

Approved September 22, 2011

**ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
ACADEMIC SENATE
SEPTEMBER 8, 2011: 12:05-1:50 p.m.
Campus Center/Bamboo Room 2610**

Members Present: P. Amsler, B. Barbato, J. Beck, S. Boedo, S. Bower, L. Bryant, C. Calvelli, M-B. Cooper, D. Defibaugh, W. Destler, D. Tower DuBois, T. Engstrom, R. Hira, C. Hull, M. Johnson, M. Kotlarchyk, P. Lachance, M. Laver, L. Lawley, C. Lundgren, S. Maggelakis, H. Miller, O. Palacio, A. Phelps, T. Policano, S. Radziszowski, S.M. Ramkumar, M. Richmond, M. Ruhling, E. Saber, R. Sanchez, M. Savka, H. Shahmohamad, P. Tymann, J. Voelkl, F. Walker, L. Wild, G. Zion

Members Absent: D. Tower DuBois; C. Thoms

Members Excused: J. Haefner

Guests: R. Raffaele

CALL TO ORDER: 12:07 p.m.

COMMUNICATION OFFICER'S REPORT

Minutes of May 19, 2011 were approved with 6 abstentions and Minutes of July 11, 2011 were approved with three abstentions.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

The first motion given by the AS Executive Committee reads as follows:

The Academic Senate supports the creation of a faculty commons at RIT. The faculty commons will be a meeting place for intellectual and social activities, and it will be open to all members of the RIT Community. The commons will be housed and centrally located.

Discussion ensued.

T. Engstrom commented that this has been a longstanding lament and should be a priority. Some senators asked if this would only be for faculty use. T. Engstrom said just as Clark Dining Room which was once at RIT was used as a commons inclusively, so would the faculty commons area be used in the same way. B. Barbato said RIT has changed so much and when visitors come to RIT it would be nice to show them something that reflects this atmosphere. One senator commented that given the lack of space for labs and classrooms, this struck him as a big waste. The question arose if anyone has looked at available space. T. Engstrom said this is the starting point.

Motion was seconded and carried with 25 in favor, 3 opposed and 5 abstentions.

The second motion given by the AS Executive Committee reads as follows:

MOTION: All approved motions and documents of the Academic Senate regarding Institute Policy shall be forwarded to the Senate's Communications Officer for final review before being officially posted by Academic Affairs on the Institute's website.

P. Tymann said this year many policies will be reviewed and voted on, and this motion if approved helps with having a procedure to follow to make sure all is accurate and then ultimately put in the proper

places. The chair of each committee would bring the motion and policy that has been revised by their committee and approved by the senate to Andy Phelps, AS Communications Officer for him to review for accuracy.

The motion was seconded and carried with one abstention.

REPORTS AND PROPOSALS

ACADEMIC SENATE TREASURER'S REPORT [Posted on the AS DML site under Treasurer's Report: <https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/14127>]

Bob Barbato, AS Treasurer, reported that the Academic Senate has approximately \$7600 in their discretionary budget. He thanked Vivian Gifford for her use of senate funds and her frugality. There was a surplus from the operations fund and this was used to offset unexpected student help during the summer for the New Faculty Resource booklet and other senate website work which caused a deficit of \$524.89. The Provost Office has agreed to cover this deficit. Additionally, there was a 24 cents surplus this year in the RIT funded lines for benefits and ITS computer usage.

SPONSORED RESEARCH UPDATE [Posted on the AS DML site – <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14134>]

Dr. Ryne Raffaele, VP for Research and Associate Provost presented an update on Sponsored Research.

The OVPR mission reads as follows:

The mission of the Office of the Vice President for Research should be to support a rigorous program of research and creative accomplishment by enhancing the environment for scholarly and artistic endeavors, encouraging the highest standards of quality, supporting innovation and entrepreneurship, and fostering ethical conduct in research.

Growth in sponsored research has grown over the past 10 years, and awards given in a fiscal year have gone from 5M to 50M. The sponsored research is promoting the concept of “teacher-scholar” and has moved from being single PI’s to groups in labs to centers (65% of our total in FY11).

R. Raffaele reported on the RIT expenditures and said that RIT now ranks in the top 200 Universities (top 50 privates) in terms of research expenditures. If we exclude those privates that have medical centers, we obviously rank even higher than 50, probably in the top 25.

