

**ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
ACADEMIC SENATE
OCTOBER 7, 2010: 12:05 P.M.- 1:50 P.M
CIMS/2230/2240**

Absent: D. Tower DuBois, B. Kiely, Z. Ninkov, C. Schreck, F. Walker, G. Zion

CALL TO ORDER: 12:07 P.M.

COMMUNICATION OFFICER'S REPORT: Minutes of 9/23/2010 were approved with three abstentions.

CHAIR'S REPORT

P. Rosenberg announced an all day event on October 21, 2010 (National Conflict Resolution Day) and the topic will be "Civility." All faculty are encouraged to attend events that day to show strong faculty support.

The chair made an appeal to senators for committees which still needed faculty representation, which include:

- ICIC (Institute Conflict of Interest Committee) – need two tenured faculty members
- Institute Appeals Board (IAB) – need 4 faculty
- Eisenhart Nominations Committee – one at-large member needed (past Eisenhart recipient)

Carl Lundgren reported on the "2010 Undergraduate Research and Innovation Symposium" which took place this past summer. It was very successful with all of the RIT Colleges represented, 165 students participating and 100+ presentations given (15 minutes for each). There were 50+ posters. All abstract submissions were refereed and the presentations were judged. Five parallel sessions were run. The external judges were very impressed with RIT.

Jennifer Indovina, CEO of Tenrehte Technologies which has the best green product of the year, was the keynote speaker and was very dynamic and well received. Kudos went to the 100+ faculty who had mentored the undergraduate scholars who did a great job at the symposium! There were 20+ judges including alumni, friends of RIT and a few RIT faculty and staff. The staff was from the Center for Student Innovation (CSI) with John Schull, Director of CSI working tirelessly during this event.

Thanks went to the College of Science for initiating this event almost 30 years ago and expanding it to include all of RIT. This event is growing and the lunch session was filled to capacity at CIMS in the conference room areas (combined on the 2nd floor). CSI will run an end of Fall/end of Winter symposium. November 12th will be the first quarterly undergraduate and graduate student symposium (4:00-7:00 p.m.), with a reception for students and faculty mentors included. C. Lundgren said they are anticipating three parallel sessions. There will be an emphasis on the "work in progress" presentations to allow future journal or major conference presentations. He urged faculty to consider using this as a natural conclusion to the research or innovation projects with students. An announcement will come out soon, soliciting abstracts. M. Kotlarchyk commented that the timing of the symposium conflicts with many senior students in COS who are simultaneously under pressures to put their end-of-quarter capstone talks and papers together. As a result, the event will lose many worthwhile undergraduate projects. C. Lundgren indicated that they are providing a venue for students with projects in progress, who can participate in this, if possible. P. Rosenberg said he is happy to see this taken over at an institute level and thanked Carl Lundgren for this report.

RESOURCE ALLOCATION AND BUDGET COMMITTEE AY2009 REPORT [Posted on the Senate's DML site under Resource Allocation and Budget Committee]

Paul Tymann, Chair of the RABC for AY2009 and AY2010 reported on the committee's work of AY2009. In the report there was nothing to vote on, only recommendations from the committee per the charges that they worked on. P. Tymann said he had the pleasure of chairing this committee last year and intended to report to senate last spring but due to the heavy senate schedule was unable to. The committee was thanked for the tremendous amount of work that was accomplished last year and Dr. Jim Watters, VP of Finance and Administration was credited for the great support he provided to the RABC.

Charges 1-9 were reviewed.

Charge 1: Review across-the-board Tier 2 spending suspensions to see whether there are priorities in place that affect later budget allocations in ways that not transparent to faculty. Make recommendations where appropriate.

P. Tymann explained that Tier 1 items are ones that get funded based on the financial model and financial prioritization after the budget hearings. Tier 2 items are ones that get funded if actual income exceeds the projections. He reported that all Tier 2 items in AY2009 were funded. Presently there are no Tier 2 items in AY2010. If funding is such that all Tier 2 item requests cannot be funded, then the VP for Finance & Administration, the Provost and the President decide what gets funded. This is done only after the 21-day report.

