

APPROVED 10/7/2010

**ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
ACADEMIC SENATE
SEPTEMBER 23, 2010: 12:05 P.M. - 1:50 P.M
CIMS/2230/2240**

Absent: S. Bellinger, M-B. Cooper, M. Laver, K. Mook, Zoran Ninkov, C. Schreck, Paul Tymann, J. Voelkl, L. Wild

CALL TO ORDER: 12:07 P.M.

COMMUNICATION OFFICER'S REPORT: Minutes of 9/9/2010 were approved with two abstentions.

CHAIR'S REPORT

P. Rosenberg reported that the EDF process is moving forward with some re-classification taking place. After discussion with the Provost, the executive committee felt it would be appropriate for past EDF to continue in their elected positions within Senate for this year as they so choose.

ACADEMIC SUPPORT COMMITTEE REPORT AY2009 UPDATE:

Rhonda Laskoski, AY2009 ASC chair gave a Power Point presentation (posted on the Academic Senate DML site under Academic Support Committee) reviewing charges 1, 3 and 2 in this order.

Charge 1: Review the transition and restructuring occurring in the library, in consultation with Chandra McKenzie and Lynn Wild. Report on the financial, resource and space implications of this change, with an eye towards becoming a good research library.

For Charge 1 the action taken was a thorough report by Chandra McKenzie (ASC committee member and former director of Wallace Library) on The Wallace Center transition and restructuring. These reports were a great vehicle for informal discussion of what the different resources faculty desire . Some samples that came up were: When we get a thesis from another college can we archive it to be used later? Can we create a comprehensive website?

The committee recommends that The Wallace Center use the Academic Support Committee as a focus group to gather feedback throughout the year and provide a more intimate, informal venue for exchange. The Wallace Center did report directly to the Senate in AY2009. The committee could provide the center with valuable recommendations and feedback.

Charge 3: Review the work of and consult with the Institute Technology Committee to insure that the technology concerns of the faculty are being addressed as prioritized issues. Issues include faculty email and those technological impediments to delivering instruction including those involving the Registrar's Office. Joeann Humbert and Chris Lerch presented this committee with an overview of their Committee's progress to date.

Feedback was provided by the committee on the technology concerns of their colleagues. Some concerns were: Was there enough faculty representation on their task force? Technology in the classrooms is inconsistent. A recommendation was made by the committee to have the Technology Committee and any other technology committees on campus use the ASC as a focus group to gather feedback throughout the year.

Charge 2 (received most attention): Develop ethical guidelines for the use of all self-published materials as required student purchases. A) Determine by whom and how often these materials

should be evaluated and the appropriate costs including royalties. B) Develop ethical guidelines for the use of faculty publications as required student purchases in their own classes.

RIT needs to be assured students are using the most appropriate materials for their classes. The committee struggled with this charge and a recommendation was given by the committee (not a motion) to gain feedback from the Senate to help guide the work around this charge.

Recommendation:

Faculty who wish to require that digital and/or print self-published materials, from which they directly derive royalties, be purchased for their courses must obtain initial approval from their academic unit's lowest level curriculum committee. After initial approval, faculty are required to submit annual disclosures of approved self-published materials and cost to students. The initial approval will be based on fair pricing, to be determined by two criteria. 1) Is the material priced comparably to currently available published materials that are suitable for the course? 2) If there are no comparable materials, does the price represent a reasonable royalty? Any materials developed by a faculty member as part of his or her normal responsibilities for course preparation and development cannot be submitted for approval or sold to students beyond the cost of actual printing.

Discussion and Q&A:

- ❖ New Jersey allows faculty no profit. Texas is 6%. Where does one draw the line?
A: R. Laskoski said we don't want to discourage faculty from developing materials.
- ❖ T. Policano asked why the committee limited this to royalties. Anything above and beyond the cost of reproduction of course materials is profit.
A: R. Laskoski agreed to change the word "royalties" to "profit."
- ❖ E. Saber suggested that the wording could read "reasonable royalty."
- ❖ T. Engstrom said there is a contradiction between royalty and self-publishing. We should not be making anything from our students unless it is reviewed by publishers and considered scholarship. Profit gained from self publishing is unsavory. Engstrom also noted that Charge #3 (technology) requires the Institute to set budget priorities and clear proposals about budgetary remedies need to be brought to Senate. This process should be linked with the Resource & Budget Standing Committee.
- ❖ L. Lawley indicated that some self-publication can be considered scholarship but any financial gain does tread on shaky ethical ground. A good policy should require that no profit is gained from students. This recommendation also puts an unreasonable burden on the curriculum committees.
- ❖ M. Ruhling suggested that self-publication might be an issue for tenure and promotion regarding scholarly work.
- ❖ L. Twyman questioned whether this had been vetted by the conflict of interest group. This is a slippery slope. Issues arise every year from students who are required to purchase self-published materials. Who makes the decision about what is reasonable?
A: R. Laskoski replied that it had been vetted and there were no concerns voiced.
- ❖ A. Phelps commented on the current wording that is unclear about to whom the faculty discloses. If it is the curriculum committee, this is outside their purview.
- ❖ T. Cornell said the heart of the policy should be the approval process and a mechanism for review and approval needs to be provided.
- ❖ E. Saber noted that this recommendation would mean that self-published books sold at RIT may have to be free very inexpensive, but they could be sold at market price at other universities which could be problematic.
- ❖ S. Manian Ramkumar asked if we could separate this for "use within RIT" and "use outside of RIT?"
- ❖ T. Engstrom stated that if you don't allow faculty to profit from students then there is no need for a process. Academic freedom covers the creation of course materials.