Recent notable awards which came in August were shared and the single largest NSF grant was for \$4.45 M (National Center of Excellence – Technological Education Center for Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Students (DeaffEC). The recent notable awards for August exceeds all awards for a single year. Dr. Raffaele said they are looking at shrinking federal funds towards RIT. The federal focus is on more applied research. Already FY12 will be a record year in terms of NSF awards.

OVPR initiatives were presented. The VPR felt that we are still placing too much of a burden of proposal preparation on the individual PIs and the Sponsored Research Office is looking at ways to help improve pre- and post-award support. Other initiatives included painless compliance training, improved mentoring for research, re-tooling of corporate R&D and celebrating and leveraging success. The VPR thinks we should do a better job of communicating RIT’s research success and is committed to doing so.

The VPR also reviewed how the university had been making its strategic re-investment into its research enterprise. Charts were reviewed and please refer to the ppt online for more details (<http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14134>).

Discussion and Q&A ensued.

- Q: What are the numbers on the Corporate R&D program?
A: They are growing, but currently only account for approximately a quarter of our corporate research funding. I realize that we have just finished revising the program, but the feedback I have received indicates that some more tweaking is advisable.
- Suggestion: Do a survey of PI's. R. Raffaele thought this was a great idea.
- E. Saber asked about our institutional overhead rate and distributions and commented that 4% of the monies returning to the department is really not enough to support students in the department (TA's or RA's) to provide a pool of graduate students for future grants. We need to see what the Institute does support and break it down and get this accountability per the re-distribution of monies.
Response: 44.5% F&A is a federally negotiated rate and we are in low comparison to most of our peer institutions. R. Raffaele said there is not a lot that we can do to change our rate quickly. However, what we can do is to make sure the overhead monies we are re-investing are done so wisely. The VPR intends to make sure that those who control those resources will be held accountable. The VPR stated that it is a fact that the return to areas that are not currently doing much in the sponsored research will be quite small. He is worried that splitting small amounts up into even smaller pieces doesn't leave enough to make any impactful investments. This is in contrast to areas such as the Center for Imaging Science.
- Imaging Science has a large research portfolio and therefore sufficient ROH funds to support a pool of graduate students. In many of our research centers and emerging research areas, ROH monies are low and most directors are struggling just to keep things afloat. I don't want to make any changes to the current policy precipitously as the ROH distributions were just established, but this is something I am concerned with and will be monitoring.
- S.M. Ramkumar said the mission statement is missing "to encourage faculty to transfer their research development into the pedagogical instruction."
Response: A very good suggestion. In discussion of our research enterprise with the Board of Trustees, I suggested that a metric we can use to evaluate the various types of research we pursue could be student impact. This was favorably received and therefore I think it would be appropriate to include your suggestion in the OVPR mission statement.
- Q: Who are our peer institutions?
A: We belong to the Association of Independent Technical Universities (AITU), which is a consortium of 20-30 universities that we share data privately with each other. This includes Stevens, NJIT, Case, Clarkson, RPI, Carnegie Melon, etc.
- E. Saber had a second suggestion regarding the RIT Corporate R&D Program and said they started the program dirt cheap and went to cheap and now are operating competitive.
Response: In regards to revising Corporate R&D, it's all on the table and he said he wants this program to work for a wider fraction of faculties' interactions with industry.

COMMITTEE CHARGES [Posted on the AS DML site: <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14142>]

P. Tymann said these charges were sent to RITSTAFF and the executive committee met several times this summer to craft this document. He noted that the document is extremely fluid. One executive committee member will be in attendance, only for each of the committee's first meeting. Additionally this year the

executive committee will try to prioritize dates to bring action items to the senate and Tim Engstrom, AS Vice Chair will be organizing this, instead of waiting until the end of the year for these to be presented to Academic Senate.

Discussion and Q&A.

- Q: T. Policano raised the question per a motion regarding tenure faculty and re-allocation of tenure faculty for the best interest of faculty regarding tenure positions and will this under the LRPC charges? He noted that in his college there are a lot of tenure track faculty near retirement and saturation and this is very important for faculty to be involved or at least to be informed. Additionally he said Adjunct Faculty at RIT have the ability to have rank but there are no procedures for these ranks and no promotion, but they should have criteria for them. He requested either FAC or the LRPC address this.

