

**APPROVED 5/3/2012**

**ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY  
ACADEMIC SENATE  
APRIL 26, 2012: 12:05 - 1:50 p.m.  
CAMPUS CENTER/BAMBOO ROOM/2610**

**Present:** M. Amy (J. Beck's Alt.), S. Boedo, S. Bower, L. Bryant, M-B. Cooper, D. Defibaugh, T. Engström, J. Haefner, R. Hira, C. Hull, M. Johnson, M. Kotlarchyk, P. Lachance, M. Laver, L. Lawley, C. Lundgren, S. Mangelakis, H. Miller, O. Palacio, A. Phelps, T. Policano, G. Pollock, S. Radziszowski, S.M. Ramkumar, M. Richmond, M. Ruhling, M. Savka, V. Serravallo, H. Shahmohamad, C. Thoms, D. Tower DuBois, P. Tymann, J. Voelkel, F. Walker

**Members Absent:** H. Ghazle, G. Pollock, R. Sanchez, L. Wild, G. Zion

**Excused:** B. Barbato

**Guests:** Linda Tolan, Sandra Rothenberg, Kristen Waterstram-Rich

**Interpreters:** Carolyn Kropp, Gayle Macias

CALL TO ORDER: 12:05 p.m.

COMMUNICATION OFFICER'S REPORT: Minutes of April 19, 2012 and April 26, 2012 to be voted on for approval on May 3, 2012.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT: None

**PROPOSALS AND REPORTS:**

**POLICY D3.0** (Registration)

Proposed Revisions to Policy D3.0: <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14971>

Linda Tolan, AAC member reviewed the revisions made to Policy D3.0, Lines 90-93.

**MOTION: The Academic Senate approves the proposed revisions to Policy D3.0 (Registration) as presented by the Academic Affairs Committee.**

**Motion carried with 22 In Favor, 3 Opposed and 2 Abstentions.**

**POLICY D5.0** (Grades)

Important Changes Noted and Marked-Up Document reflecting all changes:

<http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14988>

Linda Tolan, AAC member reviewed important changes made to Policy D5.0 This policy has been reviewed by the Academic Affairs Committee, Graduate Council, the Registrar and the Senior Associate Provost.

When the committee reviewed Policy D5.0 they encountered a number of items that need to be semester only items. Therefore the committee recommended that this policy be a transitional policy with basic changes being made and then the committee will return to senate with more substantial issues at a later date. Graduate Council still wants to look over the portion regarding incompletes. This policy applies ONLY to academic year 2012-2013.

Today was only discussion of this policy. The committee received information from Doug Meadows, past chair of AAC regarding Grade Exclusion and therefore today's document was not yet ready for vote. The committee will get other voices to review and comment on the final version once it is ready to come back to senate for review and vote.

#### Discussion and Q&A:

- Q: There are 180 calendar days and does this include summer, as summer is a term? Also it was suggested having a reference to students being on campus in the summer.  
A: The committee will discuss this phrase regarding revising it to include summer.
- A question was raised about extensions. The full policy addresses extensions in detail.
- Q: M. Richmond: Will changing the "Z" grade to "AU", does this comply with the new SIS system?  
A: Yes.
- E. Saber: Changing from two quarters to three quarters, to include summer, may solve your problems.  
Response: The committee will work on the wording of this section.
- Q: What was the process in the shift of terminology from "faculty" to "instructor?"  
A: The FAC struggled with this and L. Tolan said she will follow up on the answer to this.

P. Tymann asked that the committee return to senate next week with an updated revised copy of D5.0 for senate vote, which will include grade exclusion and add/drop.

#### **POLICY E18.0 (Faculty Leave)**

**Proposed Policy E18.0:** <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14989>

Tom Policano, FAC member reviewed the proposed added changes to Policy E18.0 from suggestions at the April 19, 2012 Academic Senate meeting. <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14989>

#### Discussion and Q&A:

- Q: E. Saber: What if a professor wants to cancel an approved leave and what if they are told "you must go"? This should be made clearer in the policy. You should separate "cancel" from "defer" in the policy.  
A: K. Waterstram-Rich: You do have to receive permission to cancel an already approved leave and all have to follow through the process in policy.  
L. Lawley: If the department has made financial commitments, then does the professor have to take their leave?  
Suggestion: T. Engstrom: Should a timeline be added so there is no ambiguity?  
Response: K. Waterstram-Rich: Timelines may make this much more cumbersome. What complicates this is the commitment to the courses, commitment to adjuncts being put in place once the professor is on leave, etc.

- O. Palacio: Since the leave has been approved, should one go directly to the Provost to cancel? And could a 2-month timeline before the date of leave be put in the policy, per cancelling ones leave?

Response: T. Policano: This process needs to start at the department level. A clean summary is needed so the Provost can act accordingly.

