

APPROVED 09/06/2012

**ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
ACADEMIC SENATE
MAY 17, 2012: 12:05 - 1:50 p.m.
CAMPUS CENTER/BAMBOO ROOM/2610**

Present: B. Barbato, J. Beck, S. Boedo, L. Bryant, D. Defibaugh, W. Destler, T. Engström, H. Ghazle, J. Haefner, C. Hull, M. Kotlarchyk, M. Laver, L. Lawley, C. Lundgren, S. Maggelakis, H. Miller, O. Palacio, A. Phelps, T. Policano, G. Pollock, S. Radziszowski, S.M. Ramkumar, M. Richmond, M. Ruhling, E. Saber, R. Sanchez, M. Savka, V. Serravallo, H. Shahmohamad, C. Thoms, D. Tower DuBois, P. Tymann, J. Voelkel, F. Walker, G. Zion

Members Absent: P. Lachance, O. Palacio, L. Wild

Excused: R. Hira, P. Tymann

Guests: David Martins, Paul Rosenberg, Kristen Waterstram-Rich, Jim Aumer

Interpreters: Samantha Gibson, Kristi Love

CALL TO ORDER: 12:07 p.m. [Tim Engström, AS Vice Chair chaired today's meeting as Paul Tymann was unable to be in attendance.]

COMMUNICATION OFFICER'S REPORT: Minutes of May 10, 2012 were approved unanimously.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

- Tim Engström expressed on behalf of the Senate the Senate's appreciation and gratitude to Paul Tymann, AS Chair for his previous and ongoing work for faculty governance. The Senate applauded him in honor of his service over the last year.
- The vote on B2.0 (Academic Governance Charter) that was sent online to all voting faculty at RIT is considerably low in responses for voting on revisions to the Charter. T. Engström asked senators to remind their constituents who are voting faculty to participate and suggested that another reminder will be sent out to all voting faculty.

**AT LARGE LIST TO BE APPROVED FOR STANDING AND INSTITUTE COMMITTEES:
[The AS website will be updated with this information by early June.]**

Paul Rosenberg, chair of the AS Nominations Committee gave thanks to Carl Lundgren and Hossein Shahmohamad who served with him on the committee, and previous Nominations Committee members, Charlotte Thoms and Heidi Miller, as they stepped down after being nominated for the Academic Senate Executive Committee.

It was moved and seconded to be approved. Motion to approve the list of at large members carried with 4 abstentions.

PROPOSALS AND REPORTS

**RECOMMENDATION FROM ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE TASKFORCE REGARDING
UNIVERSITY-WIDE SYSTEM OF STUDENT INPUT ON TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS**

PPT Presentation and AAC Taskforce Final Report presented on May 10, 2012:

<http://hdl.handle.net/1850/15010>

The Academic Affairs Committee Taskforce had made their presentation at the May 10, 2012 AS meeting and discussion had ensued. There was not a quorum at the end of last week's meeting to vote on this recommendation so it was brought to senate today by the AAC for vote and reads as follows:

We (Academic Affairs Committee) move that Academic Senate endorse the recommendation of the Academic Affairs 2012 Task Force, as outlined in Part IV of their report, to conduct a pilot investigation of two systems of student input on teaching effectiveness in order to determine a final recommendation of a system for university-wide launch in fall semester, 2013.

It was narrowed down to two candidates for these pilots: IDEA Tool and SmartEvals. A vote was requested by M. Laver and following the vote he requested to have a brief discussion regarding the possible in-house platform that was discussed at last week's senate meeting. T. Engström noted that discussion had ensued at the last senate meeting and there was no quorum to vote, therefore this will be voted on today, excluding a discussion following as that was not planned for this week's already packed agenda.

Motion to endorse the two pilots for Fall 2012 carried with 15 in favor, 5 opposed and 9 abstentions.

Jean Casares was invited to today's senate meeting regarding having an in-house platform. M. Laver said an in-house platform would cost approximately \$55,000 per year, compared with IDEA Tool costing approximately \$50,000 and SmartEvals costing approximately \$26,000. The AAC's recommendation is to do the pilot but be open to alternatives. If anything was to be done in-house it would have to be constructed this summer, yet there are so many things that go into this site and those constructing the in-house site would have to work closely with those in the field of evaluation.