Recommendations:

- After Tier 2 decisions have been made, the rationale for these decisions should be discussed with the Chairs of the Senate, Staff Council and the RABC.
- A transition meeting should be established that takes place shortly after the 21-day report is issued and after Tier 2 decisions have been made. Attendees of this meeting would be current participants and those from last year who participated in the budget process to discuss the process and Tier 2 decisions that were made.
- Tier 2 decisions should be discussed

Charge 2: Review the impact of computer security standards on institutional resources and make recommendations where appropriate.

Security policies are established by the RIT Information Security Office (part of F&A). Decisions have been made that had an adverse impact on resources (Example: laptop encryption- laptops in P. Tymann's department became unusable and they had to be replaced with desktops). Decisions have been made that had an adverse impact on instruction (Example: auto logout after 10 minutes of idle time- this upsets the flow of the class). When a need for a security standard arises the technical people in the areas immediately affected are consulted. VP for F&A has indicated that he will change the process to include a review by the Executive IT advisory group which includes the Provost and some Deans and serves as an advisory group to the CTO. Per the RIT Information Security Office standards process there was no operation/budget review; no faculty review; and no assessment. The committee spoke with J. Watters and he was going to change the policy.

Recommendations:

- RABC should review the Information Security Office Standards Process and explore the possibility of including Academic Senate input on the adoption of new security policies.
- The committee was not clear who should do this given instructional and resource impact – RABC, ASC, or another group.

Charge 3: Review the overall benefits in relationship to resource allocation and make recommendations where appropriate.

P. Tymann reported that RIT has moved to self-funded insurance and pays expenses plus a 6% administrative fee. Coverage is based on the plan RIT selects, currently using BCBS and changes to coverage are determined by the plan. Legally RIT could become the insurance company but this is not really practical. The Benefits Advisory Group holds meetings to discuss issues, questions, concerns. It is not clear if proposed changes to the benefits package are a part of the formal governance process. Many changes have occurred, now that we have a health care bill and there are many unknowns and many variables. He stated that it is important for all employees to know what is happening with benefits, long-term, and the effect of self-insurance. A chart was shown reflecting from 2004 to 2009 ratios that indicate that benefits are not putting a greater burden on RIT.

Recommendations:

- This is an important issue that needs to be looked at and the effect of RIT's move to self-funded insurance needs to be reviewed.
- The senate could hire someone to help study and analyze this so there is an independent and expert voice. Dr. Watters indicated that this would not add value to RIT, as the person investigating this would again state the obvious (RIT's Findings).

Charge 4: Describe the budget building process and faculty's role in that process and make recommendations where appropriate.

P. Tymann reviewed the RIT Budget Process which starts with a planning meeting that starts in January. Governance group's chairs, Budget Office Staff, the Provost, VP of Enrollment Management Services, and the VP of F&A are all part of the Budget Planning Committee. (see PPT on the DML site for more detailed information). The committee works with a financial model, fixed costs, utility costs, etc. and then reviews what the projected amount of income and expenses is. For this year tuition increase was approved, although this was a reluctant decision among the board. There were 19 hearings and then a summary was made of all the requests given by colleges and departments. This information is used within the spreadsheet model by the Provost and Dr. Jim Watters. The President then makes the final decision and this approved list is discussed by the Senate, Staff Council and RABC. This process is fairly transparent and faculty and staff are represented at each step of the budget process. The entire process is a steep learning curve for participants. P. Tymann also indicated that currently there is no transition between the past chair of RABC and the new chair, which puts a burden on the continuity within the committee and requires additional time to come up to speed Tier 2 decisions are also not being discussed with the participants.

Recommendations:

- Extend the length of the term for the RABC chair to at least 2 years
- Establish a transition meeting that takes place shortly after the 21-day report is issued and Tier 2 decisions are made. Same recommendations give in Charge 1.

Charge 5: Monitor RIT's commitment to implementation of benchmarking rules.

