CALL TO ORDER: 12:08 p.m.

COMMUNICATION OFFICER’S REPORT: Minutes of April 5, 2012 were approved unanimously.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT
None

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ELECTIONS
Paul Rosenberg, chair of the Nominations Committee reported that a slate of nominees was secured for the election to take place on April 19th. A one-page ballot was distributed. There was concern from L. Lawley that voting was taking place without the opportunity for senators to review the bios and vision statements provided by the nominees prior to April 19th and hence should be postponed to next week. It was noted that election information (nominee slate and bios/vision statements) was sent to senators well in advance for all to review prior to April 19th meeting.

A question arose as to when the elections should take place according to B2.0 – the Charter of Governance. It was identified that the Charter of Governance stipulates elections to be conducted the 7th week of classes, which is the week of April 23rd. It was noted that April 26th was originally only a hold date for senate meeting and hence the elections were decided to be held on April 19th. P. Tymann affirmed that the EC would prefer to finish the process on April 19th.

The floor was then opened for additional nominations.

Mike Laver nominated Heidi Miller (CHST senator) to the Operations Officer position, which was seconded and accepted by Heidi. Eli Saber (KGCOE) was already placed on the ballot for this position, as well.

M. Richmond commented that since H. Miller is a new candidate on the ballot and no one had read her bio, he asked if she could share briefly her biography and vision statement for the position.

H. Miller indicated that this was her 19th year at RIT and is currently the Director of the Physician Assistant program (formerly housed in COS and now is housed in CHST). H. Miller also elaborated on
her service to RIT on numerous institute committees (Grievance Committee, Appeals Committee, Parking, LRPC, Student Learning Outcomes Committee etc.) over the years. She highlighted her philosophy to promote critical, creative and ongoing dialogue in this important time for RIT, wrought with challenges and opportunities for growth. She accepted the nomination and said she would be honored and pleased to serve on the executive committee.

The election results were as follows and congratulations went to those who will serve on the Academic Senate Executive Committee for AY2012-13:

CHAIR:   P. Tymann (GCCIS)  
VICE CHAIR:   S.M. (Ram) Ramkumar (CAST)  
OPERATIONS OFFICER:  Heidi Miller  (CHST)  
[Note: Eli Saber (KGCOE) had also been a nominee for the Operations Officer position and it was a very close race.]  
COMMUNICATIONS OFFICER: Andrew Phelps (GCCIS)  
TREASURER:   Charlotte Thoms (NTID)

REPORTS
SIS UPDATE  
PPt Presentation:  http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14968

Joe Loffredo, RIT Registrar presented the new SIS status report and said we are on the verge of meeting our goal of fall registration being on time. The timeline was reviewed (see PPt) and focused on Launch #3 (student records, student center, faculty center and advisor center).

In the conversion process of Launch 3, 14 million rows of data have been converted, which includes the entire academic history of the students that are not archived. We have also converted the degree records of archived students. Interfaces were created as well. Legacy (present RIT system) will stay in affect through this summer. All changes from Legacy for terms prior to fall 2012 will be interfaced to or dual entered in the new SIS through the end of summer. Fifty training sessions have been held to date with approximately 2,500 attendees. The training videos and class search visual tour have had over 10,000 views. J. Loffredo gave kudos to Tina Sturgis and Luke Auburn for their work with developing, organizing and running the training efforts. Tina is also offering daily HELP sessions which have been very well attended. In the communications area (facebook, blog, video, etc.) it has been very good in communicating with RIT and outside of RIT. This has been helpful with many concerns being addressed and questions answered daily. There have been daily updates to key groups in the colleges, as well. To report problems or ask questions you may use the “Questions/Problems” link on Infocenter.

The Advisor Center and Faculty Center were made available last week. The Student Center was made available this week and the Student Enrollment Center will be made available next week.

The new features will provide the following:

- Shopping carts will allow students to plan their schedule and backup schedules weeks in advance. Students can select classes and all can be done before enrollment. Students should be made aware of this and be encouraged to use this system now.
- 24/7 access (Legacy was down at midnight and up at 6 a.m. so the new system.)
• All is integrated into one place
• There are automated wait lists to replace Unmet Needs.
• Will eliminate shadow systems and centralize information to improve student service.
• Class swaps create a safety net when you want to switch classes
• Expanded class schedule
• Visual class schedule
• Registration appointments (randomly gives 30 minute appointments, 150 students per ½ hr during the day)

Q&A and Discussion ensued.