- M. Kotlarchyk: Recommended not to have a timeline as personal issues or health reasons could arise and a timeline would not be helpful in this. This should be dealt with case by case.
- The Provost agreed that not putting in a timeline makes for better policy. No one should be forced to go on leave, and RIT will do everything we can if something arises that one wants to cancel their leave. Every deferment for a leave has been approved this year thus far.
- M. Amy: He questioned the validity of one taking two semesters off with a 50% reduction in pay, when a member of the faculty takes two semesters off, and this seems like punishment, especially since (a) faculty salaries are at the 26<sup>th</sup> percentile, and (b) we are increasingly being urged to produce significant scholarship, and this might require substantial sabbaticals (only once every seven years.) He asked if this is done across academia in America today?  
Response: Yes it is done across Academia in America.
- M. Savka: This varies in colleges, as some small liberal arts colleges in the United States offer sabbatical to tenured faculty every 4 years and are given 100% compensation during the sabbatical year.
- Provost: The President has made a commitment to move salaries on average to the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile. I am working with Dr. Watters on an action plan to meet the president's commitment. The Faculty Affairs Committee did a thorough job in reviewing this policy and what is in the policy now is common and best practice.

**MOTION: The Academic Senate approves the revisions to Policy E18.0 (Faculty Leave for Professional/Career Development) as proposed by the Faculty Affairs Committee.**

**Motion carried with 21 in favor and 5 abstentions.**

### **POLICY E13.0 (Faculty Salary)**

**Proposed Policy E13.0:** <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14990>

Sandra Rothenberg, FAC member reviewed the proposed changes to Policy E13.0.

The summary of changes helped to clean up the policy. The following proposed changes were reviewed:

- Terminology:  
Changed “Chief Academic Officer” to “provost”  
Change “Pay Checks” to “Salary Payments:
- Wording was clarified
- Changed 10 months to 9.5 months
- If you leave RIT before the end of the pay period for which there was advance pay, you have pay RIT back the following:
  - Salary and benefit payments paid during July and August
  - Note: Agree to change to “MUST” from the policy that you have

What was added was the following:

- Annual salary increments shall be determined on the basis of performance review, benchmarking, and cost of living, within the constraints of the pool available funding. (See Policy E7.0 on “Annual Review of Faculty”):  
<http://www.rit.edu/academicaffairs/policiesmanual/sectionE/E7.html>

#### Discussion and Q&A:

- Comment: E. Saber: Many other universities use 9 month versus 9.5 month contracts. Additionally, he said changing from quarters to semesters and ending around May 22 or 23d, there needs to be clarification in the policy regarding this. In regards to research 9.5 months should be looked at.  
Response: K. Waterstram-Rich said whether this is a 9 or 9.5 month contract, it is beyond the scope of this policy and this is an administrative decision. RIT did go to 9.5 months because of federal grants etc. We will have to ask administration to look at this or make it a charge for the Long Range Planning Committee next year.
- Q: When does start and stop begin for faculty?  
A: The word “generally” was put into the policy in regards to the dates beginning and ending of the 9.5 month contract so people could plan their lives.
- T. Engstrom: Edit: Very last line of the policy, drop the “s” on depends.

#### **MOTION 1: The Academic Senate approves the revisions to Policy E13.0 (Faculty Salary Policy) as proposed by the Faculty Affairs Committee.**

**Motion carried with 24 in favor and 4 abstentions.**

#### **POLICY E13.1 (Faculty Extra Service Compensation and Summer Employment)**

**Proposed Policy E13.1:** <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14995>

Sandra Rothenberg, FAC member summarized the changes and all can be viewed on the senate’s DML site through the link above.

The summary of changes cleaned up this policy and it was in regards to formatting, wording changes, brevity, reorganized portions, and adding that additional professional activities are not a part of the normal workload or extra service and therefore this would not make faculty eligible for extra compensation. The section on Scheduling Flexibility was removed. Summer employment was changed from 10 months to less than 12 months. Limits were put on externally-funded projects and university-funded projects.

#### Discussion and Q&A.

- Suggestion: E. Saber: Section 4, last line regarding “no additional compensation” should read “no additional compensation **from RIT**”.  
Was accepted as a friendly amendment.
- Q: Why was section 5.0, Scheduling Flexibility removed?  
A: We don’t have hours, only now a plan of work.
- Q: A. Phelps: In looking at the caps there seem to be some discrepancies. First, we seem to have somehow re-defined “full time” as different depending on the source of funding, i.e. internal or external to RIT. But this is at least clear when there is a clean break between these kinds of activities. I’m more concerned with situations where there is a blend of activities – for

example if someone were doing work over the summer for the university, and also contributing to a funded project. What would the cap be and how would we delineate between the two activities?

A: K. Waterstram-Rich: How is this not covered in your plan of work?

