CALL TO ORDER: 12:10 p.m.

COMMUNICATION OFFICER’S REPORT: Minutes of April 19, 2012 and April 26, 2012 were approved unanimously as amended.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

- The May 10, 2012 AS Meeting will take place in CIMS, 2230/2240 with newly elected senators being acknowledged at this meeting and farewells will be given to those senators who will be completing their service on the senate this year.

- Michael Richmond, COS Senator volunteered to be the liaison for SIS issues and should be contacted if there are any issues people wish to voice regarding SIS.

REPORTS

INTER-SESSION and SUMMER SESSION PROGRAMMING PLANS

The full PPT presentation is posted on the Provost’s Website:

Jeremy Haefner, Provost and Senior VP for Academic Affairs gave a presentation on Inter-Session and Summer Session Programming Plans. The agenda, goals and objectives were shared (summary of the concept, why offer Inter- and Summer sessions, who are the students, what are the opportunities, how will this be delivered and the next steps.) [See link to view the full report.]

The sources worked with per inter-session and summer session programming planning have been the following: Education Advisory Board, RIT’s Intersession sub-committee, the Provost committee on intersession and summer financial models, Senior VP’s Planning, and phone called, emails and Web browsing.
The Provost reviewed what it is meant by Inter- and Summer Session Educational offerings. See Ppt: https://www.rit.edu/provost/sites/rit.edu.provost/files/intersummersessionforweb-site.pdf

After talking with many other institutions it was seen that the importance of offering Inter- and Summer sessions is large and there are many reasons for offering these sessions as they are a strategic initiative and student-centered. These sessions offer complementary or continuous learning experiences for students. The students who will be involved with these sessions could be current students (recovering from academic misfortunes, advance in degree program or short-term experience), alumni (would like to get re-engaged with the campus) or non-RIT students (High School, transfer-credit courses or continuing education for industry, non-profits).

In the fall of 2010 Kit Mayberry’s committee did a survey regarding student interest in intersession at RIT and 495 students responded. The survey asked if the student would like to be at RIT during intersession and also what appeals to students during intersession (i.e. International Trip, non-major credit course in area of interest counting towards graduation, credit course required in their major, etc.).

[See Ppt Presentation for detailed results of the survey.]

Today’s presentation was also made at a Town Hall meeting. It was a great opportunity for creativity to flow and to bridge various academic experiences. These sessions can offer a unique integrated academic experience. The many opportunities to have Inter- and Summer-sessions were shared.

How will Inter- and Summer-sessions work? A basic model was given showing a central office (OIS – Office of Inter- and Summer Sessions) which will work with colleges, the Registrar, students, alumni and industry. Dr. Fernando Naveda is the founding director of this office and he has been the Academic Calendar Conversion director.

Some expectations are:

- Marketing Intersession and Summer-sessions as a unique academic experience (Marketing is key to the success of these sessions.)
- Identify courses that will serve current students
- Focus on opportunities that will sell
- Have a variety of offerings in 3, 5 and 10-week courses
- Monitor enrollments and open and close sections as needed (courses will not run without adequate enrollment)
- Jumpstart with a small committee of motivated individuals

There are many challenges as January 2014 is just around the corner and a schedule needs to be put into the hands of advisors this fall. [See link to Ppt for more details concerning the challenges presented today.]

Additionally a name is needed for these sessions that is widely used and understood. Some of the experiences RIT may be offering will be unique to RIT and we need to develop an RIT Intersession-Summer identity. There may be a university-wide naming contest to help with choosing a name for these sessions.

Having sessions with the governance groups has been helpful and suggestions will be brought back to the senior VP’s.

Discussion and Q&A ensued.
Q: G. Pollock: There are 10 week summer sessions and will there be an opportunity for 3-week sessions?
   A: Provost: We are planning around two 5-week sessions and can have some flexibility in this. This depends on faculty interest as well.