For further discussion on this it was suggested to contact Mike Laver and comments will be collated for review and discussion.

E9.0 (Visiting Scholar Policy) – Proposed Revisions from Faculty Affairs Committee
Clean Copy of E9.0 with Revisions and Current Policy: <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/15011>

E9.0 with revisions returned to senate today. K. Waterstram-Rich, chair of FAC reviewed all the revisions made by the committee. Revisions were made to provide clarity and not to be overly bureaucratic regarding Visiting Scholars being at RIT, but for people at RIT to be made aware of why some new faculty are here when they do arrive.

The following revisions with comments can be seen on this document: <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/15044>

Discussion and Q&A ensued.

- Q: M. Ruhling: Academic terms are in the policy but can the January intersession and summer terms be addressed in this policy as well?
A: The Provost agreed that the Fall and Spring terms are normal academic terms and summer and January intersession should be defined in policy.
- Per this section of the policy that reads "A visiting scholar must be in residence at least one academic term", wording suggestions were made so flexibility could be built into the policy. K. Waterstram-Rich said there is a difference between being here 3 weeks versus 15 weeks. The suggestions were as follows:
 - 1) Have it read "full terms and intersession and summer"
 - 2) Have it read "period of service."
- K. Waterstram-Rich said there is a difference between 3 weeks of service versus 15 weeks. Academic Term covers fall, spring and summer.
- Other senators added that it is a long process to get the visiting scholars approved and would take longer than 3 weeks for this process to be completed, so there should be a longer commitment for them when they arrive here for work. It involves a substantial amount of time and effort in hiring visiting scholars.

- S. Radziszowski: This revised policy does not encourage visiting scholars to come to RIT and agreed that it should be a more flexible policy. Other senators agreed that it should be more flexible.
A: K. Waterstram-Rich: The policy has not changed much, it is now more clearer. We are asking visiting scholars to come to benefit our students.
- Q: How are they paid?
A: Through their company, RIT is not paying them.
- T. Engström: Could we just remove this sentence and avoid stipulating in policy any specific length of residency?: “A visiting scholar must be in residence at least one academic term.”
- H. Shahmohamad: At MIT to have a visiting scholar come to the school, permission only has to come from the department head and the process we have is so cumbersome.
- M. Kotlarchyk: It was noted that post docs go through no process, are approved by the department head and come here through soft money.
Response: Post docs do get a criminal check.
- Having visiting scholars at RIT is an opportunity to bring a colleague from another institution here, and they are not funded by RIT.
- M. Richmond: I was a visiting scholar and did not go through a big set of approvals. M. Savka also was a visiting scholar and said he only had to fill out a document and met the head of the lab he worked for. To have the visiting scholar come should be a one-on-one decision.
- T. Engström: This is an honorific category; visiting scholars should feel this and our processes of review should reflect it. Perhaps further discussion is needed to strike the right balance between flexibility and consistent process and oversight.

K. Waterstram-Rich agreed to take these suggestions back to FAC and make this a more streamlined process. E9.0 will return to senate in the fall for vote.

UNIVERSITY WRITING PROGRAM PROGRESS REPORT

Report and Recommendation to the Academic Senate (Proposed Policy Revisions): <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/15032>

David Martins, University Writing Program Director reviewed the Institute Writing Committee’s (IWC) charge for AY2012 (see report on DML site). Activities of the committee were reviewed. Weekly meetings had been held and the committee tested and revised the Course Criteria Checklist (Triple C) form; they completed sample Triple C Forms to provide faculty examples; developed a submission procedure using “myCourses” and created sample writing assignments, activities and assessment tools.

D. Martins outlined the procedure one takes for WI courses.

Q&A.

- Q: T. Policano asked about this process. The faculty member submits the form online but can only a college curriculum member post it?
A: Yes, a College Curriculum Committee member should post the completed CCC (Triple C) form. The form will be available online, starting the first week of June.

The IWC website is being revised and D. Martins presented this to senate. There is now an explanation of the process; the Triple C form has been revised; there will be completed Triple C forms (samples from approved WI courses) that are on display; and the IWC guiding principles are on the website, showing distinction between First Year Writing, General Education-Writing Intensive and Program-Writing Intensive.

