CALL TO ORDER: 12:10 p.m.

COMMUNICATION OFFICER’S REPORT: Minutes of February 23, 2012 have been approved with 3 abstentions.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT
The chair welcomed back all senators to a new quarter. He further briefly mentioned that we were meeting on the Ides of March and this may not bode well for his personal wellbeing during the meeting.

The Chair note that in studying Roberts Rules and in the Charter of Academic Governance section 7.2, in regards to action items being voted on at senate that a “quorum of the senate consists of a majority of its members. An action of the Senate is approved only if passed by the majority of its members present and voting.” The Chair decided that at the beginning of each senate meeting roll call of all voting members of the senate will be taken so it is known the number of voting members present when action items are being voted on. Roll call was taken.

REPORTS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE
Paul Rosenberg, Nominations Committee chair announced who is serving on the Nominations Committee this spring is as follows: Hossein Shahmohamad, Carl Lundgren, Heidi Miller and Charlotte Thoms.

The charge to the committee is to formulate a robust list of nominees for the executive committee elections which will take place on April 19, 2012. He encouraged senators to stand for elections as this is a very important function of the senate. A strong senate executive committee makes a strong senate. Additionally, he noted that there are openings on various committees which senators can volunteer for and a letter with present openings on committees was distributed. He asked IC members to provide names to the executive committee for these slots to be filled and also for folks to be free to nominate people to be on the executive committee slate for the April elections. If there are any questions he asked he be contacted or Vivian Gifford in the Academic Senate office.

TEACHING EVALUATION PROGRESS REPORT (ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE [AAC])
Michael Laver, Academic Affairs Committee Chair deferred to Carol DeFilippo, member of the Academic
Affairs Committee to report on the Teaching Evaluation Progress Report. Please see full report presented at today’s meeting that is posted on the senate’s DML site: http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14845

The AAC reviewed, discussed and extracted issues identified in feedback on the 2010 proposal from the previous Academic Affairs Committee Clipboard survey of April, 2011, and in an email exchange. The AAC sub-committee familiarized themselves with the research literature. C. De Filippo noted that there was a need to separate tasks of faculty evaluation from course evaluation and from student input on their learning experience in the classroom, as student input is but one piece of the picture with faculty evaluations. The report noted that useful student input requires forging a closer connection between student ratings and faculty development opportunities, student understanding as to their role and importance in the process of faculty evaluation, clear guidelines based on known factors that influence validity and reliability, and consistent practices in using student input as part of faculty evaluation.

The AAC sub-committee considered alternative options for fulfilling the charge. Additionally they conferred with RIT specialist on technical requirements.

The following timeline was anticipated:
* March - Formulate draft recommendations. Confer and seek initial feedback from individual college senators, administrators and Student Government representatives and then revise with feedback in mind.
* April - Bring recommendations to Academic Senate for discussion
* May - Senate vote

Q&A and Discussion ensued.

- It was requested to send the report to V. Gifford for the minutes.
- Q: A.Phelps: As we move toward peer review, we need to consider who has access to this, hoping the final recommendation has some guidance on this. He said currently we have to sign a waiver. Another issue is that when we hire faculty (particularly those transferring rank or tenure), what are the processes we use in order to review them to understand how they have been evaluated at their home institution?
  A: M. Laver said the first point was discussed at great length. Michigan University puts their evaluations online and other schools do it other ways.

**PROPOSALS**

**POLICY B2.0 (Charter of Academic Governance)**
Kristen Waterstram-Rich, Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) Chair reviewed that at the last senate meeting all was removed per B2.0 in regards to motions that had come from the executive committee and from the Faculty Affairs Committee, and today is starting off with a clean slate. Any motions that are approved by Senate for changes in B2.0 will have to then go before the full tenured faculty for approval, and the current B2.0 will remain in place until this occurs. Any comments on grammar need to be sent to K. Waterstram-Rich as today only the content of the policy is being reviewed and discussed.

The entire B2.0 Ppt presentation can be found on the senate’s DML site, which includes all revisions being proposed, the rationale for these being proposed and motions (not all but some were presented today due to time constraints): http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14844

The guiding principles are as follows per B2.0:
- Desire to have a consistent and coherent governance policy
- Recognition of lecturers as an integral part of RIT
- Have all faculty represented on an inclusive Academic Senate

Housekeeping modifications were made throughout B2.0 as follows:

- The word “institute” was changed to “university” – when referring to RIT.
- Where warranted, there was the addition of the identification of corresponding policies by number and name along with hot links.
- Identification of “university-level voting faculty” was added where appropriate.
- The change in the number of colleges, where appropriate, will be made.

Changes to 2.2, 5.2, 2.3 (formerly 2.2), 4.4, 5.1, 5.6, 6.1, 10.1 and the addition of 2.4 and 9.3.4 and the rationale for each of these changes were presented (see entire Ppt with all of this listed – http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14844
The overall changes to Article X and its rationale was that with the exception of the Nominations Committee, the committees were all listed in alphabetical order for easier reference.

