

Faculty Council on Governance

College of Engineering

Members:

<i>Biomed:</i>	Eric Crumpler Anthony McGoron	<i>Electrical & Computer</i>	Osama Mohammed Sakhrat Khizroev
<i>Civil:</i>	Walter Tang Albert Gan	<i>Industrial & Systems:</i>	Chin-Sheng Chen Martha A. Centeno
<i>Construction</i>	Gene Farmer Syed Ahmed	<i>Mechanical & Materials</i>	Yong Tao Cesar Levy

Officers:

<i>Chair</i>	Osama Mohammed
<i>Vice Chair</i>	Gene Farmer
<i>Secretary:</i>	Martha A. Centeno

MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 19, 2004

Meeting started at: 12:21 PM
Meeting ended at: 02:06 PM

Next meeting → December 10, 2004

- **Present:** Anthony McGoron (BME); Osama Mohammed and Sakhrat Khizroev (ECE), Walter Tang (CEE); Martha A. Centeno and Chin-Sheng Chen (ISE); Cesar Levy and Yong Tao (MME).
- **Absent:** Eric Crumpler (BME); Albert Gan (CEE), Gene Farmer and Syed Ahmed (CMgmt);
- **Guests:** Jean Andrian, Bruce Hauptali, Malcolm Heimer, Norman Munroe, Nikki Pissinou

1. The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 12:21 PM.
2. Agenda for the meeting was approved.
3. Minutes from 10/29/04 were approved with two minor corrections: misspelling on Dr Tang's name and heading should read "Faculty Council on Governance"
4. In the absence of Dr. Crumpler, Dr. Cesar Levy was asked to be the acting parliamentarian for this meeting.
5. Report from the Chairs of Standing Committees.
 - a. *Curriculum* → Dr. Sabri Tosonuglu
 - Committee met on 11/18/04.
 - Dr. Alan Carsrud came to clarify some issues on entrepreneurship courses, minor, certificate, and graduate tracks. Each department will propose their own courses and then cross-list for actual offering.
 - The Combined BS/MBA program will be discussed on 11/29. Dr. David Shen will be part of that discussion.
 - A clarification was made as to how to object to courses. Dr. Bruce Hauptli clarified that courses may be objected at any point in the process before they get voted by the Faculty Senate. Faculty must be proactive and read the bulletins of the Curriculum committee that get circulated via UnivMail. If the course in debate is only awaiting the vote from the Faculty Senate, the opposing faculty may request a postponement until the next bulletin on the basis of misrepresentation by checking on the form that appropriate departments had been consulted. The person to contact for an objection is Dr. Rosalie Hallbauer.
 - b. *Library* →
 - In the absence of Dr. Crumpler, no report was given by the Library Committee.
 - Dr. Mohammed re-stated the fact that we are below standards with respect to our sister

institutions when it comes to research material holdings. Hence, the need for the Library Committee to act on Motion FCG0405_3 (Approved on 10/29/04), which reads

“The Council requests the COE Library Committee to write a proposal that analyzes current allocation of Library funds, funding history, comparison to sister institution in the State, and make recommendations for funding requirements to support the research goals of the College of Engineering. The proposal shall be presented to the Dean. The proposal shall be submitted to the Chair of the Council in 3 weeks.”

- Such report is expected for the next meeting of the Council.
 - A discussion ensued regarding the importance of member of the Council to work on action items assigned to them and on delivering reports on those action items timely.
 - c. *Promotion and Tenure*
 - There was no report from the P & T committee.
6. Report / presentation of new issues by department representatives. (new topics for inclusion)
- a. Dr. Tao from Mechanical and Materials Engineering requested that the topic of “Course Load Assignment” be included in the pool of topics to be discussed by the Council. **(Inclusion approved.)**
 - b. Dr. Levy from Mechanical and Materials Engineering requested that the topic of “Removing Candidacy Examination” be included in the pool of topics to be discussed by the Council. Immediate discussion ensued as the statement was made that the Chairpersons had already approved such change; however, Dr. Tosonuglu said that what has been transpiring is a discussion of what should be part of the candidacy examination and when students can take dissertation credits. In ISE, students do not take dissertation credits until they are admitted into candidacy. Dr. Munroe said that he would look into what is going on from the administration side. Dr. C. Chen will investigate as well an report back to the Council at the next meeting. **(Inclusion not approved.)**
7. Report from the Dean
- a. There was no report from the Dean.
8. Discussion of topics by priority (Topics are discussed, as time permits, in the order shown)
- a. Collegial governance
 - i. Computer Science move to Engineering
 - ii. Role of Faculty in the process of Departmental changes
 - iii. Right of Faculty to decide on their own future
 - b. Research facilities
 - c. Departmental academic restructuring
 - d. Joint appointments
 - e. Construction / Building expansions
 - f. Complaints against Chairs / Administrators
 - g. Nominations of Faculty for Awards
 - h. Acting Chair appointments
 - i. Associate Chair
- Of the 9 items on the agenda, only the first item was discussed: “Collegial Governance”
 - This issue was brought up by concerns from the ECE faculty in regards to the lack of faculty involvement in the decision making process to merge or bring over Computer Science. Dr. Bruce Hauptli, Chair of FIU Faculty Senate, was invited to clarify to all faculty present what are the rights and responsibilities that faculty have to secure that decision of such great importance are made only after the affected constituencies have been consulted; in other words, what the role of the faculty in these decisions.

