CALL TO ORDER: 12:05 p.m.

COMMUNICATION OFFICER'S REPORT: Minutes of February 9, 2012 were approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

- Memo on course scheduling from the AS Executive Committee had been sent to all senators on line prior to today’s meeting regarding concerns and issues per the proposals that had come to the Academic Senate on January 26th. The administration needs our consideration and review of the proposed course schedules so they can continue to create mock schedules. Course scheduling discussion will be on the February 16th senate agenda.

- Resource Allocation & Budget Committee will present on February 23 a report on the Retirement Simplification Plan with Dr. Jim Watters in attendance to help answer any questions concerning this.

- The Nominations Committee needs to be formed this winter quarter and the committee will consist of 4 IC senate reps and Paul Rosenberg, most recent past senate chair. P. Tymann asked for the IC members to meet soon and decide who will be on this committee as they will be creating the slate for the AS Executive Committee for nominations to occur in April and also to secure at large members for Standing and Institute Committees, where needed.

- The executive committee commented that there are ongoing discussions with the Provost and the President about increasing the interaction between the Academic Senate and the RIT Board of Trustees. As such, members of the executive committee will be attending a portion of the BOT executive committee meeting in March.

REPORTS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

GLOBAL EDUCATION TASK FORCE INTERIM REPORT: Ann Howard, Co-Chair; Bob Barbato, Co-Chair

B. Barbato, Co-chair reviewed the relevant charges of this committee. They were as follows:
• Conduct a review of the current state of internalization at RIT
• Research proven models, best practices, and appropriate governance mechanisms for advancing and monitoring internalization in higher education.

The Associate Provost for International Education and Global Programs will:

• Develop and implement programs to advance the university’s internalization effort and global presence
• Support internalization of RIT’s curriculum
• Advance international exchange and faculty led study abroad
• Secure resources to support international teaching and research
• Collaborate with RIT’s global network of campuses

A search is presently underway by a search committee co-chaired by Hector Flores and Bob Barbato per the position of the Associate Provost for International Education and Global Program. The position was posted on December 6\textsuperscript{th} and has been advertised widely including in the Chronicle of Higher Education. There have been 53 applicants, 30 of whom are qualified, and this has been narrowed down to eight finalists. Telephone interviews have been conducted with the top eight applicants. Next 3-5 finalists will be chosen and campus interviews will begin in March. A recommendation per who should be hired will be sent to Provost Haefner in late March or early April. The new Associate Provost in this position will begin at RIT on July 1, 2012.

Discussion ensued.

• T. Engstrom said he is grateful for this activity and thanked the Provost as well for working with the Senate to establish this committee. Q: Our department, and no doubt others too, has been reviewing CV’s and syllabi from possible teachers/courses of faculty at other locations. The issue is not simply a question of credentials or course content (which is sometimes problematic), but process and governance. We don’t seem to be involved in any meaningful way or exercising meaningful insight over those working in our name. In effect, the concern that’s being expressed is that we weren’t historically and don’t appear now to be very engaged with the satellite campuses at the Senate or governance level. We’re aware that the Trustees and President are appropriately attentive to the financial dimensions of these relationships, but the governance process doesn’t appear to have kept pace. Is this an explicit concern of the committee’s?
  A: A. Howard noted that the recommendations of the taskforce will be to establish a standing committee of the Senate with responsibilities for reviewing international education initiatives. As discussed with the Provost, the new Associate Provost for International Education will be expected to collaborate with this committee on new and ongoing international activities.

PROPOSALS

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE [Policy B2.0 - Charter of Academic Governance - Proposed Revisions - Discussion and Possible Vote]

The proposed revisions of B2.0 had been presented at the January 26, 2012 AS meeting and the motions on the Ppt presented at the last meeting had been reviewed but not voted on as of yet due to time constraints at the last senate meeting. Ppt: http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14587.
T. Policano reviewed the proposed changes to B2.0 - http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14580. He noted that Lecturers is a category and has ranks within it.

P. Tymann reminded everyone of the process today, in that 2/3 of overall faculty vote is needed for approval and that the current B2.0 is in effect.

Discussion ensued.

- C. Lundgren asked if the senate is voting on individual changes and then voting on the entire proposed B2.0?
  A: Okay.
- It was suggested by C. Lundgren that the senate should require a supermajority (2/3) at the senate if we are giving that to the faculty. If we pass something with 60% to 70% approval, it may not pass the faculty. He stated he wasn’t bringing forward a motion, but rather a point for discussion.
- A Friendly amendment was approved came forth to re-incude the Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion.