The change to Article XIII removed “at a duly constituted meeting of the Faculty Assembly”. Voting on amendments to the Academic Governance Charger to be approved by 2/3 majority of the voting members of the faculty at the university level will only be done electronically or by paper ballot and this is due to the large number of faculty at RIT and a Faculty Assembly will not be held.

Motions for the proposed revisions came forth as follows:

**Motion #1:** The Academic Senate approves the new B2.0.2.2 as proposed by the Faculty Affairs Committee. “All faculty except the president, provost, and vice presidents holding professorial appointments at the university level shall have an appointment in a college or the Golisano Institute of Sustainability. In the reminder of this charter and all policies in which the word “college” is used, it will refer to all colleges and the Golisano Institute of Sustainability.”

Discussion & Q&A ensued.

- A. Phelps said his concern is that only GIS is new but RIT may decide in the future to have another institute added to the campus and we would have to return to the charter each time an institute arises. He suggested this section needed to refer to all colleges and institutes.
  Response: K. Waterstram-Rich said there are academic and non-academic institutes. At one time a suggestion was to use the term “degree granting Institutes,” but that allows room for entities other than colleges to be formed. The proposed working indicates that GIS is an exception to the rule.
- T. Engstrom was very grateful for the clarity offered today by the Faculty Affairs Committee per proposed changes of B2.0 by this committee. He expressed his concern, however, about making exceptional and complicating provisions to the governance structure for an entity that isn’t large enough to do the work of governance. Governance is more than having representation; it’s about having sufficient numbers to be responsible for the work of governance, and being able to staff all the standing committees. Moreover, the hallmark of GIS is having collaborative relationships and faculty and colleges across the campus. Thus, being given joint appointments with other colleges would be both good in principle and avoid disrupting the governance system in response to the identity politics of one small entity.
  Response: K. Waterstram-Rich said faculty from GIS currently are not adequately represented. A joint appointment would mean that they are represented by a different entity and their views or needs for representation would not be met. There are 7 or 8 Tenure Track faculty in GIS and they would have to serve on committees as required by all senators.
T. Engstrom: Labor matters and we ought to have a governance entity capable of doing it. Thus, it is legitimate to seek an alternative. With all due respect, our concern should be less about the feelings or anxieties of some faculty than about creating a viable structure for the future, and for hires we haven’t yet made.

Q: O. Palatino: What would it take for GIS to become a college?
A: The Provost responded that the notion of this was discussed at various times and conversations were held with the deans. To create a college of GIS, in response to a representation issue, would be to miss an opportunity to be more strategic. There are a number of affiliated faculty across all colleges. GIS has a total of 8 tenured/tenure track faculty not affiliated with another college. This institute has a lot of cross fertilization. In addition, the provost said he and the president feel that using joint appointments is not the best way to solve this representation problem as this would not be a meaningful representation for these faculty. There is also the name of a donor attached to GIS. Nonetheless, other institutions have created colleges of sustainability so we need to be thinking for the future.

Paul Stiebitz, Associate Academic Director of GIS said he was appreciative of all the discussion and consideration regarding representation. The issue of mutual representation is exciting for GIS faculty and said they look forward to participating in governance.

C. Lundgren said we need a definition for college based on curriculum and granting degrees. This was dealt with when CHST came forth, as originally they were called an Institute but are now called a College. Another new group on campus is Multidisciplinary Studies, so this will come up again as other institutes and colleges arise.

Response: K. Waterstram-Rich said Multidisciplinary Studies have faculty tenured in other colleges and GIS does not, so this is different and GIS is an exception.

Others responded to why GIS has kept this identity of institute and not become a college.

C. Hull: In visiting GIS the facts are that faculty are doing cohesive teaching, research etc. These people do not have joint appointments. It may be too small presently to be a college but could be a college someday.

L. Lawley: This is not just about representation on Academic Senate, but there is a long list of committees that need representation (ICC, Grad Council etc.) The problem is not a voting seat here but on other committees.

A. Phelps: There is the breakdown of the college model and new things are emerging. I submit to the Provost that we may have 2-3 more institutes in the coming years and we need to consider what the structure of the university should be and find a way to deal with this and challenge the administration as to what you are trying to accomplish in the long-term. As multi-disciplinary problems become a larger and larger part of the academy, the traditional models of organization are under strain both here and elsewhere in the Academy.

A. Phelps moved to table this motion, seconded by L. Lawley.

**Vote to table Motion #1 carried with 24 in favor, 7 opposed and 3 abstentions.**

This motion will be brought to senate prior to the Full Policy being voted on for approval. Any feedback or discussion needs to be sent to K. Waterstram-Rich.

**Motion #2:** The Academic Senate approves the change to B2.0.5.2 as proposed by the Faculty Affairs Committee.

“The operations officer of the Senate shall validate the number of voting members in each college by January 15th each year from a list provided by the provost and shall allocate a certain number of senators to each according to the following procedure. **Each college shall have one representative for the first 15 university level voting faculty or fraction thereof and a second representative when the university level voting faculty count reaches 30 faculty. Thereafter each college shall have one**
representative per 30 university-level voting faculty or fraction thereof. No college shall have more than 20% of the total representatives not counting the representatives of the Deans Council.”