- ❖ T. Cornell said we need a policy in place. There must be an ongoing group to review these issues.
- ❖ W. Koontz asked if this is restricted to self-publication? There are still ethical issues around published materials with royalties. Is there a policy pertaining to this?
- ❖ D. Tower DuBois, a committee member, said they spent a lot of time on this issue. She felt that this was not a fair academic charge and that it should go to the legal office as procedural policy for faculty.

This charge will be brought back to the Senate at a later date this year.

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE: Revisions to E2.0 and E3.0 [Discussion and Action]

K. Waterstram-Rich, chair of FAC was unable to be in attendance today so Tom Policano, FAC member, presented. He reported that Policy E3.0, Oath of Allegiance, was approved in 1958. The proposed change to this document is that it will now read in the very first sentence, “**RIT shall comply with...**”. This document is an agreement to comply with New York law. When asked, no one in the meeting room remembered taking the oath.

Discussion ensued.

Comments:

- ❖ L. Lawley commented that current practice is saying you “sign the Oath of Allegiance.” It is not the same thing as signing the oath directly. She feels this is an issue for Bobbie Colon and their office to deal with.
- ❖ T. Cornell said Bobbie Colon assured them that this is still NY State law.
- ❖ T. Engstrom wondered if NY State can demand this oath of private institutions. He thought that Senate should encourage getting rid of the oath.
- ❖ S. Boedo stated that he had checked New York State law and found that only U.S. citizens have to swear to this. No resident of the Indian nations or naturalized citizens have this requirement.
- ❖ A. Phelps observed that there are RIT campuses in four other countries. This oath could be problematic in many ways. He also encouraged legal advice around this issue.

Motion to table the proposed revisions to E3.0 (Oath of Allegiance) passed unanimously.

Revisions to E2.0 (Principles of Academic Freedom) had the following changes and additions:

- Added this paragraph: RIT adheres to the principles of academic freedom as articulated in the American Association of University Professor’s “1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure with 1970 Interpretive Comments.”
- Second paragraph, first sentence, added **their**: ..in **their** studies and research, ...
- Second paragraph, second sentence, added words in red: However, they shall not **persistently** introduce into their teaching controversial **material** which has no relation to their subjects.

Discussion ensued with suggestions to these revisions.

- ❖ T. Engstrom said the word “persistently” is a much more evaluative word and suggested the word to be used could be “regularly” which is much more quantitative.
- ❖ Others agreed that the word persistently can open the door to other things.
- ❖ T. Policano said he liked the suggested change of using the word “regularly.” He noted that Academic Freedom does not limit the subject matter that can be covered or prevent faculty from instigating a dialog. When 9/11 occurred, there was not a classroom that did not stop to talk about it.
- ❖ M. Ruhling said there may be exceptions to “All faculty...” (paragraph 2). Proprietary agreements do not allow faculty freedom to disseminate information about that research.

- T. Policano said faculty are not forced to go public on anything they do.
- ❖ T. Engstrom asked that in the 3rd paragraph, 4th line, delete the word “accurate and” in the sentence that reads, “They should, therefore, at all times be ~~accurate and~~ exercise appropriate restraint.” Opinions that are voiced may not be accurate. He also noted that the next sentence that required respect for the view of others should be removed. Some views do not deserve respect. His recommendation was to delete, in the 3rd paragraph, the third sentence through “constituency, and” .
- ❖ M. Ruhling said that striking “respect” could have larger ramifications in other policies.
- ❖ L. Lawley recommended this go back to the Faculty Affairs Committee and a final version be brought to Senate for a vote.

