CALL TO ORDER (S. Manian Ramkumar, AS Operations Officer led the meeting in P. Tymann’s absence.)

COMMUNICATION OFFICER’S REPORT: Minutes of November 17, 2011 were approved as corrected with four abstentions.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT: None

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Provost Haefner gave his initial thoughts regarding follow-up on class scheduling and developing different models for different days. A small committee comprised of Fernando Naveda, Joe Loffredo and two Academic Senate volunteers will have a planning meeting regarding scheduling and modeling various scenarios and this will be presented to the senate for discussion and consensus. It is not a huge time commitment and the Provost requested two AS volunteers. B. Barbato thanked the Provost for involving the faculty.

President Destler shared briefly on budget modeling for next year. The increment date has been moved to July 1st and for budgeting it has to be decided what increment to give faculty and staff. Tuition will stay at the same number. There are four-year independent colleges that are raising tuition but losing money. He asked the senate if there should still be the 24 budget meetings in winter quarter, where presentations by colleges are made and then reviewed by a budget committee. He sees this as a waste of time as it is very time consuming and in a normal year, there is usually one million dollars to distribute, which is not available this year. It would be useful for the senate to give input regarding this. Some commented that hearings may still be needed for submitting individual college/department needs. C. Hull asked if there are no budget hearings would the budgets be similar as this year. President Destler indicated that commitments are already on the ledger and may or may not get an increase. S. Maggelakis was concerned if there would be a mechanism to share what the colleges need, if there are no budget hearings.

As the acting chair for the senate meeting, S. Manian Ramkumar expressed that this issue can be discussed at a later time due to time constraints, and this information will also be provided to the Resource Allocation and Budget Committee (RABC) for further consideration, evaluation and reporting.

PROPOSALS

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE CHARGE

The following two charges were presented for vote. A third charge (Determine whether or not a deadline and statute of limitations should be established for grade disputes. Recommend policy changes where appropriate.), that was originally listed in the agenda was eliminated, as this charge was given to the Academic Affairs Committee during the discussions and vote, on standing committee charges, on September 8th, 2011.
SAC Charges on the table that were voted on:

- Develop a set of recommendations to the Senate in order to provide more clarity as to expectations for academic conduct, collegiality, and civility.
- Investigate whether or not faculty are provided with adequate resources to provide special accommodations to student populations needing such accommodations.

MOTION: Academic Senate approves the proposed charges for the Student Affairs Committee.

Motion carried with one abstention.

CHARGE FOR SENATE TASKFORCE ON ONLINE STUDENT EVALUATIONS [Distributed online prior to today’s meeting.]  http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14434

M. Laver, chair of the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC), presented a draft set of charges outlined by AAC, for the Taskforce on Student Evaluations, as per the approval and request by the senate on May 5, 2011, to create a taskforce for online student evaluations and for the AAC to put forth charges for the taskforce.

Tim Engström asked for the following edit to be made to the document, as a friendly amendment:

> Page 2, Charge Number 5, 2nd paragraph, first sentence, “should” to be changed to “shall” to read as follows: The taskforce shall be comprised of a representative from each college and a representative from student government.

MOTION: Academic Senate approves the proposed charges for the Online Student Evaluations Taskforce as amended.

Motion carried unanimously with 28 in favor.

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (Three Proposed Policies on the agenda - B2.0, E9.0 and E17.0)

Discussion of B2.0 (Charter of Academic Governance) and PPt Presentation  http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14402  [Ppt Presentation will be posted under the Faculty Affairs Committee site once received.]

In order to provide Senators with the opportunity to discuss the proposed changes to B2.0 with their constituents prior to voting, B2.0 was presented for discussion only. Action on B2.0 will take place at the December 15th Senate meeting. Once the changes to B2.0 have been endorsed by the Senate the policy will be put before the faculty for a vote.

T. Policano of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) presented the revisions being proposed to B2.0. Sue Provenzano’s participation and Kristen’s chairing of the FAC were acknowledged by Tom, given the amount of work that the FAC has been charged to undertake.

Tom indicated that the current exercise to revise the charter was to update it to accurately reflect the changes taking place within the University and to provide an opportunity for the faculty to ratify the changes proposed. This is in line with Article XIII, Provisions for Amending the Charter, which states that in order for this to go forth, “…shall require approval by the Senate and…a 2/3 (vote)…of the faculty. Such an effort had not been undertaken since the formation of the Academic Senate in 2004.

In summary B2.0 was reorganized, including an ABC listing of standing committees, and reformatted to be semester ready. Specific changes have been highlighted in the document posted on the DML site.
One major change to B2.0 is in regards to the definition of voting faculty (E6.0 Faculty Classifications & B2.0 Proposed Institute Level Voting Status). In E6.0 the lecturer rank was created and principal lecturers were charged with service to the Institute. The FAC is proposing that Principal Lecturers be given two seats on the senate as non-voting members.

B2.0 Issue: A small number of faculty (tenured track) not associated with any college have no representation, such as the ones in GIS, which is a degree granting entity. Possible resolutions to this problem, as proposed by FAC, are:

Administrative:
   Either make GIS a college or merge it with a college.