Structures of support were shared in the presentation. (See page 7 in this presentation - <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/15032>). There is now the creation of the University Writing Program (UWP) which includes Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC), the Writing Center, and First-Year Writing (FYW). One

form of support, a year-long Faculty Learning Community, was shared and 10 participants were selected representing 8 colleges.

The development of the writing center was discussed. The WC staff currently offer face to face appointments in the Writing Center, along with online writing support for “Distance Learners.” In the future, as capacity is built for the Writing Fellows Program, the Writing Center will also offer classroom-based writing assistance, recurring appointments, class visitations, and periodic workshops.

Proposed IWC recommendations to Academic Senate for changes in Institute Writing Policy (D.16) were introduced.

I. Recommendation: Per Committee Membership

Proposed Revision: [These changes identify ex officio members, adds the Writing Center Director and reflects the creation of the University Writing program.]

“The Institute Writing Committee shall be a standing committee of the Academic Senate and will serve to implement this policy and evaluate courses for the determination of meeting the WI designation. The membership of the IWC shall include: a college faculty representative from each college to be elected by his or her collegial faculty; one representative elected at large by the Academic Senate; and five ex officio members: the University Writing Program director (voting); the First-Year Writing Program director (voting); the Writing Center director (non-voting); the English Language Center director (or his or her delegate, non-voting); and the Academic Support Center director (or his or her delegate, non-voting) and the provost or his or her delegate (ex officio, voting). Faculty representatives will serve staggered three-year terms with the possibility of reappointment. The committee will report annually to the provost and the Academic Senate on its work.”

II. Recommendation: FYW as Prerequisite for Program-WI

Proposed Revision: [This clarifies First-Year Writing as a pre-requisite for Program WI courses.]

“Students should complete First Year Writing (Writing Seminar or other so-designated WI course) by the end of their first year. Students should take one WI course in general education by the end of their third year. Students must pass a First Year Writing course before enrolling in a Program-WI course. Students should be able to complete WI requirements within the existing graduation requirements.”

T. Engström suggested each recommendation be voted on separately with two different motions.

Discussion and Q&A ensued.

- Q: C. Hull raised the question of college proliferation and is it really necessary to have one member from each college on committees and three years from now do we need representation on every committee.
- Response: Provost: We ought to be using that as a filter in what we should do. (i.e. GIS does not have undergraduate programs and therefore does not need a rep on this committee.) Writing across the curriculum involves a change in our culture and input from all the colleges is important. On this particular committee we want to include membership from all colleges.
Response: T. Engström: Clyde’s concern about how standing committees are constituted in general is worthy of further inquiry but does not apply to this motion.
- Q: How do you decide who is voting and who is non-voting or ex officio?
A: D. Martins said this was discussed on the committee and shouldn’t they all vote; yet for some voting on curricular values seems less valid (Writing Center Director). And ELC and ASC are outside

of Academic Affairs.

Additionally we wanted to have more clarity to the policy by making these changes. Yet, we can have a friendly amendment regarding this.

- M-B. Cooper expressed that Student Affairs has enjoyed a wonderful collaboration with this committee and they have been very respectful. Yet the notion of voting and non-voting can influence how we move forward in dialogue. The committee has really been collaborators.
- T. Engström : There is obvious silence regarding who is eligible to become chair of a committee. As this is a curricular body and other analogous curricular bodies are chaired by faculty, we should consider making this explicit in this case too. David Martin has functioned superbly to bring this committee into being, but he is an administrator and answers to the Provost. It would be best, therefore, if we clarified explicitly how the committee's chair will be selected, and do so in a way that maintains consistency with faculty governance on curricular matters.
Response: D. Martins noted that yes, he is an administrator but also faculty. ICC and GEC were looked at and the current policy does not stipulate anything. This can be addressed later.
- T. Engström: A friendly amendment was made: *"The chair shall be elected from among the committee members."* This is consistent with ICC, GEC and Graduate Council.
Response: D. Martins said he would consider this but the committee had decided to remove this and would need to ask the rest of the committee.
G. Zion said he chairs GEC and also has administrative duties and others who chair curricular bodies do too.
- T. Engström replied that they have administrative duties, but their primary administrative function is not to administer the very thing the curricular committee is responsible for. This is the case with David as University Writing Director.
- T. Engström moved that this now be a proposed amendment that *"The chair shall be elected from among the college faculty representatives on the committee."* Motion carried with 27 in favor and 3 abstentions.