Motion to table the revisions to E2.0 was passed unanimously.

INCLUSION EXCELLENCE FRAMEWORK [Posted on the Senate’s DML Working Papers site.]

Dr. Kevin McDonald, Chief Diversity Officer said a charge had been given to create a better connection between inclusion and the Institution. They started a vetting process in April and a document was crafted called “Inclusive Excellence at RIT 2010-2015 Framework” which is being circulated among the governance groups, to be endorsed prior to the Board of Trustees meetings in November. This framework reaffirms RIT’s commitment to growing and sustaining a diverse and inclusive learning, living, and working environment. The plan is shaped by RIT’s core values and the framework is aligned with the university’s goals articulated in the 2005-2015 University Strategic Plan in which RIT vows *[to] engage all members of the campus community in the shared responsibility for an enriching and inclusive experience for all...; [to] have an enriched academic curriculum with courses and programs addressing a broad understanding of global issues and featuring enhanced opportunities for acquiring language skills...; [and to fostering] a learning, living and working campus community environment that supports and encourages cross-cultural understanding and global awareness.*

K. McDonald said they are attempting to connect this into four areas: Access and Success for faculty, staff, and students; Campus Climate and Intergroup Relations; Education and Scholarship; and Institutional Infrastructure. He stated that he is open to changing the content and titles per suggestions made as the governance groups review the framework.

Q&A and discussion ensued.

- ❖ T. Engstrom said this is the most impressive, scholarly document he has ever received, and it connects the administrative culture with the academic culture. It must be read carefully.
- ❖ S. Yang asked if some things have changed per ALANA and asked how K. McDonald’s defines diversity.
 - A: K. McDonald said he has a broad view that incorporates human differences. The history at RIT is based on improving the ALANA experience. Even the term ALANA has changed in the Strategic Plan, and he recognizes he has to take a broader view. For example, it was suggested to that Asians not be considered part of ALANA. Improvements have been made, and ALANA may need to be expanded again.
- ❖ J. Yang observed that “inclusive” needs to be more global, including even European faculty and students who do not really feel at home here at RIT.
 - A: K. McDonald asked the Senate to let his office know of additional issues like this, so they can take them into consideration.
- ❖ S. Boedo said in engineering they are trying to hire diverse faculty members and have attracted excellent candidates, yet these faculty accept other offers for various reasons. Have exit interviews been considered for faculty?
 - A: The framework does not have “exit interviews” in the document. He said he would like to look at this more collaboratively for faculty and staff and make this a priority.

- ❖ S. Yang suggested that statistics from each college that identify numbers of diverse faculty and students in each discipline would help us understand diversity at RIT.
K. McDonald said these could be used as an assessment tool for each college to use to assess needs and where they stand in terms of RIT mandates.
- ❖ O. Palacio asked if the desired process was for this framework to become policy.
A: It has been shared with the Board of Trustees, with the Institutional leadership, executive committees of each governance group, and the governance groups. Once the governance groups endorse the final draft of the framework, it will be brought back to the Board of Trustees.
- ❖ T. Policano asked if this will become a goal in the institutional Strategic Plan?
A: We are looking at it not as a separate Strategic Plan but as an overarching framework. It would be housed at a high level with the President and Board of Trustees signing off on this, not incorporated as a whole in the Strategic Plan but expanding it. This is more a diversity strategic plan.
- ❖ F. Walker, Dean of CAST, said this is a framework for general implementation for the colleges to follow and will need endorsement not approval.
- ❖ E. Saber asked how K. McDonald would know the goal had been achieved.
A: By established institutional goals that have already been set by the President.
- ❖ A. Phelps said a lot is in the framework and the metrics and measures should be done each year.

K. McDonald asked if he could return next month with changes made to the framework per the suggestions that come forth and then get an endorsement on this final document. The interim report will be presented at the November Board of Trustees meeting. L. Lawley suggested the executive committee work together with Kevin on this framework prior to the time it returns to Senate for endorsement.

CALENDAR CONVERSION: STATUS REPORT [Ppt is posted on the Senate's DML site under Semester Conversion Reports]

Dr. J. Fernando Naveda, Academic Calendar Conversion Director gave a progress report stating that there are many open issues with requests coming to the office, and things are moving along.

- The Program Framework has been re-worked and the semester load will be 15-16 credit hours while recognizing that some semesters may 17 credit hours.
- The checklists have been delivered and are an integral part of this conversion process. The process is more complex than anyone envisioned and the checklists help ensure that nothing is left out or missing.
- After talking with the registrar he said they would like to have a database of course outline forms that can be easily accessed by all of RIT. The primary point of contact for this project is Joe Loffredo, the registrar, and will be completed by spring quarter.
- The Calendar Conversion Office has begun meeting with the College Curriculum Committees.
- There are two groups of students to be concerned about and that is the present first-year students, who need to know what will be happening per the conversion, and returning students. A video was created for first-year students so that they know what is happening through FYE.