Response: T. Engstrom said if any of these charges need to be refined, we can review that later.

- Q: It was noted that Ag Crassidis is on sabbatical this year and will he be the chair of Graduate Council?

A: This is unknown, yet one of his constituents say though Ag is on sabbatical he will return for work on Graduate Council.

- Q: Regarding RABC and doing benchmarking, what will be done on the data and what is the outcome?

A: P. Tyman said this depends on the committees. T. Engstrom said this is a pre-cursor to all recommendations.

- Suggestion: Consider the feasibility of benchmarking lecturers.
- For RABC make sure the committee annually does a benchmark report and reports this to senate.
- Dr. Mary-Beth Cooper, Senior VP for Student Affairs said she had concerns for all three SAC charges and was more than happy to meet with the Executive Committee to identify items for the Student Life Committee.

1. Review policies regarding management of student behavior issues.

Comment: Dr. Cooper said a task force is already in the works for this topic.

2. Consider the adequacy of special accommodations and costs associated with student populations needing such accommodations.

Comment: Dr. Cooper was not sure if this was appropriate or needed.

3. Determine whether or not a deadline and statute of limitations should be established for grade disputes. Recommend policy changes where appropriate.

Note: This charge was moved to the AAC charges.

- Ram noted that how quickly we accommodate students has to be reviewed.
- For the Eisenhart Nomination Committee charges it was noted that this charge should possibly be four charges instead of one, as it presently reads as one charge.

Recorded votes for each committee's proposed charges are as follows:

Academic Affairs Committee	31 in favor, 0 opposed, 3 abstentions
Academic Support Committee	31 in favor, 0 opposed, 3 abstentions

Campus Environment Faculty Affairs Committee	32 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions Bullet two was edited to read as follows: <i>Review proposed motion regarding participation and representation of lecturers in the governance system.</i>
General Education	29 in favor, 0 opposed, 5 abstentions
Graduate Council	32 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions
ICC	32 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions
IETC (Institute Effective Teaching Comm.)	33 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention
IWC (Institute Writing Committee)	32 in favor, 0 opposed 2 abstentions
LRPC (Long Range Planning)	31 in favor, 1 opposed, 2 abstentions
Multidisciplinary Curriculum (MCC)	31 in favor, 0 opposed, 3 abstentions
Nominations Committee	32 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions
 RABC	 31 in favor, 1 opposed, 2 abstentions Prior to the vote edited bullet 5, to read: <i>Review Institute implementation of salary benchmarking goals, and review the feasibility of benchmarking lecturer and adjunct compensation.</i>
 Student Affairs Committee	 Tabled: 32 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions Prior to being tabled Bullet 3 was moved to the Academic Affairs Committee: <i>Determine whether or not a deadline and statute of limitations should be established for grade disputes. Recommend policy changes where appropriate.</i>
 Eisenhart Committee:	 31 in favor, 0 opposed, 3 abstentions

RESOURCE ALLOCATION AND BUDGET COMMITTEE – [Posted under RABC on the AS DML site: <https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/14128>]

The RABC report was on the agenda in May but due to time constraints is being presented at today's senate meeting by Paul Tymann, last year's RABC chair. P. Tymann commented that the committee was a great group of people to work with and gave them thanks. The Ppt presented at today's meeting is in the order of the charges given last year to the committee.

Charge 0.1: *Re-visit the process of deferring salary increases for three months into the fiscal year.*

A motion passed in senate on 12/16/2010: "On the recommendation of the RABC, the AS recommends to President Destler that RIT return to the practice of making salary increments effective at the beginning of each fiscal year on July 1st." On May 5, 2011 President Destler reported that the BOT will consider making salary increments effective July 1 starting in AY2012-13.

P. Tymann at today's meeting thanked President Destler publicly for being such a great support.

Charge 0.2: *The Provost requested that the RABC review the memo on faculty compensation.*

Final memo (subject "Faculty Compensation") was distributed by the Provost on March 10, 2011. Much of what RABC requested was in the memo (Commitment to benchmarking, 50th percentile; Salary increments set aside prior to the budget cycle).