Response from A. Phelps: Administration faculty have to work over the summer and no department chair, coordinator or director makes a plan of work to cover these activities. It is commensurate with their position.

Response: K. Waterstram-Rich: With the department chair there is a contract and this is different than Policy 13.1.

Response: A. Phelps: I can give you examples of situations that conflate these issues. Contracts are cut for faculty with the 9.5 month contracts when summer expectations are required. There is a grey area in which the university has expectations relative to a position beyond the 9.5 month contract, while at the same time encouraging external support.

- Provost: There are different ways of compensating administration and faculty are given flexibility to do their research.
- President Destler: I'm concerned that it appears the Institute will pay for service at a lower rate than we apply to externally funded projects and we need to address this issue. I believe this needs to be looked at by legal counsel.
- T. Engstrom: In 3.1 (definition of extra service) there is a confusion between "extra service" as what happens *after* the plan of work is determined and "extra service" as what is confirmed *by* a plan of work. It can't work both ways.

A: S. Rothenberg: This is a problem and extra service can be in the plan of work or may not be in the plan of work.

T. Engstrom: There should be an "either" or an "or" clause in this definition.

- C. Hull commented on needing more specificity regarding "flexibility" and gave an example of grading exams all weekend, and needing to drop off his daughter at day-care and in that instance would need that flexibility during the day. Faculty work many hours outside the normal workday, and the flexibility clause we now have takes this into account. Additionally the policy does not address what happens in "intersession" and a clause is needed in this policy regarding this. Are we still planning to allow faculty members, with department chair permission, to treat courses taught during the intersession toward their annual total?

Response: Provost: The Compensation Model for January intersession has not been set. It is suggested to have the same flexibility using the summer as an optional load, which gives more flexibility.

- Suggestion: L. Lawley: In the first sentence under 3.1, put a period after the word "year". Additionally she said this is becoming an issue defining 9.5 months and 12 months. Deciding when it is extra service and when it is contract may create some issues. Some people working 12 months may be compensated for only 9.5 months.

- Q: L. Lawley: Doesn't "normal workload" assignments cover your workload?

A: S. Rothenberg: This will return to the FAC for further discussion.

K. Waterstram-Rich: When this policy returns to FAC, we will discuss these issues and make the policy more clear.

- D. Tower DuBois: Extra service should be under self-appraisal.

The Faculty Affairs Committee will work on this policy and it will return to senate on May 3, 2012.

## **GRADUATE COUNCIL- FINAL REPORT AND SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS TO D12.0.E. Master's Degree/D12.0.F Doctoral Degree**

**PPT Presentation of Final Report and Policy Proposals:** <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14996>  
**Proposed suggestions to D12.0E and D12.0.F:** <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14997>

Agamemnon Crassidis, Graduate Council Chair reviewed the suggested modifications to DE12.0E Master's Program first, and then reviewed the changes to the Doctoral Degree. (See links above to the report and proposed suggestions to Policy D12.0.E and D12.0.F.)

Discussion and Q&A:

- E. Saber asked that the policy be more clearer per when the seven years begins.
- A. Phelps pointed out the ambiguity regarding when the seven years starts when a student is in the BS/MS program  
J. Loffredo: The new system may be able to accommodate this.
- H. Miller: Some Master's Programs allow students to take one or two programs and was concerned that RIT would count that as the 7-year extension.  
A: A. Crassidis: The intent of the 7-year extension is to now allow students to graduate with their most recent classwork.
- J. Voelkel: Is Graduate Council making all the decisions?  
A: Decisions are usually made by the Graduate Council sub-committee.

During the discussion the following edits or suggestions were made and will be taken back to the Graduate Council for consideration:

- 1) T. Engstrom: Under Petitions for Extension, Page 7, first bullet, "should" change to "shall be submitted" This was accepted as a friendly amendment.
- 2) T. Policano: Rearrange the numbers on page 3 – 1-5 would now be 1-6 (Start out with #1 being the first sentence, all else is moved down to #2..and will end with number 6.)
- 3) Page 5, 2nd paragraph, change the word "degree" to "*program with a Master's Degree*"
- 4) There was a question about page 9, 2nd sentence, the word "*unusual complexity*" and whether to change that wording – T. Engstrom commented on this. T. Policano said it could possibly say "if the student wishes to appeal" but Hector Flores felt the wording should remain as is (unusual complexity) as there are cases where a judgment has to be made in some cases.
- 5) A. Phelps: Should there be a final process of appeal to the Provost if Graduate Council is not able to resolve an issue? When I served on grad council years ago it was at that time the viewpoint of academic affairs that these decisions were ultimately the responsibility of the Provost from the viewpoint of NYSED.

The updated proposed modifications to this policy will return to senate on May 3, 2012, for discussion and vote.

**CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE - FINAL REPORT**

Due to time constraints this agenda item was deferred and will return to senate in the future.

ADJOURNMENT: 1:51 p.m.