M. Richmond: In his Physics Department for catch-up, a three-week make-up on physics would mean four hours today. Response: This is a valid point and a 3-week session would be more compressed. Compression is complex. We have to choose wisely, courses are complex and some may be good candidates while others are not.

T. Engstrom had the following questions and comments:

1) Has the faculty been surveyed to support what we are building?
   A: Excellent suggestion and will ask Fernando Naveda to do this in the fall.

2) Regarding the financial model, trying to build incentives, we wouldn’t want to create a sense of coercing individual faculty into offering courses during intercession. Accepting an obligation on doing research can create a disparity in this regard as faculty are pulled in several directions.
   Response: The incentive model is always a challenge for us and we want the departments to be incentivized.

3) Need to consider students in need and not simply have this available for those who can afford it. If this is only available for students with means (i.e. that financial aid is not available) it is critical that this doesn’t disadvantage some students from completing their degrees in a timely manner or lessen the goals of the university with respect to inclusion.
   Provost’s Response: There are limitations on how to use financial aid in the January intersession as there are new federal regulations. Keeping tuition drastically reduced is key for us, but this is a concern for all the SVP’s as well as the President.

E. Saber: Intersession is an excellent time to get a second chance at a course that a student may have done poorly at in the prior term. However, the faculty compensation and revenue sharing needs to be worked out so that it is a win-win for all involved.
   Response: Provost: Department control is fundamental and they need to have oversight. There is a balance issue and I have asked Fernando Naveda to become the founding director of this central office as he has done an excellent job working with faculty and department chairs and understands the tensions involved.

G. Zion: Was concerned with summer session in particular, when resources can be an issue when non-regular classrooms (labs) are needed.

H. Ghazle: He addressed the issue of program advancement incentive and to be careful in the area of marketing. Programs in the CHST cannot do that because of clinical sites limitations. These programs usually accept/admit a specific number of students based on the availability of sites each year. Students cannot advance in their academic programs based on taking more classes because there will be no clinical sites for internship.

S. Maggelakis: For students who cannot afford intersession, can we ask them to take a catch-up module during the intersession and incorporate such modules in our conversion to semesters curricula?
   Response: It is unfair to ask a student to take a course in intersession with additional costs and we need to have some discussion on this to see how we can make it work.
• P. Lachance: It makes perfect sense to offer courses in the summer for CIAS students and the CIAS courses are very sequential and it is a great time to catch up. Yet for CIAS the best way to incentivize for summer sessions is to get an air conditioner where classes are held in the summer.
• Q: G. Pollock: Nothing was mentioned about supplemental instruction and giving the students the opportunity to not be distracted and to focus more on their course?
  A: I think this allows us to think very creatively and differently how to deliver courses. For the January intersession, it may be an interesting time to pilot a course or a study abroad, or a collaboration, etc. The slate is blank in the work that is happening. Yet we need to think quickly about the January 2014 courses.
• Q: H. Shahmohamad: In the survey it says about 78% of the students would be interested in taking a course during intersession. Is there a contingency plan and is it financially sustainable?
  A: Provost: All of the places we have looked at have done this in a way that makes this financially stable and we will not burden the Institute and have to support it with tuition revenue. It will stand on its own. The President has supported a strong revenue model that is not the normal load. A contingency plan is to model out a curriculum that is modest in scope and find out what resources are needed. To have a survey is an excellent idea.
• Q: D. Defibaugh: Will OIS be another layer of bureaucracy to go through?
  A: We do not have this to be a burden or a bureaucratic obstacle, but have it be student driven. The central office will have a central place to catalog all the courses at RIT.
• C. Hull: In some colleges there are regulations were a student is not allowed to take more than a certain number of classes in a specific area. If you want to give faculty and students incentive to do intersession classes, letting the intersession class be an exception to the normal rule about this limit would work for a lot of people. Additionally there was a rumor that if you taught in intersession and your department head authorized it, you could count that as a regular load, reducing your teaching load in the regular year, Is that true?
  A: We want to make sure the department heads have the full responsibility. There will be some flexibility and Deans will want to discuss the parameters.
• Q: Will there be financial aid for intercession?
  A: There will not be financial aid but we hope to substantially lower our tuition to be competitive.
• T. Engstrom: I want to make sure we do not sacrifice our diversity and inclusion goals in terms of providing access and opportunity to all given economic disparities.
  Provost: I will note this and take this back to the senior VPs.
• G. Pollock: We need to think about how to approach two different groups of students, one that is already here and potential students.
  Response: In the spirit of what we are discussing, some students already on campus will want to engage in something new.