Motion to approve the recommendation number one presented today carried with 20 in favor, 4 opposed and 6 abstentions.

The second recommendation that had been introduced was discussed.

II. Recommendation: FYW as Prerequisite for Program-WI

Proposed Revision: [This clarifies First-Year Writing as a pre-requisite for Program WI courses.]

"Students should complete First Year Writing (Writing Seminar or other so-designated WI course) by the end of their first year. Students should take one WI course in general education by the end of their third year. Students must pass a First Year Writing course before enrolling in a Program-WI course. Students should be able to complete WI requirements within the existing graduation requirements."

D. Martins noted that the committee felt it was important that First-Year Writing is a prerequisite for Program WI courses.

The spirit of the recommendation is to express to faculty an expectation and give guidance and clarity.

Discussion and Q&A.

- M. Kotlarchyk: In the sentence "Students must pass a First Year Writing course before enrolling in a Program-WI course" he said the word "enrolling" is questionable.
- T. Policano: This higher standard will increase writing skills among students. Yet what about transfer students and where do they fit in with eligibility in regards to Writing Intensive courses and are we satisfied that they have the writing skills.

- Response: Current institute policy regarding transfer of credit for FYW/Writing Seminar includes a review of course syllabi. If the course is not seen as similar, transfer credit is not awarded.
- A. Phelps: In GCCIS, A. Phelps said there are a couple of courses that are writing intensive, but that are taken prior to taken freshman writing seminar, including the 'Intro to Interactive Media' course and introductory computer science courses... this requirement for writing intensive courses to be taken after writing seminar is being introduced after these programs were designed and approved. This will affect over 1000 students who take these courses in the GDD, NMID, and CS programs if this recommendation is approved. We have to be careful creating requirements after already approving the structure and content of our programs.
- Q: V. Serravallo: Does the proposed revision eliminate passing all the WI courses? This does not seem to be consistent with allowing students to graduate.
Response: The students would need to pass the class.
- Q: C. Hull: Do students have to take an additional WI class and if so this should be added into the policy:
Students should complete First Year Writing (Writing Seminar or other so-designated WI course) by the end of their first year. Students should take one additional WI course in general education by the end of the third year before which they must have passed a First Year Writing course or its equivalent.
- L. Lawley said she developed a writing course where 240 students per year take this in the fall and it is a very intensive writing class. Getting this approved was difficult as they had to go through many hoops but the revised proposal for the policy would change everything. She asked that this be removed and is not comfortable with this change.
- F. Walker: Putting students in disciplines before getting these skills is not right.
- T. Engström: Suggested to include in the wording "*or its equivalent*" in the sentence being discussed to provide flexibility when required.
D. Martins agreed to this.
- Provost: Are there any specific learning outcomes to capture and can this criteria be defined?
A: D. Martin said the policy is not clear and the guiding principles included articulation on this. He said his position is to have the kind of curriculum you want students to have, and as the IWC chair to maintain the integrity of the program.
- Chris Licata: Last year when the guidelines were passed, we have now two options and all the programs are using those guidelines. If there is a re-thinking we need to think seriously if we want to give up on the scaffolding of WI courses, and this change would affect many. The original program guidelines were approved last year. This is problematic to go back and revisit this.
- M. Laver: Current research suggests that that consistent practice of writing works best, not just quick, intense writing.

There was a motion to table this recommendation and this motion carried unanimously.

D. Martin reported that only 6 courses have been approved by IWC thus far.

This agenda item will return to senate in the new year.

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE – FINAL REPORT OF AY2012

Due to time constraints this report was deferred and can be found on the AS DML site: <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/15021>

T. Engström noted that Jim Aumer, chair of SAC, will be retiring and therefore will not return to senate next year to present SAC's final report. All senators applauded Professor Aumer for his service as chair of the Student Affairs Committee and for his retirement in the near future.

Adjournment: 1:51 p.m.