Charge 1: Report on and make recommendations to the Senate based on the results of last year's work as recorded in the Budget Report for AY2009 and a report was presented to Senate on October 7, 2010.

Charge 2: *In consultation with Ross Koenig in Budget and Financial Services, study the financial model of RIT in the coming years, especially noting the impact of enrollment increases on an enrollment-driven institution.*

RABC met with Jim Watters, Ross Koenig and Jim Miller. The committee struggled with what this meant of studying the financial model and it was discussed where RIT is today.

What was discussed was a commercial product that was used to model the financial performance of RIT based on financial statement, five years past data (predicts 10 years out) and supports “what if” analysis. An extremely sophisticated spreadsheet based model was looked at based on many parameters and complex relationships. It would take more than a year to go through all of this so the committee picked areas of interest to discuss. It was difficult to understand and assess everything in the given time frame and it would be useful to study this further. The administration was open about showing the RABC detailed workings of the model.

Fall enrollment chart was presented which is shown on the report along with the 20091 Projected vs. 20091 Actual headcounts and FTE [<https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/14128> - Slide 9.] The actual undergraduate headcount was 14,045 in 20091. The actual graduate headcount in 20091 was 2,728. P. Tymann said data from last year showed how amazingly accurate enrollment management was in their projections.

The selected Institutional Goals were shared and RIT is tuition driven and looking at the demographics of the student body, we want to improve these balances to become more selective, become more national/global, achieve improved gender balance, enhance ethnic diversity, distribute enrollments within RIT, improve persistence and graduation rates and to grow.

Issues were presented and can be seen on the RABC DML site. There was concern for high expenses, costs are rising, losing Pell Grants, sensitivity to enrollment is problematic, increase annually in direct proportion with tuition rate increases, etc. There is a need to look at all expenses incurred by the Institute and ask if our resources are being deployed in the correct manner.

Charge 3: *Assess and, where appropriate, make recommendations regarding faculty participation, oversight, and approval of Institute decision making, especially in determining Institute financial priorities and commitment to, for example: salaries and benefits, health benefits, security standards, and future building and renovation of academic buildings. Review budgetary commitment to library support in light of our new strategic priorities. Make recommendations where appropriate.*

RABC met with Shirley Bower, director of Wallace Library to discuss what the charge was requesting. A graph was presented showing the actual library budget and the increase in costs going above this. Total library expenditures were shown on a graph chart, crafted by Shirley Bower and it showed where RIT falls below the 50th percentile. Another graph chart was displayed showing materials expenditures per student FTE.

The library has shifted from “purchase” model to “access” model and 85% of materials budget is for electronic sources, so when this is cut we lose the resource and in many cases the associated archives. Staffing needs have shifted as well and now there is a greater need to have staff with IT/data skills. Additionally, new programs are funded at a level well below the requests.

What can faculty do? Do not go down the road to the U of R. The RIT library is here to provide services to faculty and students. Faculty need to communicate what they need and are not getting yet. Inform the library when there is a new need. Communication is important in both directions.

A motion was presented.

MOTION: Given the growth in scholarly and creative activity among faculty and students, we recommend that the Wallace Center be assigned a high priority in the next budget cycle. An immediate goal should be to close the gap between the increase in the Wallace Center's costs and its budget allocation. A longer term goal should be to bring the Wallace Center's expenditures per student to the 50th percentile of the CAC peer schools.

Discussion and Q&A ensued.

- E. Saber said it is hard to understand the motion if we do not know the itemized things and what is the usage of these items. Can these details come to senate and can we see the whole budget for the library?
- S. Bower said the library does a cost/usage analysis every year and she can bring that data or other requested data to Senate. The library uses this information to make adjustments and wants to educate faculty as there has been a big shift to electronic materials which typically have a 5-7% inflationary rate/year and it is becoming increasingly difficult for the library to sustain existing resources or purchase new resources due to this. As an example, the cost of RIT's subscription to Elsevier Journals alone is almost \$400,000 this year.
- Some senators remarked that this is a gold bullet motion.

The motion by T. Engstrom to table the motion on the floor due to time constraints was 2nded and carried with 1 abstention.

ADJOURNMENT: 1:53 p.m.