Discussion and Q&A ensued.

- Q: L. Lawley asked for clarification of the numbers per college and would that not increase the size of the senate considerably? She asked this during the time another motion was presented and P. Tymann asked to keep to the motion at hand.
  
  A: K. Waterstram-Rich: The intent of the motion is that colleges with less than 30 voting faculty, would have one representative and those colleges with 30 would have 2 senators and an additional senator for every fraction thereof, as stated in the current wording.

- P. Tymann suggested to bring this motion and portion of B2.0 back to FAC and bring this back to senate after we bring the GIS representative motion back.

- Comment: T. Engstrom asked that we stick with the question of what will constitute a governance entity, which is entirely different from worrying about what is (or is not) a disciplinary identity. Whether GIS is or is not seen as a specific disciplinary field is not the question. Colleges are administrative and governance entities; they presume no natural or necessary disciplinary identity. In my own case, I have much more in common with the philosophy and ethics of sustainability than I do with engineering psychology, although I share a college with that discipline. Finding an appropriate collegiate location to participate in the governance system should be distinguished from whether or not it is identical with one’s disciplinary affiliation.

Motion #2 was tabled with one not in favor and one abstention.

Motion #3: The Academic Senate approves the changes to B2.0.2.3 as proposed by the Faculty Affairs Committee.

2.3 “The voting members of the faculty at the university level are the tenure-track faculty and principal and senior lecturers who: 1) serve full-time in their appointments at RIT; and 2) devote at least half time to teaching, research, academic administration or other academically related duties.

Discussion and Q&A ensued.

- Q: For clarification, T. Engstrom asked if lecturers would be able to vote for senators.
  
  A: K. Waterstram-Rich said voting would be for a senior or principal lecturer representative, not the college senator.

- S. Boedo: Per 2.3, the issue is voting members at the department level. If something came up at the university level, could the senior lecturers vote on this?
  
  Response: They could vote but would be non-voting at senate. K. Waterstram-Rich said yes, they would be able to vote on something at the university level.

- C. Hull: Since this has come forth with B2.0, now lecturers in our college feel less integrated. We should not segregate them.
  
  Response: Faculty as a whole are on opposite ends of the spectrum. Some faculty don’t feel lecturers should vote. Some feel lectures should be embraced at every level. There are a multitude of opinions and we have heard from AAUP as well. We have lecturers that do feel disenfranchised. In this proposal this is the step where recognition is given to lecturers and it is a good place to start. Some people will be thrilled and some will not. We are trying to reflect changes in the university and FAC believes this is the best route to take.

- B. Barbato: In regards to voting rights, voting right at the university level and not at a college level is this the FAC’s idea or is this in the Charter? Could you give me some examples of this? This seems
messy and compromises can be messy and unclear. Should senior lecturers have voting rights at all? Response: K. Waterstram-Rich said principle and senior lecturers could vote on most committees except for committees such as ICC, Graduate Council or RABC.

- B. Barbato suggested to fold motion 3 into motion 4 and remove the terminology about university level and college and department level and replace it with voting rights.

- P. Tymann said if principle and senior lecturers have voting rights on all matters, it would be all matters except for what is listed in motion 4 (1. Budgetary and employment decisions, 2. Promotion and appointments beyond their rank, 3. Scholarship-related decisions, 4. Curriculum decisions that require ICC or Graduate Council approval).

- C. Thoms noted that principle and senior lecturers are not required to do service.
Response: K. Waterstram-Rich said regular lecturers are not required to do service but principal and senior lecturers are expected to do service as stated in E6.0.

- L. Lawley: Section 2.2 defines voting members of the department and 2.3 defines voting members of the college. And any changes in the full charter needs to be approved by voting members of the faculty. Response: K. Waterstram-Rich said 2.2 defines voting faculty at the university level and 2.3 puts it in college and departments.

P. Tymann requested that K. Waterstram-Rich and B. Barbato craft the wording of a new motion to return to senate next week, per combining motions 2 and 3.

**Motion #4:** The Academic Senate approves the new B2.0.2.4 as proposed by the Faculty Affairs Committee.

**2.4** The voting members of the faculty at the college and department level are the tenure-track faculty and principal and senior lecturers. Certain committees have specifications regarding membership. Membership specifications that are set forth in policy will be adhered to. Specifically tenure-track faculty shall vote on all matters except promotion and appointments beyond their rank or otherwise specified. Principle lecturers, and senior lecturers vote on all matters except:

- 1. Budgetary and employment decisions
- 2. Promotion and appointments beyond their rank
- 3. Scholarship-related decisions
- 4. Curriculum decisions that require ICC or Graduate Council approval

Due to time constraints there was no discussion and Q&A regarding motion #4.

Proposed B2.0 will return to senate next week, March 22, 2012.

**POLICY E18.0 (Faculty Leave for Professional/Career Development)**

Kristen. Waterstram-Rich, FAC Chair

Due to time constraints E18.0 was unable to be presented and will be on the March 22, 2012 senate agenda.

**ADJOURNMENT**