

APPROVED 4/19/2012

**ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
ACADEMIC SENATE
APRIL 5, 2012: 12:10-1:50 P.M.
BAMBOO ROOM/CAMPUS CENTER**

Present: J. Beck, S. Boedo, H. Boice-Pardee (M-B. Copper's Alt.), S. Bower, L. Bryant, D. Defibaugh, T. Engström, J. Haefner, R. Hira, C. Hull, P. Lachance, M. Laver, L. Lawley, C. Lundgren, S. Maggelakis, H. Miller, A. Phelps, T. Policano, G. Pollock, L. Quinsland (NTID Alt.), S. Radziszowski, S.M. Ramkumar, M. Richmond, M. Ruhling, M. Savka, A. Sears (Alt. for F. Walker), V. Serravallo, H. Shahmohamad, C. Thoms, D. Tower DuBois, P. Tymann, J. Voelkel, G. Zion

Members Absent: B. Barbato, D. Defibaugh, H. Ghazle, M. Johnson, M. Kotlarchyk, G. Pollock, L. Wild

Excused: L. Bryant, E. Saber

Guests: Linda Tolan, Kristen Waterstram-Rich

Interpreters: Carolyn Knopp (Lomeo); Gayle Macias

CALL TO ORDER: 12:10 p.m.

COMMUNICATION OFFICER'S REPORT: Minutes of March 22, 2012 and March 29, 2012 were both approved unanimously.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

No report.

Roll Call taken for voting members of the senate.

GENERAL EDUCATION PRESENTATION AND FYS PROPOSAL

Ppt Presentation: <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14934>

FYS Proposal: <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14889>

G. Zion continued the report from March 29, 2012 per the Gen Ed FYS proposal. He reviewed the proposal of the 1st year foundations elections. These would fulfill the learning outcomes. Next year students will be required to take a Gen Ed election and the Foundation electives will be required in Fall 2013. The Provost agreed to provide stipends to committee members working on these changes throughout the summer.

Discussion and Q&A.

- **Q:** M. Richmond: The goals of this program seem to duplicate the Science Technology and Society. The First-Year Seminar sounds like a course already offered.
A: The goal of the original FYS proposal was to combine the efforts of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs to meet both general education outcomes and transition to college like issues that students face. Since the proposed Foundation Electives will replace the original FYS in the General Education Framework, the transition to college like topics no longer need to be addressed. It was recommended that this course could be proposed as a Foundation Elective.
Q: M. Richmond: Why is it important to involve Academic Affairs?
A: They help with house issues and having a placeholder, we would like to resurrect FYS.

Motion to approve the proposal of the First-Year electives and have the General Education Committee develop a framework for First-Year electives carried with 24 in favor, 1 opposed and 2 abstentions.

The next charge that was presented was to develop procedures and criteria for the definition of immersion courses. A brief description of immersion courses was presented (chart where they enter the courses, pre-requisites and any additional comments about the structure.) There are 400 courses and if you do not have a 300 courses an explanation is required. Students that are ineligible will use a minor proposal form.

The last charge to the GEC reviewed at today's meeting was to update the senate on the progress regarding the charge to review decisions, process, criteria and guidelines for determining when a course is included in the Gen Ed Curriculum. A flow chart was presented in the Ppt presentation: <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14934> . Does the course fit? Does the course meet at least one student learning outcome? Has it been requested as a Gen Ed course?

The General Education Curriculum course review process was reviewed. If there are no overlap issues then it goes to the Provost for final approval. If the committee has to, it is then referred back to the college curriculum committee to resolve issues and then goes back to the Deans and then the cross-disciplinary committee. Yet this could be a problem as the cross-disciplinary committee may be going away. With some courses there were some issues with perspective courses and these were asked by the committee for slight modifications to be made.

Q&A

- Q: T. Engström: We do have a multi-disciplinary curriculum committee (as a standing committee). Wouldn't it be appropriate for this committee to play a roll in resolving questions of cross-disciplinarity and overlap?
A: G. Zion: Since the GEC and MDCC committees have similar membership and the MDCC would not have the expertise in the General Education, adding the MDCC to the process may be counterproductive.
Q: T. Engström: If there is not an issue then it goes to the Provost, but if there is an anomaly where does it go for potential resolution first?
A: G. Zion: Since the Provost has representation on the Gen Ed Committee, any anomalies are identified and resolved before going to the Provost.
- Comment: S. Boedo: It would be nice to have a "yes" or "no" response in the last process to have closure.

