

**College of Engineering and Computing
Faculty Council Meeting
November 6 2015**

Committee in attendance: Jessica-Ramella-Roman (BME); Armando Barreto (ECE); Yiding Cao (MME); Cheng-Xian Lin (MME); Jason Liu (SCIS); Peter Clarke (SCIS); Walter Tang (CEE); Ronald Bair (OHLSC)

Absent: Chensong Li (BME); Gang Quan (ECE); Ali Mostafavi (OHLSC); David Garber (CEE)

Guest: Dr. Ranu Jung (Interim Dean College of Engineering and Computing)

In attendance (other guests): Dr. Mark Weiss (SCIS)

- The meeting was called to order at 11:05am
- The order in the tentative agenda was changed as the Interim Dean had not arrived yet.
- The minutes from the Faculty Council meeting on 10/16/15 were approved unanimously.
- Dr. Clarke provided a report from the Chair's Meeting:
 - It is necessary for all units to develop their individual Tenure and Promotion guidelines. The differences between *policies* and *criteria* were emphasized. There was a recommendation by the Dean for the FC to create college-wide policies for Tenure and Promotion.
 - It is necessary to include faculty achievements in terms of intellectual property (IP) and patents in the Tenure and promotion guidelines.
 - In response to Dr. Clarke's question as to who has authority /responsibility for assignment of research space, it was indicated that, at the university-wide level it is ORED. However, within the CEC the authority/responsibility is entrusted to the CEC Dean, with input from the CEC Faculty Council. It was further explained that within the Office of the Dean the current individual managing space assignments is the Associate Dean of Research, Dr. Agarwal.
 - It was explained that the assignment of TA-ships is left to the discretion of each department (school) within the college, with the recommendation to maintain a fully transparent process in the assignment of TAs.
- Dr. Jung presented the following Dean's report:
 - Since her last report to the FC there have been no new meetings with the provost.
 - Grant funding in the college has gone up in the last cycle (2014-2015).
 - Student numbers have dropped. This may be in part because incoming students are now routed through the "Engineering Exploratory Major" and cannot move forward to Engineering until they pass the Mathematics requirements. A meeting

between the “Engineering Exploratory” advisors and our “Engineering” advisors is being planned to address these issues.

- The interim dean has met with student organizations and tried to make them focus on Grand Challenges proposed by the National Academy of Engineering
- The college’s career services will be enhanced and there are plans for students to create a “Resume Book”
- There will be physical reorganizations that will involve construction in the EC:
 - Advising will move into the area of the Center for Diversity in Eng.
 - There will be construction in the 1st floor to create an enhanced Reception Area.
- In response to questions from the FC members, the interim dean indicated:
 - The next “Faculty Assembly” will likely take place in early Spring 2016.
 - The digital signage efforts for the Engineering Center are being revived, as there is a strong need for better signage in the building.
 - The efforts of the External Relations Office (previously led by Dr. Susan Jay) will now be undertaken by two individuals: Linnell Bickford and Megan Meeks.
-
- Tenure and Promotion College Guidelines
 - As pointed out in a previous email from Dr. Mark Weiss, the Bylaws of the CEC Faculty Council call for the council to develop uniform, college-wide policies and procedures for the tenure and promotion processes, including, but not limited to:
 - Selection of external reviewers
 - Process of solicitation of external letter
 - It was indicated that the following issues should be defined in the college guidelines
 - Who can view the files
 - Who can attend the meetings
 - Procedure (if any) for a candidate to withdraw from the process (Dr. Clarke indicated that he had learned during a SCIS faculty meeting (08/27/4014) with Tonja Moore, Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs and Isis Carbajal De-Garcia, Senior University Counsel, that withdrawal from the T&P process is not allowed once it has started. However, it was not clear if this is just for tenure or also for promotion. Dr. Clarke said he will find out the details on the T&P process related to this issue.)
 - It was made clear that, in any case, the college guidelines will indicate policies, not criteria (thresholds).

- Based on the new information a motion was presented, seconded and voted on to “Re-consider the motion from the previous Faculty Council meeting (10/16/2015)” The motion was approved, as the vote was 7 in favor and 1 against.
- As part of the re-consideration process, Dr. Clarke will seek clarification on the validity and implications of Part B, Article IV: “Charges of the Faculty Council of Governance”, in the Faculty Council bylaws, with respect to the college’s tenure and promotion guidelines.
- Dr. Clarke will collect college-wide guidelines and college constitutions from other FIU colleges. Dr. Clarke will investigate if the FIU College of Engineering and Computing has a constitution. (The question was raised if the constitution of the faculty council is the constitution of the college).
- Faculty Salary Inversion / Faculty Salary Compression Offset
 - Dr. Clarke reported that a recent union meeting there has been a request that increases be assigned seeking to give equal amounts (not equal percentages of the base salaries) to faculty members. This may help alleviate / prevent the inversion / compression effects. See Appendix A.
 - It was clarified that the Faculty Council can only make a recommendation on how the increase funds given to the college might be allocated.
 - Dr. Clarke will investigate policies which might exist in other colleges to include consideration of the inversion / compression problem in the allocation of increase funds.
- New Business
 - It was proposed that TA allocation should respond to faculty and TA performance measures such as publications, citations, number of years in the program (student)
 - Dr. Clarke will collect data from the college to see what kind of recommendations, based on performance measures, could be generated by the council.
 - Next meeting will take place December 4 (11:00 AM), and an invitation will be extended to all the chairs of standing committees (Tenure and Promotion, Library, Curriculum) to provide a brief report to the faculty council on that date.
- Meeting ended at 12:15 pm.

Prepared by: Armando Barreto

Reviewed by: Peter Clarke and Walter Tang

Appendix A:

UFF-FIU UPDATE, email on 11/09/2015

Collective Bargaining Update

We have one more scheduled bargaining session for the year (11/23), and both teams are hoping to conclude negotiations soon. The administration is considering union proposals on, among other things, external reviewer letters for promotion and tenure, domestic partnership benefits, overload pay, and summer compensation for tuition-generating activities.

As I indicated in a previous weekly update, the union proposed a salary raise of 2% + COLA (thus, 3.3%), and the administration countered with a 1% bonus. After the unanimous support of union members at the Chapter meeting on October 30, the union countered with a lump-sum \$2,817 salary retention increase to the base (\$2,817 is a 3.3% raise to the average faculty salary of \$85,366) effective August, 2015. This proposal helps the lowest paid faculty members in particular. We also encouraged the administration to limit raises to administrators to \$2,817 also, rather than giving them a percentage raise, which would only further increase the inequality between administrators' salaries and the salaries of the rest of university employees. At the last bargaining session on November 6, the administration countered with a 1% retention raise to the base (effective January 1, 2016) and a 1% merit bonus.

While the union believes this latest proposal is an improvement on the previous one by the administration, it neither adequately reflects the fact that most of the salaries in the bargaining unit have not kept up with the cost of living in South Florida, nor does it reflect a clear priority of investing in faculty, who are crucial to any success the University achieves in performance funding or in meeting its strategic goals. Nevertheless, the union will consider the administration's newest proposal, and in this regard we strongly seek the opinion of the membership on this issue.