The Provost has indicated a commitment to benchmarking. Originally this was done using data from the Compensation Advisory Committee (CAC) list which consisted of 21 schools. The Institute wide benchmark started to migrate towards a college based benchmark. When this happened it appears that the progress achieved doing benchmarking stopped. P. Tymann said all dollars in the salary pool count equally in the determination of RIT's progress toward its benchmarking goal.

Recommendations:

- Re-commit to the goal of achieving within the next 5 years, at each rank, a campus-wide average compensation for tenured and tenure track RIT faculty equal to the 50th percentile of the average salaries for each rank for schools on the RIT Compensation Advisory Committee (CAC) list
- Make benchmarking a high-priority budget item by moving the funding for market-based increments of faculty salaries to the base budget of the Institute
- If the salary pool is small (less than 2%) distribute across-the-board raises tied to annual evaluation
- We would encourage the formation of a joint committee, consisting of faculty and administration, to review the RIT CAC list of benchmark schools and to consider any revisions to the current list

Q: What does the wording “across the board raises tied to annual evaluation” mean?

A: Everyone is given a 2% raise across the board, since the merit pool is small, as long as they receive a satisfactory or above in their evaluation.

Charge 6: Review budgetary commitment to library support in light of our new strategic priorities and make recommendations where appropriate.

Due to time constraints the committee did not complete this charge, even though they met in the library in the spring.

Recommendation:

- Make this is a charge for this year’s committee.

Charge 7: Conduct a study of the size of RIT’s administration compared to institutions of similar size and mission. Make recommendations where appropriate.

The committee found this difficult to do as they did not have a good definition for an “administrator”? The committee tried to obtain a “count” from web sites and found this difficult to do. P. Tymann said the Charity navigator website was used by the committee for research: <http://www.charitynavigator.org> which was founded in 2001 and has become the nation’s largest and most utilized evaluator of charities. Tens of thousands of non-profit financial documents can be found. A chart of peer institutions including RIT was shown revealing that RIT has 91% program expenses, 7.8% administrative expenses, \$0.04 fundraising efficiency, total revenue \$ 538,669,629 and total expenses \$ 485,093,180. RIT is better than many of the schools in the CAC list.

Recommendations: None

Charge 8: Review the following two reports from the Senior VP for Finance and incorporate any responses into the year-end report:

- A budget review after the Institute’s 21-day report is released that includes Tier 1 and Tier 2 expenditures and the status of contingencies,
- A budget review for the subsequent fiscal year following the budget hearings process.

The committee came to the conclusion that if Tier 2 decisions are discussed/explained at the transition meeting, this issue will be addressed.

Charge 9: Survey the salary distribution for RIT lecturers and include range by college as part of the annual tenure track merit salary distribution report. Make recommendations where appropriate.

A chart was shown and is on the PPT posted on the senate's DML site (RABC reports).

Recommendation:

- Benchmarking lecturer salaries-it is not clear if the data exists to make this possible

Discussion and Q&A ensued.