P. Tymann asked if there is a senator willing to serve as a liaison to the intersession group.

AAC Sub-Committee Final Report

Final Report: http://hdl.handle.net/1850/15004

Elizabeth Kronfield, AAC Sub-committee chair reported on the charge to review data from the Provost’s Office numbers and uses of adjuncts across programs and colleges; assess their implications with regard to academic quality and integrity. Data was reviewed from Institutional Research and policy studies. The committee found that RIT uses a much lower percentage (35%) of adjunct/part-time instructors than the national average of 51%. The RIT percentage drops to 24% of actual undergraduate credit hours are taught.
Data was broken down college by college and can be seen on the PPT presentation (see link above).

A survey was developed to seek more input from administrative chairs about the number of adjuncts used and the quality and integrity of adjunct instruction. Twenty-five administrative chairs responded. The percentage of undergraduate credit hours taught by adjuncts in each department was calculated per those that responded. (See PPT presentation).

When asked to identify criteria used to select adjuncts, the most common questions were:

- Previous teaching experience
- Good typing skills
- Masters/PhD

Respondents said these criteria were met always or most of the time.

Question #14 of the survey was: Generally how do you feel the use of adjuncts impacts academic quality and integrity?

- 14 respondents answered that the use of adjuncts positively affects academic quality and integrity
- 6 answered that due to several factors it affects quality and integrity neither positively nor negatively
- 3 answered that the use of adjuncts negatively affects academic quality and integrity

Given the data of numbers of adjuncts used at RIT and the feedback from the survey, there does not seem to be any general reason to be concerned about the use of adjuncts impacting academic quality and integrity negatively.

If there is a specific concern, this should be identified and go to the college level.

Discussion and Q&A:

- Q: S.M. Ramkumar: Did you compare the number of students and faculty in each college and if not it would be useful to have this information.
  A: No, we did not.
- E. Saber: Shared several experiences from when he was an adjunct for six years both here and at the UofR. He said adjuncts are good in bringing in outside experience. Additionally, both small graduate courses and large undergraduate courses are great for adjuncts. Labs for adjuncts are too demanding and he personally turned down classes offering this when he was an adjunct.
- M. Laver: This was a difficult study and we found there are so many reasons to hire an adjunct.
- T. Engstrom: He was concerned that the people who hire adjuncts were surveyed about the process of hiring adjuncts. Secondly, having been a department chair, we don’t always review the work of an adjunct systematically. He suggested as well that it may be good to survey the adjuncts and find out more about structural issues.
- H. Ghazle: Asked if the respondents’ data from CHST could be added to the survey.
  Response: E. Kronfield thought it was sent to CHST faculty and no one responded.

P. Tymann said next week the Academic Affairs Committee will be reporting on student input of teaching effectiveness and course evaluations. Last year this topic came up at the last meeting but this year it is the second to last meeting in case more time is needed for discussion at our last meeting. He asked that this be sent out to senators in a timely fashion.
Linda Tolan, AAC Member reviewed the updated revisions to Policy D5.0. These policy changes once approved apply only to academic year 2012-2013. The full review of D5.0 will be completed for semesters.

See link for detailed PPT presentation of all changes being made to Policy D5.0.

Per the portion on Grade Exclusion, the committee spoke with Doug Meadows, past chair of AAC. The committee had worked on this portion, had a proposal and this never came back to senate for vote, and therefore these changes never were included in the policy. See PPT for revisions added to this portion of the policy. [http://hdl.handle.net/1850/15005](http://hdl.handle.net/1850/15005)

Discussion and Q&A ensued regarding Grade Exclusion.