For voting purposes there were 34 voting members present (2 of which joined the meeting while in session).

**Motion #1:** The Academic Senate endorses the addition of two senior or principle lecturers at large elected by all lecturers as members of the Academic Senate.

**Motion #2:** B2, section 5.1 (Composition of the Academic Senate)

Discussion ensued.

- Typo was noted per the Provost being non-voting and it should read “voting.”
- It was moved to split the motion to approve this section (5.1) into separate motions such that each bullet of the voting/nonvoting lists in P. Tyman’s slides were individual motions.
  T. Policano said he did not think we need to do this since there is a reason that they are all in one category.
- C. Lundgren said he did not think that this needs to be diced in an effort to change the outcome.

Question was called on splitting this section into individual motions.
Motion carried: 20 In Favor, 12 No, 2 Abstentions

- M-B. Cooper, VP for Student Affairs noted that she is the designee of the President from among the Vice Presidents. She said she has abstained from nearly all issues, but has voted on a few issues. She remarked that by removing the vote from the vice-president it sends a message. She said she does not take it personally but professionally.
- Q: C. Thoms asked if the VP for Diversity and Inclusion is included in the one vice-president.
  A: No
- C. Lundgren: Are we an Academic Senate or a Faculty Council? We abandoned FC nearly 18 years ago for this, and this is supposed to be a better model. I do not think we can call ourselves an Academic Senate if we do this.
- T. Engstrom said he agreed that we want inclusion. Without the voices of inclusion this would be inadequate. As an Academic Senate, we are accountable for voting on measures pertaining
to academics (i.e. curriculum). We bear that responsibility, as a matter of principle, not of personality. Given who is accountable and responsible for the vote should pertain to exactly that.

- F. Walker, CAST Dean said he can’t see how this does anything other than move this group to a faculty senate.
- Q: R. Hira asked M-B Cooper when she has voted.
  A: I have abstained on curriculum and matters of the faculty. I’ve voted on issues such as the calendar that are broader issues.
- D Meadows: The transition of the AS from the Faculty Council is absolutely critical.
- T. Engstrom noted that he wrote part of the charter in the beginning of AS. The voices are here and included. The question is whether a voice and a vote are synonymous.
- C. Lundgren said if you take away the vote then it’s a body that only makes decisions of the faculty. As an Academic Senate we need to have an Academic Senate that encourages members to vote their convictions.
- Someone commented that they support Mary-Beth Cooper and her service to the Institute.
- J. Voelkel said if Faculty Council met behind closed doors that would be different, but if people are included in the process and discussion then it is more than a Faculty Council (i.e. an Academic Senate).
- R. Hira said this is not about individual people, it’s about positions and its roles and responsibilities.

**Motion 2A:** The Vice President member of the Academic Senate shall be a non-voting member of the Senate.

Question was called regarding voting rights for Vice Presidents.

**Motion 2A:** 18 in favor of voting, 14 non-voting, 2 abstentions.

- C. Lundgren said Dean’s are inherently involved in the academic process and that voice needs a vote.
- E. Saber said there are two deans in favor of Academic Senate and this would encourage the Deans to work through and with their senators.
- C. Lundgren said this is not strictly proportional representation even now.
- Ram said it is not about our numbers or percentage.
- T. Engstrom said he feels obliged to see the other side presented. No one doubts that the Dean’s advice is not needed but the Dean’s Council is not a governance body. It is an additional vote that is not required.
- J. Winebrake, CLA Dean said we discussed this in Deans Council and we are not of one opinion.

**Motion 2B:** The Deans representing Dean’s Council on the Academic Senate shall be non-voting members of the Senate.

15 in favor of Deans voting, 18 in favor of non-voting for Deans, 2 abstentions.

P. Amsler, VP for SG moved that AS combine the vote for non-voting/voting status. Seconded by M. Johnson.
This motion carried with 29 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions.

- P. Amsler: If SG loses their vote Academic Senate will love the buy-in from this group.
Response and Q: T. Policano asked if faculty have a vote at Student Government?
A: P. Amsler said that comes up for discussion occasionally within Student Government, but we are called ‘student government.’
Response: M. Johnson: Faculty do have a vote on Staff Council.
- T. Engstrom recalled that the last time this was discussed, the last student president felt it was inappropriate that students vote at Academic Senate.
Response: M. Johnson said that they had said, only voting when appropriate.
- S. Boedo: We are voting on the position, not personalities. Do you want a person in student government to vote on a tenure policy? Abstaining is their discretion, not the right.