POLICY E6.0 (FACULTY RANK)

E6.0.2.d (1) – Proposed Wording: <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14935>

Proposed E6.0: <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14939>

K. Waterstram-Rich reviewed all the proposed changes to the policy. <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14939>

Lines 87-97 will be replaced with the following proposed criteria for Promotion to Professor [E6.0.2.d (1)] once approved:

The basis for the promotion of an Associate Professor to Professor is effectiveness of teaching, the quality and scope of scholarship, and service including the leadership in or contributions to professional activities on and off campus. Since receiving tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, the candidate shall have an established record that indicates continued growth, development and accomplishment in teaching; research, scholarship or creative work; and service including leadership. The successful candidate for promotion will have a record that is judged to be excellent overall in regards to the three categories of work identified in E4.0 Faculty Employment Policies.

Discussion and Q&A ensued.

- Several senators asked about the requirements of scholarship, teaching and service and in the wording proposed in E6 regarding promotion, does one have to be excellent in all three categories and what if you are not excellent in all three? How would one interpret this pertaining to being excellent?
A: K. Waterstram-Rich: The balance of the work would be judged to be excellent.
- Suggestion: E. Saber: Could the wording be “judged to be competitive or benchmarked” instead of saying “judged to be excellent?”
- Motion from T. Policano: He moved that Line 776, paragraph 4, regarding policy E5 (tenure) be re-worded to read:
Appointment to this classification does not qualify one for consideration for tenure or other privileges accorded to tenured and tenure-track faculty (see [E5.0](#)). **Tenure-track faculty who are accepted to a research faculty position will be given a leave of absence from their tenure faculty position. Details regarding tenure-track faculty who are appointed to research faculty positions ~~prior to earning tenure~~ are located in [E5.0-Policies on Tenure](#).**

There was no 2nd to the motion, so the motion failed.

- Suggestion: S. Boedo: He asked to remove the last sentence of the proposed wording to E6.0.2.d (1) as he felt that the present proposed wording is doing a pre-judging action that should be done by the committee. He also felt that the word “excellent” can be interpreted in a generic way or a concrete way. Response: K. Waterstram-Rich did not see the issue here as it is clear what excellent means.
- S. Radziszowski: He agreed that the last sentence either be removed or re-worded.
- Suggestion: O. Palacio: Suggested to change the word “judge” in the last sentence to “evaluated”. And why are we changing the criteria?
A: K. Waterstram-Rich: Moving from Associate to Full Professor you are doing something substantial and you deserve the title of Professor. You have excelled and have continued to produce. Since tenure you have continued to produce and excel. The wording is being changed because of the suggestions from the last senate meeting.
- Provost: There are two camps, focused on excellent and overall. Consistency is what we want professors to emulate. The wording being proposed (excellent overall) are the kinds of standards we want and are looking for. We have set excellence as a standard and this is worked out at the committee level. One may not be excellent in all areas. Yet when reviewed by the Deans, Chairs, etc., do they think overall that their work constitutes excellence.
- A. Phelps: There seems to be concern that the Chair could somehow stall the process, or use this wording in order to not put someone forward for promotion. But as the policy is amended, nomination for promotion can come from the chair, the peer group, or from the candidate themselves.
- Suggestion: T. Engstrom: Change the wording to read:
“...the candidates shall be judged in terms of whether they have an established record that indicates etc.”
Change last sentence to read: **Candidates for promotion shall be judged in terms of whether they have a record ...”**
- Q: J. Voelkel: No matter how it is worded, the whole idea of promotion is subject to annual review. If we accept the words as they are, this implies that this needs continued growth and is this what you intend to say?
A: K. Waterstram-Rich: I would envision that someone is always growing in their area of expertise. Yet are you saying because they have one patent, now they need two?