Academic Senate:
   For the purpose of governance representation, merge faculty that are not in a college, with a college.

Motions brought forth from FAC today were as follows:

1. AS recommends that the administration assign all RIT faculty to a college of RIT.
   or
2. AS requests the Executive Committee to work with the colleges of RIT to associate all faculty not part of a college to a college for governance representation.

3. AS approves the revised B2.0 Charter of Academic Governance and requests that it be brought to a vote of the RIT faculty. (Vote by AS will take place December 15th).

The proposed policy was reviewed line by line, per the lines that were revised as follows:

1. Line 43 – The voting members of the faculty at the university level are the tenure-track faculty and principal lecturers. T. Policano noted that principal lecturers have a 5-year contract and have been here at RIT 10 years teaching 3-4 courses per quarter.
2. Line 60: Article 3.1
3. Line 98: Additions added
4. Starting at Line 107: Composition of the Academic Senate and under this 5.1.8, added “Two senior principal lecturers at large elected by all lecturers (non-voting).
5. Starting at Line 152 (re: terms of service)
6. Line 167: Officers of the Academic Senate “All officers will serve for a term of one year and take office at the end of the academic term in which they are elected.”
7. Article 10, Standing Committees – “…faculty representative from each college to be elected by his or her collegial faculty.” This phrase was added to several committee descriptions.
8. Graduate Council at Line 408. Added: “The chairperson will be elected from one of the faculty representatives of the Graduate Council Assembly.”
9. Line 457 – New committee added: Multidisciplinary Curriculum Committee
10. Line 523: Added: “…the voting members of the faculty at the university level.”

T. Policano encouraged senators to take this back to their constituents for review prior to voting on B2.0 at the December 15th senate meeting.

Discussion and Q&A ensued.

- Q: How is RIT Dubai represented?
  A: RIT Dubai faculty are hired by Global Delivery Corporation and they have their own set of policies, separate from governance structures here as they develop their own governance structures.
- C. Hull had two friendly amendments that were accepted:
  1. Under 6.1 (term of senators) put in “to finish the term” under 6.1, Article VI.
  2. Lines 438, 466 and 482 spell out ICC (Intercollege Curriculum Committee)
A question was raised about service requirements for lecturers and senior lecturers. T. Policano said the policy does not dictate that faculty do service at the university level for getting credit. They could not use that service as part of their documentation. K. Waterstram-Rich said this doesn’t preclude a lecturer or senior lecturer to serve. In E6.0 they are not required to do service and when it is a university issue they cannot vote. T. Policano said since plans of work are negotiable there is no mandate to give credit to serve on a committee. Lecturers and Senior lecturers are not paid to do service.

Tim Engström said that there are ongoing ambiguities. All voting faculty are representing a college. In this proposal, Lecturers are being invited as a category of laborers within the university, not as representing a college or academic or governance unit. These are two different principles of association and organization, and at present only the latter principle is appropriate in an academic governance structure.

In addition, Tim pointed to line 48. “College policy may specify voting privileges at the department and college level by rank”, as being worrisome. This may create more confusion and inconsistency across the university. Voting is not a privilege but a right! If it is a right, it should be a right across the entire university; no college should be in a position to decide otherwise and Institute policy trumps the policies set by colleges and departments. Otherwise, we have inconsistent policies and practices of decision making. Others agreed.

Response: T. Policano said it is a catch-22 and leaves the colleges alone to make the decisions as we do not want to dictate to the individual colleges.

K. Waterstram-Rich suggested for line 48 that “may” be changed to “shall” to provide consistency.

B. Barbato said voting should be based on principle as a right to vote. Governance doesn’t mean voting rights only as it also means consultation, participation etc. Voting rights is separate.

C. Hull said circumstances are different in each college and in his college lecturers have a lot of rights. We may be taking away voting privileges if we become consistent overall.

It was suggested for the deans to be non-voting members, as they represent the Provost’s Office. A few others agreed.

Response: S. Maggelakis, Dean of COS and representing Deans Council said that she is not just representing the Provost’s Office. She saw this as returning to what used to be in place, which was Faculty Council and does not reflect “shared governance?”

T. Policano said having a seat at this table is a privilege and this policy change is trying to improve it.

C. Lundgren said that he has been involved in the Academic Senate for almost 15 years and it would be a step backwards, to go back to the Faculty Council model as at times it was acting out of step with the interest of the university. In the spirit of providing true shared governance, he urged the senate to re-consider the changes to the voting rights of members of the senate.

K. Waterstram-Rich said all do not have voting rights in other governance groups (i.e. SG, BOT) but we can participate. Not having the voting right does not mean the participation of the member is not valued. It is Institute Council that is the governance group for a full vote.

Some of the senators then agreed that the Deans should have voting privileges.

S. Maggelakis said AS should not be compared with Deans Council nor IC. AS is a voting body. She asked what is being improved by not giving the deans voting privileges?

K. Waterstram-Rich said if deans are thought of as faculty members, then they are already represented on senate by the senators of each college and it is not a matter of trust.