• Q: J. Voelkel: How are they (enrollment appointments) prioritized?
  A: Randomly, within year level.
• Q: C. Thoms: In regards to pre-requisites, when registering will this keep students from registering.
  A: Course pre-requisites will be put in place starting in fall 2013.
• Q: D. Tower DuBois: What happens if students are on a different level but they register in another level. Will they then be locked?
  A: If a course is restricted to year-level 1 students and a student is year-level 2, they will be prevented from enrolling in this class.
• Q: M. Richmond: Each year will be identified by a 4-digit number and please explain this.
  A: The new system only has 4 digits to represent an academic term. As a result, fall 2012 will be represented as 2121 instead of 20121.
• L. Lawley: Students have been publicly commenting on the serious problems with the new system’s interface. There are problems for faculty, too. The new system does not allow faculty to look up the records of an individual student, which is often necessary when checking prerequisites, providing informal advising, or writing letters of recommendation.
  A: We have a request pertaining to this and this will go to the committee and the senior team.
• T. Engström: Commented on the icon term ”Shopping Cart”. He thought we should look less like Walmart or Amazon and adopt symbols that belong to a university. We shouldn’t be diminishing what we do or encourage students to think that making curricular choices is like being an online customer. The shopping cart icon is embarrassing and hardly dignifies what we do or how students should think about it. Could it be changed in favor of something that better represents who we are as an academy, perhaps something like a “Library Shelf” on which to arrange courses, rather than a “shopping cart” to collect products.
  A: J. Loffredo said he understood the concern. At present their directive was to implement the system with little to no customizations, including changing key terminology in the system.
• J. Voelkel: The guiding principle at RIT should be that the student see a smooth transition into semesters and it is important we do not use the wrong words. In not being able to look up right away the student’s name and information this keeps us as faculty from helping the students and again making the transition for them to RIT less smooth. It is functionality that needs to improve.
• Q: O. Palacio: Is there a way that all things can be addressed (i.e. academic restriction etc.) to get solved and what kind of process can be implemented? Many faculty and students are not happy with the new SIS and I am asking you and the Provost how we can make a change in this system so students are not perceived as customers.
  Response: J. Haefner said there is a robust team that is taking input, prioritizing requests for changes and discussing the factors. This will continue after Go Live 3 is stabilized. All of these
concerns and suggestions are important features to be taken into consideration. The most important aspect is that we need a stable and accurate system for the students right now and the interface may lack some features and usability but it is key that students have access to this. All is proceeding well.

- Q: P. Tymann: What would be the most effective way for senate input to come forth?
  A: The Provost said we need to work through this system so the right people get the right information.
  Response: P. Tymann said that if senators had concerns, to send them directly to EC and the EC will get them to the appropriate people.
  J. Loffredo said he is thankful for the feedback and ultimately the senior team makes the final decision.

- C. Lundgren disagreed with individual issues coming forth and said a list of issues from all of RIT should come through the academic senate and need to see this addressed. Faculty are obligated to do advising and when the tools are not there, this will compromise our responsibility.

- Q: Can a member of the senate attend meetings of the SIS team or talk to one of the committee members.
  A: The Provost responded that everyone today is talking to one of the committee members.

- T. Policano: Every customization is a repeat cost. Can the customization be made by RIT?
  A: We apply for customization to be made, but every customization has to be tested after every update to the base software. It is possible for us to do the customization.
  Provost: This is a good question for Jeanne Casares.

- M-B. Cooper (VP for Student Affairs): Many do have concerns and she said she appreciates these concerns, but we are operating under the same constraint of the budget. This really is a cause and affect situation and it has been the president’s dictate to save on funds. The concerns need to be prioritized. Before students did not have a lot of information and now they do. It is important to gather feedback and input and to see what the cost would be in making changes.

- P. Lachance: In CIAS we were told with the new SIS system that faculty will not have access to academic records of students unless they are advisees.
  A: J. Loffredo: In the new system there is an auto provision process that grants rights to faculty center and advisor center. By default you are granted access to the records of your advisees. We still need to determine the process to grant access to all student records. I will be working out this process with the Provost and the leadership of each college.

- J. Voelkel: At IC yesterday, it was said the initial cost of this is $4M and it is not uncommon for a university to spend $20M and there is a significant cost doing customization. Companies charge a lot and are making a lot of money.
  Response: Provost: The President does understand there will be additional costs, but does not want the costs to escalate out of hand. At Colorado University, there was a 5-year process to implement PeopleSoft and this cost was $40M.
  Response: F. Walker said at the University of Maine with PeopleSoft, the work started at $18M and with customization the cost was $40M and climbing.