- ICC and Graduate Council have issued program review schedules and keeping track of the programs going through the approval process for the conversion. Colleges decide when specific programs will go through the review process.
- The Provost sponsored a chairs and directors retreat and the Dean of Grad students had a graduate coordinators retreat. The Calendar Conversion Office participated in both. As a result of the Chairs/Directors retreat we implemented weekly updates are coming forth; every Friday we send out a communiqué that describes what happened in the previous week.
- BS/MS (minimum and maximum double-counted credit hours) has been worked on. Above 150 credit hours can be double counted. There has been some discussion about this issue and C. Licata's office will get clarification from NYSED.
- The Co-Op/Internship committee, chaired by Hank Etlinger, has met a few times in the summer, and their first draft has been submitted to the Calendar Conversion Steering Committee.
- The Calendar Conversion Process Committee, chaired by Chandra McKenzie, has addressed all their charges.
- The Cross-Disciplinary Committee, chaired by George Zion, has crafted the non 3-credit hour course protocol. The Provost has approved some of the requests submitted so far.

Q: Does this handle courses for less than 3 credits as well?

A: The committee is will be discussing these courses as well but F. Naveda will be discussing this specific matter with the Provost on Monday. He stated that we must keep in mind that proliferation of 1 and 2 semester credit hours may seriously impact the 5 x 3 semester model. It may be a good idea to first stabilize the chosen semester model and then implement modifications to it.

- T. Policano felt it is a very bad decision to wait until the conversion process occurs regarding less than 3 credits.
- There is still work pending on the first-year seminar, and some of the freshman year's one credit courses in some majors may not be needed.
- The Intersession committee, chaired by Kit Mayberry and includes individuals from all colleges, met early fall quarter and are exploring ways to leverage the January intersession. The charge to this committee is to produce recommendations by the end of fall quarter describing how colleges can optimize the use of the intersession.
- The following are the open issues reported by F. Naveda:
 - To remain full-time, undergrad minimum semester credit hours will be 12. There is a proposal to set no tuition charge for undergraduate overload but with some process in place that would require undergraduates to obtain authorization to register for more than 22 semester credits. Implementation of this recommendation may have financial implications and the Conversion Steering Committee has yet to discuss this matter. There is a recommendation to set the minimum graduate

credits to 9, which has been approved. The Provost will inform of the maximum semester load for graduate students. The Provost has met with Jim Watters and will have a recommendation soon.

- E. Saber said this could allow a student to register for 23 credits, drop some of the classes, and result in taking a seat away from another student.
- F. Naveda noted that departments may have to approve taking more than 22 credits.
- Graduate minimum credit hours would be 9 to remain FT and maximum credit hours are still open for discussion.
- A. Phelps asked about the combination BS/MS degrees and if the required credits were 150.

Response: C. Licata responded that New York State clarified the need to have the degrees completed within five to six years.

- A. Phelps noted that the SUNY schools require only 132 -138 credit hours. So what would be the incentive for doing a BS/MS with no reduction of credits?

Response: C. Licata said they will go back to the committees with this information and asked A. Phelps to send her this information.

- G. Zion suggested a policy that would award the BS degree first while students complete the MS.
- Master's programs that require more than the recommended number 36 semester credit hours are not encouraged.
- Course formats outside of the 5 by 3 model as described in the program framework. Provost stated we need to stabilize the semester model first.
- Space: Impact of the new calendar on classrooms and labs? After programs are converted, we need to start working on scheduling and space issues.
- Language related to tuition increase as a result of the conversion: “[And] that no student will see any increase in tuition as a result of the conversion.”

F. Naveda reported that the Conversion and RIT groups have been terrific and extremely supportive of the conversion effort. The Provost as well has been proactive, supportive and responsive. Everyone's hard work is appreciated and encouraged people to contact the Conversion Office with any questions or suggestions people have including financial questions such as “How will we compensate faculty in the summer?” “How will this affect my retirement?” Everyone's input matters. He noted that this is a complex undertaking from which we are learning a lot about RIT, its programs, its organization, its processes and its aspirations. Many issues related to the conversion are surfacing, some of which we can handle and other issues are sent to the right individuals.

ADJOURNMENT: 1:55 p.m.

Latty Goodwin
Communications Officer
9/28/2010