- ECE faculty stated that they are concerned with the merge and with the widespread rumors and conflicting information that they are receiving. On one hand the Dean assures them that no official proposal exists, yet, they also have been told that a proposal has been submitted to Engineering (summer 2004).
- Dr. Bruce Hauptli explained that ever since the Provost announced the University's reorganization, some faculty all over the university became uncomfortable and worried about how the process would evolve.
 - i. He has told the Provost that the process should be such that before any decision is reached, faculty must have the opportunity to review, research, and vote on the proposals, so they can express their views and contribute to formulate a more successful reorganization proposal. A process like this conforms to the definition of minimal collegiate governance.
 - ii. Must of the reorganization plans affect more than one unit; hence, the Faculty Senate must be involved too to provide a holistic perspective.
 - iii. Following a collegial procedure will help reduce rumors, especially irrational rumors which are unhealthy and create a sense of disenfranchisement among the faculty.
 - iv. Plans should be made public with ample time for the faculty to express Pros and Cons.
 - v. In regards to the specific issue of merging/moving Computer Science, he met with Dean Prasad in the summer, and discussed with him issues of collegiality, and the importance of timing, especially since the Provost wanted everything completed by the end of December of 2004. This is now unlikely to occur unless the administration decides to totally ignore collegiality.
 - vi. He encouraged the faculty to be empowered, to stand up and be counted.
 - vii. To the questions "How do we enforced faculty resolutions / Decision? And what is the Due Process?" Dr Hauptli responded that there is no written procedure as to how to reorganize the institution. The faculty at each unit must stand up and be proactive as to how the process should be.
 - viii. In response to a comment on the fear that non-tenure faculty may have to "stand up", Dr. Hauptli said that is a reality and a risk that faculty must considered, and he added that the concerns of the ECE faculty are not unique. There is a lot of discontent by tenure and non tenure faculty across the university with the upper administration. This discontent is putting at risk the medical initiative as well as the Research I status of the university.
 - ix. He stressed the need for each department to insist on being consulted on these matters, and on asking what assurance are there that the collegial process is indeed being followed on the other side too.
- Dr. Centeno asked ECE faculty what they want to do, so that the Council can act accordingly. The proposal should be submitted to the Council for review from a holistic perspective at the College level.
- Dr. Chen further stated that the administration has to inform us as to what the goal of reorganization is, expected benefits, cost of merging, etc, so that faculty have a better view of the issues. The administration should be part of the accountability model imposed on faculty.
- ECE Faculty reported that they had given Dean Prasad a letter in which they expressed their concerns for the merger and for the perceived lack of collegiality. Dean Prasad met with some of them and assure them that nothing final has been decided. There was a proposal submitted by Computer Science, but it is no final. Dean Prasad and Dr. Yen were meeting with Computer Science at the time of the Council's meeting. Dean Prasad is expected to

have an engineering proposal the week of thanksgiving.

- Given the events of the two days prior this meeting, and the prospective of faculty involvement in the next days as part of this process, the Faculty Council will wait and see if an action on its part is needed and what kind of action would be appropriate.

9. Action Items

- a. Dr. Mohammed will email the members of the Council to address the importance of their service as Council members.
- b. Dr. C. Chen will find out what exactly is going on with the issue of the Candidacy examination and report back to the Council at the next meeting.
- c. Dr. Crumpler will prepare the report requested in Motion FCG0405_3.

10. Next meeting was set for December 10th, 2004 at 12:00 noon; EC 2300

Having no more time to conduct pending business, the Faculty Council adjourned at 2:06pm