As acting chair for the senate meeting, S. Manian Ramkumar requested the Provost to take into consideration discussing the proposed changes, pertaining to faculty in units that are not part of any college, with the respective units, as they had no representation on the senate floor.

B2.0 will return to the senate on December 15th for a vote.

**Discussion and vote of Policy E17.0 (Faculty Leave of Absence)** [An overview of changes to E17.0 (Faculty Leave of Absence) was distributed and reviewed.]  
Link Proposed Policy: [http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14404](http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14404)  
Link to Overview of Proposed Changes to E17.0: [http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14416](http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14416)
Jamie Winebrake, FAC member presented the revisions by FAC being made to Policy E17.0 and they are as follows:

1. The policy changes now distinguish a leave of absence from other types of leaves available to faculty (paragraph 1).
2. Divided leaves into those “without pay” (paragraph 1) and those “with pay” (paragraph 2) since policy stipulates different actions to be taken for each.
3. Revised the conditions related to benefits (paragraph 2) to reflect input from HR and Legal Affairs (paragraph 3). J. Winebrake said the chairs and deans were the gatekeepers in the current policy and now in the proposed policy the chairs and deans will review the request and the Provost will give the final approval, unless the senate wishes to have the President be a part of this as well.
4. The changes also clarify the process by which a faculty member applies for a leave of absence (paragraph 3). In particular, the policy change stipulates that the department chair and the dean provide recommendations to the Provost for the final decision.
5. Based on input from Legal Affairs, the proposed policy change clarifies the nature of the agreement that will be put in place for faculty granted a leave of absence (paragraph 4). The old policy was fuzzy and the revised policy is more clear.

Discussion and Q&A ensued.

- E. Saber said there ought to be a separate process for leave of absence with and without pay. 
  Response: The process is the same but the rigor of evaluation may be different.
- T. Policano said there are liability issues and having approval covers everything. The new policy is now more open and the administration can now weigh in on it. The university may even decide to pay a faculty for the faculty’s leave of absence if the work done by the faculty during the leave will benefit the university.
- C. Hull gave the example of a faculty taking a 3 month leave of absence and returning back for the rest of the year. The question was would the faculty be without a contract for the rest of the year and could there be language included in the policy to cover part of the year?
  A: All that should be written out in the leave agreement and the current policy does not spell that out.
- Q: What would 3 months mean in semesters?
  A: This policy was revised with semesters in mind and the three months may have to do with benefits. The FAC will check with HR about this.
- Q: Have you looked at the other categories?
  A: K. Waterstram-Rich said other leaves of absence are covered under HR and other policies per the categories and will be coming to senate in the future.
- O. Palacio requested that the policy say: “Have an annual contract with the leave of absence agreement.”
  Response: This wording in the policy came from Legal Affairs and we would have to have them check out this wording that you are requesting.
- E. Saber asked for an amendment per leave of absence being still on a contract and there should be an annual contract with proper agreement.
  A: J. Winebrake indicated that FAC had to get precise language from Legal Affairs. J. Winebrake suggested that to meet the amendment presented by E. Saber, the FAC could remove “not” and insert “and” in the final paragraph. The FAC is required to send such language changes to Legal Affairs for input.

It was moved to table this policy and return to senate for a vote on December 15th.

Motion to table carried with 1 Abstention

**Discussion and Vote of Policy E9.0 (Visiting Scholar) -** [http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14403](http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14403)

K. Waterstram-Rich presented the revisions to Policy E9.0, which was held over from last year. The issue was that people were not following the policy and colleges were looking at it inconsistently. Not many changes were made to the policy, but the committee believes the proposed revision is more organized and adds clarity.
Revisions:
1. Visiting Scholar has a clearer definition in the proposed policy.
2. The process to follow is now laid out in order. In the current policy the sequence of steps is out of order.
3. The role of the sponsor is clarified.
4. Section E separates the order of approvals rather than having it in paragraph form. In addition it clarifies that the Provost receives information from all involved in the visiting scholar review.

Discussion and Q&A ensued.

- Tim Engström commented that the wording used in paragraph one of the policy is “college”, and the more general and inclusive “Academic Units” is used later in the policy. If the policy covers only colleges, other relevant entities (i.e. Institutes, centers, etc.) would not be included. He recommended consistency to ensure universality of jurisdiction.
  Response: J. Winebrake said it should read “colleges” and centers would be included.
- C. Lundgren addressed an inconsistency with RIT’s IP Policy and where do the fruits of scholarly activities conducted by the visiting scholar fit in? This needs to be resolved. Visiting Scholars are bound by the IP Policy.
  Response: T. Policano asked that Carl send them these inconsistencies.
- M. Kotlarchyk asked if the hiring of Post Doctoral researchers was discussed, since there are a lot of similarities between them and the visiting scholars. Yet the post doctoral researcher is a staff employee, while visiting scholars are not.
  Response: K. Waterstram-Rich said they didn’t discuss Post Doctoral researchers, as they are treated as staff.

It was moved to table E9.0. and the motion carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT: 1:51 p.m.