Motion 2C: The Chairs of Staff Council and Student Government representing these governance groups on the Academic Senate shall be non-voting members of the Senate.
15 in favor of SG and SC members voting, 17 opposed for SG and SC members voting, 2 abstentions

Motion 2D: The senior and/or principal lecturers representing lecturers on the Academic Senate shall be non-voting members of the Senate.
16 in favor of lecturers voting, 14 opposed lecturers voting, 4 abstentions

Motion 3: The Academic Senate endorses the proposed B2.0, section 2.3, to be amended as follows: The voting members of the faculty at the university level are the tenure-track faculty and principal lecturers. Tenure-track faculty, senior lecturers, and principal lecturers are the voting faculty at the department and college level on matters related to the responsibilities designated in their rank and not beyond.

*(this would replace the current wording of: The voting members in a college or in a department are those voting members of the faculty holding at least half-time appointments in the college or department)*

C. Lundgren: Speaking from his department, all lecturers are contributors to decision making and I would prefer to have it stay this way. The current situation is that it is not addressed.

A. Phelps: The issue is to have consistency in between the college policies, both from a fairness point of view and a grievance point of view. The specificity of ‘matters pertaining to their rank’ will really need to be clarified.

Provost J. Haefner: It is desirable both from an equity standpoint and a grievance standpoint to have consistency of the voting rights of lecturers across the university.

Why should we limit this only to senior and principal lecturers?

T. Policano: Lecturer (not senior or principal) position descriptions do not include an expectation of service. To vote is to be informed; to be informed is to participate, etc. Thus we would be expecting service from them without compensation. That was the rationale.

T. Engstrom: Lecturers are not permanent employees and should not be confused with the long-term responsibility of the tenured and tenure track faculty.

J. Pelz: Saying they are not permanent is misleading. They are not temporary either, but they are as permanent as any tenure-track appointee.

The Provost said to address this, he and the president would like to have clear, campus-wide guidelines if you choose to give voting rights to lecturers. We would not be supportive of an approach that creates inconsistent voting rights and responsibilities across the colleges.

Q: What would they vote on?
A: Department issues and such, but not beyond their rank.

- T. Engstrom: There is a clear distinction between tenure track faculty and lecturers in that tenure track faculty are hired with the expectation being long term contributors of the Institute. The difference in kind.
- S. Boedo: A principal lecturer could be put in a really awful spot here. What are their opportunities for tenure?
  A: T. Policano said that there are obviously some things that would be voted on and others that would not. Examples of things where lecturers would not be voting are things such as tenure issues or the election of a department chair.
- V. Serravallo: As an example, our faculty had a discussion of online evaluations. Having lecturer input would have been wonderful.
- A. Phelps: I don’t think these examples are so clear cut: I can imagine that a lecturer who has been at RIT for a while would absolutely expect to have a voice in the selection process for a department chair, for example. The wording in the current motion is extremely vague and not likely to give enough guidance as policy.
- B. Barbato: Tenure protects the university from outside influences. Changing the make up of that would also change the outcome. In SCB we allow our lecturers to vote. It just evolved and it has had a direct impact on the thinking of the curriculum and has given more influence to the Dean.
- Q: O. Palacio: When a lecturer is hired, does the chair or dean have to form a search committee?
  A: T. Policano said it doesn’t need to be a search committee, but faculty input is required.
- D. Meadows: I’m asking B. Barbato to clarify his position.
- C. Lundgren: I wanted to clarify that chairs are selected and serve at the pleasure of the dean.
- C. Hull said voting on department chairs or salary is not his experience at RIT.
- R. Hira: How does this phrase actually play out in practice? And we have yet to talk about scholarship and how do we separate places where teaching and scholarship go together.
- T. Engstrom: How do issues of power play out in the academy? When one is voting at a department or college level it is very difficult for me to imagine a lecturer voting against a chair or a dean. It can change outcomes. That difference is again one of principle, not of personality. Thus, I feel we need to hold on to B. Barbato’s idea on tenure.
- J. Voelkel: Point of order – if this gets voted down we will go back to the original (current) 2.3?
  A. T. Engstrom: Yes.
  P. Tyman: It this gets voted down we will go back to the original 2.3.

Question was called and seconded per voting on proposed section 2.3.

Motion did not carry to approve the proposed wording in section 2.3 with a vote of 11 in favor, 18 opposed and 5 abstentions.

Meeting Adjourned: 2:50 p.m.