- Another suggestion was given to end the last sentence with the word “overall” and move the rest of that sentence, tweeking it somewhat, at the end of the second to the last sentence.
K. Waterstram-Rich **accepted this as a friendly amendment.**
- M. Savka: Suggested to delete “in regards to the three categories”.
Response: T. Engstrom: Maximum redundancy is not a bad thing. It may be the best way to avoid ambiguity or uncertainty.
K. Waterstram-Rich: Did not accept the friendly amendment to delete the words M. Savka suggested.
- Suggestion: S. Boedo: Add the word “established” before the word “record” to have it read in the last sentence “established record.”
A: K. Waterstram-Rich: Even if you have an established record, you need to have continued growth.
Response: C. Hull: There may be greater confusion if you put in “established record.” H agreed to delete the rest of the sentence after “overall”.
- T. Engström: Per line 246 asked if this line regarding requesting letters includes “department chair”- especially as not all chairs are full professors and so won’t necessarily have the rank otherwise required of those rendering judgment.
Response: A. Phelps: A letter coming from a chair who is tenured is different than coming from a chair who is not yet promoted. He suggested the wording say “require a letter from the department chair”.
Response: E. Saber: This could cause a conflict of interest.
Response: T. Engstrom: A department chair is already empowered by the annual review process, thus the potential conflict of rank is already being subsumed by the power of the chair to assess those of higher rank.
Response: P. Lachance: She agreed with A. Phelps that we still think the department chair should be writing a letter for the person going up for promotion.
- One senator stated he has no department chair.
Response: There will be a glossary that will accommodate differences among colleges.
- Q: O.Palacio: Per line 196, “tenured professors”, does this mean all full professors?
Response: J. Winebrake: It would be good to insert “full” professors in this line.
- Q: L. Lawley: Can’t we hire someone in a professorial rank?
A: The Provost said policies do allow that.
- H. Boice Pardee: Lines 326-327 begins with a generic overall comment. Faculty teach courses for academic credit. They also teach non-credit courses.
Response: This is the umbrella defining this. This change was accepted.
- M.Ruhling: Other courses other than credit and non-credit courses say “teaching courses.”
- Q: O. Palacio: What is a non-credit course?
A: K. Waterstram-Rich: Wellness courses.
A: G. Zion: Non-transcript courses.
- Q: T. Engström asked in the interest of consistency and transparency that policy regarding “distinguished professor” also entail a process by which recommendations make their way to the Provost. He suggested we might treat it as a special case and fold it into the Emeritus portion of policy for consideration as a similar kind of case.
A: K. Waterstram-Rich said “distinguished professor” is not a rank, yet we can put this into Line 886.

Proposed E6.0.2.d (1) as amended was voted on for approval as follows:

The basis for the promotion of an Associate Professor to Professor is effectiveness of teaching, the quality and scope of scholarship, and service including the leadership in or contributions to professional activities on and off campus. Since receiving tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, candidates shall be judged in terms of whether they have an established record that indicates continued growth, development and accomplishment in teaching; research, scholarship or creative work;

and service including leadership, as described in *E4.0 Faculty Employment Policies*. Candidates for promotion shall be judged in terms of whether they have a record that is deemed excellent overall.

Motion to approve the proposed E6.0.2.d (1) as amended carried with 21 in favor, 2 opposed and 4 abstentions.

A motion to approve **all** proposed changes to E6.0 including the amendment for Distinguished Professor to be added carried with 21 in favor, 0 opposed and 6 abstentions.

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO POLICY D3.0 (Registration)

Proposed Policy D3.0: <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14940>

Linda Tolan, AAC member reviewed the changes being proposed today for Policy D3.0 The following changes were made to improve clarity and have a coherent policy, have updated terminology with the new SIS system (Joe Loffredo, Registrar aided the committee with this), remove processes from the old system, and all new policies were included. This was vetted to as many constituent groups as possible.

Proposed revisions are as follows:

- Add/drop period change (line D-Line 64) – change initiated to ensure that campus faculty/staff are available to guide and assist students on the final day of the add/drop period. Graduate Council approved this.
- Updates to Independent Study to specify guidelines are for both undergraduate and graduate students
- Complete reorganization of topics presented in the policy.

Terminology was updated as follows:

- Matriculated = Degree-seeking
- Non-matriculated = Non-degree-seeking
- Quarter = Term
- Course levels for semesters =
 - Undergraduate – 100-500
 - Graduate – 600-900

The request for this proposal is that it be effective for semesters beginning August 2013.

Discussion and Q&A ensued.

- Q: T. Engström: Per line 17 of the proposed policy, are we allowing audits and does it require formal registration?
A: L.Tolan: Yes, students must register for any audits and full explanation of what is allowed for an audit is found in Policy D5.
- T. Engström made a suggestion that line 117 say: The requested courses *or its equivalent* is not available at the home institution. It would be unusual for courses and course titles to be identical across institutions.
Response: L. Tolan said this is an actual part of a consortium agreement. And she did approve what T. Engström requested, as a friendly amendment.
- Q: M. Richmond: Is it intended to tell me it is my responsibility?
A: Joe Loffredo, Registrar, said we would like faculty to help, but cannot require that.
- Q: S. Boedo: Faculty and staff must be available after drop/add and what if it is Saturday?
A: J. Loffredo said they have not looked into this yet, and it won't end on a Saturday.

- C. Lundgren: I don't know if ramifications if a course does not meet in the first 7 days. It may be better to say "until all regularly scheduled classes...". Holiday deferral may be safer language.
Response: J.Loffredo said he will think about this.
Response L. Tolan : The Committee will work on re-wording to account for this and bring back a modified statement
- Q: J. Voelkel: Pertaining to line 64-69, why is the summer term standard length not listed?
A: L. Tolan said there are other time frames other than summer. She said they did not include as well intersession.

P. Tymann asked senators to please send issues to Linda Tolan per D3.0. This will return at the April 19 senate meeting.

Adjournment: 1:51 p.m.