- ❖ J. Voelkl (previous chair of RABC years ago) suggested to have the chair's term be one year but have a chair in-elect during that year.
- ❖ A suggestion was made for a complete review of the computer security policies, as many have been affected.
- ❖ J. Voelkel suggested to get someone from the outside to review the medical insurance related decisions and asked if it would be useful or of any value.
Response: J. Watters said it seems to be getting overcomplicated as RIT pays the bills and self-assurance is a funding mechanism and RIT is extremely transparent. External review will not add value.
- ❖ Q: B. Barbato asked how far along is RIT in achieving a 50th percentile of the salary benchmark, within 5 years?
A: The Provost indicated the following about RIT, compared to its peers:
 - Full Professor – 23%
 - Associate Professor – 27%
 - Assistant Professor – 23%
- ❖ T. Policano suggested (and a motion if possible) to change the term of the RABC to two years and stagger the membership for ½ the committee, so as to have experienced faculty on board and can move the Vice Chair into the Chair's position to give the committee continuity.
Additionally he applauded the committee on its research and depth of work last year.
Response: C. Lundgren said the committee already has two year terms. P. Rosenberg said this |was something that the executive committee and senate should look at.
- ❖ T. Engstrom questioned the rationale for retaining the previous administrations model to wait 21 days before making decisions on salary increments, spending etc. in spite of the fact that financial RIT is well managed.
Response: President Destler responded that RIT is in good shape and he did consider moving it back to July instead of October, but when Wall Street collapsed the current administration decided to retain the decision making based upon the 21-day report. He indicated that he will give due consideration to issue once the economic recovery is certain.
- ❖ T. Engstrom wanted to understand if the Tier 2 item prioritization was done only by the Provost and VP of Finance and Administration.
Response: RABC was involved.
- ❖ T. Engstrom wondered whether consideration had been given to building a broader and larger collaboration or coalition between RIT and other potential partners within Rochester, and whether such an initiative might help lower health care costs and also provide better services.
Response: J. Watters indicated that RIT is involved with the Rochester Business Alliance and Network (creation of medical records, pulled out pharmacy program – real economy scales), Rochester Health Network and RIT RGHS Alliance are constantly being evaluated to bring value to RIT employees and to lower costs of health care.
- ❖ Suggestion: Could the recommendations of the RABC return to senate as motions so that the senate can deliberate and vote on these?
- ❖ J. Watters commended P. Tymann and the committee for all their hard work and in three weeks this process will begin again. Governance groups are brought in early and this forms the drivers to model everything.

A. Phelps responded to the discussion on the subject of computer security and said this does not go far enough if the decision making does not look at risk vs. cost vs. use. In academic departments there are no incremental staff positions, no incremental time, no resources and there needs to be involvement in

the entire process. There is something broken in the process and for example the laptop encryption can affect accelerated graphics and this could affect the functioning of entire programs.

INSTITUTE OF HEALTH SCIENCES AND TECHNOLOGY PRESENTATION

Provost Haefner presented a power point (posted on the Senate's DML site) for the proposed Institute of Health Sciences and Technology (IHST). He said the timing is good and has been visiting many colleges to get feedback. The alliance between RGH and RIT has been going on for 18 months and a lot of work has gone into fostering this relationship.

The case was given for why to have an Institute for Health Sciences & Technology. RIT is well known for research and academics and both RIT and RGH have academic and clinical strengths. RGH is looking at how technology can deliver healthcare. There are a shortage of health-care professionals, particularly those in the allied areas. The IHST would have a transformational impact and RGH has asked RIT to play a role in this. This is an opportunity for RIT in regards to translational research and innovation work to develop new solutions in the healthcare industry (e.g., developing and deploying new technologies in support of the 'smart hospital'. During this forward translational research and innovation work, RIT could extend their tentacles.

The mission was given that the Institute of Health Sciences and Technology will prepare the next generation of healthcare professionals by providing innovative educational and clinical learning experiences, with a strong background in translational research and discovery and the application of evidence-based practices in community health.

- Conduct breakthrough translational healthcare research consistent with RIT's long history of productivity in and dedication to applied research
- Invent unique healthcare technology
- Deliver world-class healthcare education
- Redefine healthcare quality processes

The proposed IHST organization chart was reviewed (see Ppt on the senate's DML site). The heart of the Institute would be: (1) School of Health Science and Technology (2) Health Science Research Center (3) Health Science Outreach Center – an alliance that will bring material value back to the community. Under RIT and reporting to the Provost will be the VP for the Institute and head of the school. President Destler and Mark Clement will oversee the IHST Advisory Board. Initial staffing of the Institute was discussed and this institute will be housed inside Academic Affairs and report to the Provost.

Existing programs, proposed collaborative programs and future possible programs were discussed (see Ppt on the senate's DML site). A review will be made to see what programs are a good fit for the Institute. Policies E20 and E21 will be guiding these decisions and programs drafted will have to be reviewed and approved by ICC and none of the new or possible programs would have to go through ICC or senate.