- Q: O. Palacio: Do you have any statistics on peer institutions regarding grade exclusion?
  Response: We did not do this research and have not seen this in practice here for 6-7 years and would have to find out about this.
- C. Lundgren: Grade exclusions came about by administrative decree from the prior provost. For grade exclusion, he said he believes this is administrative, and this falls outside the senate and it never came to senate.
- L. Lawley: There are a small group of students that sometimes get caught in an awkward situation (i.e. gave example of her son) and these students take courses before they are matriculated courses here at RIT. Her son was penalized as a 13-year old for getting a B in calculus and he could not exclude his grade. This course was counted as credit.
  L. Tolan: She made a note of this.
- S.M. Ramkumar: If international students or undergraduate students exclude a courses, that could put them in a bad situation financially if it retro-actively puts them below the minimum credit hours for aid.
- H. Ghazle: Have we explored retention issues in accordance with this grade exclusion policy?

L. Tolan continued reviewing the changes to D5.0 with the changes to PFOS (Principle Field of Study) and the committee recommended to keep the current policy for 2012 and have further review on this. PFOS will no longer be calculated or available after summer 2012 when the STARS system is closed down. Departments will need to manually calculate this during 2012 if they wish to use it.

- A. Phelps commented that while he understands the constraints of modification relative to the new SIS, that the inability to calculate PFOS is actually not in accordance with the will of the Senate as discussed last year. It is a financial constraint, but not representative of the will of the faculty. PFOS appears several times in various advising decisions, and is a very useful tool.

Changes were reviewed per the E Grade. [See Link to Ppt presentation.] The E Grade will be eliminated and the question was asked if something will take the place of the E Grade. L. Tolan said there are different ways to handle this and this still needs to be addressed. “Incomplete” can be problematic.
Q: Have you looked at the winter intersession to help with this?
A: L. Tolan: No, we have not but some blending and taking different courses may help and this is very good to think about.

Next slide presented was on “Incomplete Grade” – D5.B.c. There was much discussion per the 180 days and the recommended wording was “term(s)”. Dates set for this will be done in the Registrar’s Office.

C. Hull: We discussed intersession counting as a term, and this now looks ambiguous.
L. Tolan: This change is only for this year.

P. Tymann moved to have this sent back to AAC and have it return early next year to senate. There was no 2nd to the motion, so the motion did not come forth.

It was recommended to exclude the portion on Grade Exclusion but all else will be voted on as presented today.

MOTION: The Academic Senate approves the revisions to Policy D5.0 (excluding the portion on Grade Exclusion) as presented by the Academic Affairs Committee.

Motion carried with 26 in favor, 0 opposed and 2 abstentions.

GRADUATE COUNCIL- FINAL REPORT AND SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS TO D12.0.E. Master’s Degree/D12.0.F Doctoral Degree
PPt Presentation (Proposed Revisions to Policy D12.0.E and D12.0.F):  http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14996

Agamemnon Crassidis, Graduate Council Chair presented the final revised version of Policy D12.0.E Master’s Degree and D12.0.F Doctoral Degree. Per the Master’s Degree, the Graduate Council approved this with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed and 1 abstention.

MOTION: The Academic Senate approves the suggested modifications to Policy D12.0.E. Master’s Degree.

Motion carried with 24 in favor and 4 abstentions.

Per the Doctoral Degree, there was a friendly amendment to replace “quarter” with the word “term.”

MOTION: The Academic Senate approves the suggested modifications to Policy D12.0.F. Doctoral Degree as amended.

Motion carried with 23 in favor, 0 opposed and 4 abstentions.

Due to time constraints the final report (part of this PPt presentation) was not presented and will be posted on the senate’s DML site under Graduate Council.

ADJOURNMENT: 1:51 p.m.