify will leave the university and he has heard from faculty who welcome the opportunity for other options besides research.

Sen. Jensen asked Dr. Slotkin how CoB chose the schools for comparison when developing their criteria. The CoB examined AACSB-accredited schools similar in size (both students & faculty), resource constraints, and academic reputation.

Dr. Nesnas asked if the Provost and/or Deans could ask faculty for a non-binding answer about which option they plan to pick (teaching, research, or tenure track). Dr. Nesnas suggested that this would provide the colleges with crucial data for planning purposes.

Sen. Earles asked if each of the colleges did a survey of the faculty for their opinions and whether or not they would go up for tenure or leave. Dr. Steelman responded that CoPLA did not do a formal survey, and she did not expect there to be a large amount of people leaving. Dr. Slotkin said there were just informal conversations with people in CoB, and he did express concern that there would not be enough funds to hire a lot of people if faculty chose to leave. Dr. Oyman urged everyone to wait and see the final version and communicate feedback during Senate meetings.

Sen. Jensen asked Dr. Carvalho what resources will be available to current faculty given that some of the schools listed as competitors are significantly higher in ranking than Florida Tech. Sen. Guisbert expressed concern about the teaching track because the details are still unknown.

Dr. Carvalho reiterated that there was no intention to limit research for teaching faculty who wanted to continue to pursue that. Sen. Guisbert asked if teaching faculty could expect to maintain their lab space with just a slightly higher teaching load. Dr. Carvalho responded that no one will tell teaching faculty not to pursue that type of research.

Dr. Hamed asked if teaching faculty would have their salaries adjusted and Dr. Carvalho said he has not heard anything about modifications to salary or contracts if faculty choose the teaching track; Dr. Oyman also said he has not heard anything about that being determined yet. Pres. Winkelmann explained that in the framework for the tenure model which was presented to the Board of Trustees in the spring, it was stated that current faculty would retain their titles and contracts.

Dr. Nicholson asked why anyone would want to choose the teaching track if they will have to teach more for the same salary and have less recognition and resources. Dr. Carvalho responded that the expectations are higher for the tenure track and faculty will be evaluated on those requirements; if a faculty member thinks they can make the best contribution to teaching, then they should choose that option instead. If a faculty member chooses the tenure track and doesn't meet those expectations, then they are underperforming.

go up for tenure or not. Pres. Winkelmann explained that since the criteria isn't finalized for all colleges and the information about the teaching track isn't out, some people might not be able to make that decision yet. Dr. Nesnas asked if the deans could just ask their faculty to answer and