- Comment: L. Lawley said students in her program have already built browser extensions and other front ends at no cost for use. One student had built a browser extension and they were told that RIT was going another route. She expressed that she had wished this process had been more open to all at RIT, including faculty, staff and students to get involved. We seem to be ignoring the technical skills on this campus. It does not have to cost $20,000 to change the icon for “shopping cart”.
  Response: Provost said that he will take this back to the committee regarding having a more transparent process and yet emphasized the tight timetable to have students register on time.
Stephanie Ludi and Dan Johnson, LRPC co-chairs presented the LRPC’s final report. The charge was to consider need for a representative nature of a master plan for construction on campus. The Ppt can be viewed (see link above) for more details on what was shared. Both Stephanie Ludi and Dan Johnson said the committee conferred with members of the administration in regards to working on their charge this year. The basis of their findings this year were that the committee perceived haphazard project to project approach and also general plans were not well known or available. She reviewed the unmet needs at RIT and unknown resolution plans (i.e., general classrooms, active/project learning spaces, research labs and project spaces etc. – see Ppt for more details). D. Johnson said the committee met with Jim Yarrington. There was a general discussion about classroom space. The master plan (started in 2001 and updated in 2006) was shown on the Ppt and a current plan is due for update. This master plan was not on the website and it should be there. It focused on architectural look and feel and includes few specifics.

The strategic plan has just been updated and the specifics are: innovation and creativity, projected enrollment, global education and research.

Key result areas and focused needs versus existing needs was reviewed (i.e. Where do most students live – Global Village; need more appropriate housing). http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14966 (slide 9)

S. Ludi shared on the facility plans being linked to the strategic plans.

Comment: O. Palacio: I do not see anything regarding sustainability, landscape etc.

The LRPC gave the following recommendation (see Ppt slide number 14 for the full recommendation but only this part of the recommendation was voted on):

Form a team to update and detail the Campus Master Plan with respect to the current Strategic Plan.

Paul Stiebitz, Associate Academic Director of GIS said that the architectural program and Sustainability Program would welcome this.

The recommendation to form a team was approved unanimously with one abstention.

PROPOSED POLICY D3.0 (Registration)

Proposed D3.0 revisions: http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14950

Linda Tolan, AAC member reviewed the changes made to policy D3.0 and then opened up the floor for discussion per the proposed revisions and comments.

- Page 3 of D3.0 added: [under D. Adding and Dropping Courses, section 10]
  “In extenuating circumstances in which a student requests to be added or dropped from a class outside of the established add/drop period, the student must submit a completed Add/Drop Audit
form, with all required signatures, to the Registrar’s Office.

Discussion and Q&A:

- J. Voelkel: Line 95 has a typo and should read: Add/Drop/Audit.
- A suggestion came to add a phrase about a 7-day Add/Drop period during the summer. 
  Response: Per the summer term, this is more like intercession, as it is 10 weeks versus 15 weeks.
- M. Richmond: A faculty person in his college approached him with this scenario, that if a 
  student is enrolled in a course and never shows up, yet there is a seat available for one who could 
  have taken this course. 
  Response: L. Tolan said it is the student’s responsibility to drop/add and the system will not be 
  able to do this.
- P. Lachance: We were told Add/Drop was going away. 
  A: J. Loffredo said there will be both a paper process and an electronic process.
- J. Voelkel: Per the terms, there are courses that sometimes do not run the full term and could we 
  add the word “full term” to the policy?
- Line 93, could you put in “15-week”?

P. Tymann recommended the committee edit the policy as needed and this will return to senate on 
April 26, 2012 for a vote on the final document.

PROPOSED POLICY E18.0 (Faculty Leave) 
Proposed E18 (current version with mark-up revisions): http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14951 
Power Point Presentation: http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14966

Tom Policano (FAC member) presented proposed policy E18.0 and reviewed the revisions being made 
to this policy. The rationale for the changes made to this policy were to provide clarity, remove 
references to the quarter system and present a policy that reflects practice.

The changes were reviewed and can be read on the PPt presentation http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14966 .

Q&A and Discussion ensued.

- E. Saber: Commented on the portion regarding leave of absence the first year and asked that this 
  language be clarified. Are the terms of leaves fixed as listed or can the Board of Trustees change 
  the terms? The language says you can intervene anytime. 
  A: T. Policano said the terms listed are the expected terms usually but the BOT has the right, 
  since they are fiscally responsible for the University, to change the terms offered from what is in 
  the policy.

- Q: Must you take the leave once you apply for this? 
  A: The Provost said faculty always has the right for deferment of leaves or it can be denied. 
  Comment: T.Policano said we should clarify what the intent is in the event of faculty cancelling 
  the leave.

P. Tymann asked that a final proposed document come back to senate 4/26/2012 for vote.

CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE- Final Report and Recommendations 
http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14967
Due to time constraints, the CEC’s final presentation was not presented and will return to senate next week.

P. Tymann said it is important that the CEC report that will be sent to senators be reviewed and sent to your constituents as it is being considered that RIT become a “smoke-free” campus.

**OTHER COMMENTS**
C. Lundgren announced that two RIT students just won the Rochester Business Plan Competition and they are:

Sean Petterson, Industrial Design student from CIAS
Justin Hillery, MDS

RIT must be very proud of these two students!

**ADJOURNMENT:** 1:50 p.m.