Some focus areas of research was discussed (see PPT). Michael Pickero has a \$1 million dollar grant to study infectious diseases around the ear and some RIT faculty have been involved in this as well.

The regional workforce development programs to build capacity for the healthcare sector was discussed. There would be re-training for displaced workers in lean six-sigma for healthcare, partner programs with regional workforce development agencies, K-12 programs, annual conference on re-engineering clinical practice, and develop and support community health initiatives.

Policy details were reviewed and the tenure and tenure-track lines will be housed in IHST. There will be joint appointments between colleges and the Institute and between RIT and RGHS. The Intellectual Property and F&A distribution will follow RIT policy and RIT-RGHS agreements. Academic policies, such as tenure criteria, will be developed by the founding faculty.

The Business Model was reviewed (see Ppt). There will be 10-12 faculty/staff positions. The revenue streams will be tuition, grants, and gifts. The standard RIT academic cost model will be used and expenses will be for faculty/staff line, administration, equipment and space. The IHST could leverage with COS and KGCOE per faculty.

The proposed IHST has a five-year development plan (see PPT). The Provost said there is a great deal of enthusiasm that this is the right thing to do and will be a tremendous benefit to our students and to faculty.

Discussion and Q&A ensued.

- ❖ Q: The VP of the IHST will report to the Provost and B. Barbato asked if the Dean of COS would be in a dotted line relationship to the VP and the VP to the dean.
A: The Provost said no, this will be a stand-alone Institute and will have a different sphere than COS, yet will have a close relationship with COS.
- ❖ L. Lawley was concerned that this was already being presented as a done deal. She said the faculty already have an enormous amount of work per the conversion process and additionally we would have to review and edit the entire Academic Charter. She asked why this is was happening so quickly and moving so fast and faculty have to be engaged in this. Is there some external pressures with seeing this timeline?
Response: The Provost said this is a very good point. He pointed out that there are two existing institutes –NTID and GIS, so this is not a completely alienable idea. Policies should not prevent us from moving forward. Additionally the Strategic Plan is moving us forward per the partnership.
- ❖ T. Cornell said that there is a proliferation of institutes. We are RIT (singular) but heading toward being plural (Rochester Institutes of Technology) and isn't this establishing a college of health sciences? He said the terminology is problematic and wouldn't it be best to call it a college. The ambiguity is confusing and not having any guidelines for this. He said he was not happy with the dual language.
- ❖ E. Saber said on the slide pertaining to new programs, will the selection of these programs put us in a competitive role with the University of Rochester. Yet I think this is a great idea!
Response: The Provost said the institute would be complimentary and not competitive with the U of R. RIT will play a different role.
- ❖ T. Policano said this is very exciting yet per T. Cornell's comments, NTID was founded as a college of RIT with its own resources. What could make NTID an institute is that it offered only Associate degrees on campus. There is a dean who is the VP and it is called a college, so why can't we call the IHST a college?

Response: The President said all the points made today are extremely well taken. RIT had to come up with a plan that has both entities involved (RIT and RGHS) yet RIT has control of the proposed institute which is very significant. Calling this an institute does make RGHS more comfortable, as this is a joint planning activity. Per the suggestion of being a college, the School of Health Sciences could be a college in the IHST. Per L. Lawley's comments, it is true that RIT is moving very fast but President Destler indicated that we better move fast as we don't want to lose this opportunity. He encouraged all to support this initiative.

- ❖ The entire presentation is on the Provost's website: http://www.rit.edu/provost/priorities_keyfocus.php
- ❖ RIT is not always good at collaborating across colleges but that should not be a reason why a totally new entity is being created said J. Pelz.
- ❖ The Provost said the reason for having it be a college or institute is all about tenure.
- ❖ There will be an open Forum from 1:30-2:30 p.m. on Friday, October 8 for more open discussion and Q&A to ensue.

ADJOURNMENT: 1:55 p.m.

S. Manian Ramkumar, Operations Officer
9/28/2010