

**ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
ACADEMIC SENATE
SEPTEMBER 6, 2012: 12:05-1:50 p.m.
CAMPUS CENTER/BAMBOO ROOM/2610**

Present: J. Beck, S. Boedo, S. Bower, M-B. Cooper, K. Davis, D. Defibaugh, H. Ghazle, A. Hennig (SG Alt.), J. Hertzson, S. Hoi, C. Hull, M. Kotlarchyk, P. Lachance, M. Laver, L. Lawley, J. Lisuzzo, C. Lundgren, S. Maggelakis, K. McDonald, H. Miller, A. Phelps, T. Policano, S. Radziszowski, S.M. Ramkumar, A. Ray, M. Richmond, M. Ruhling, M. Savka, V. Serravallo, H. Shahmohamad, J. Strine, C. Thoms, P. Tymann, J. Voelkel, F. Walker, H. Yamashita, G. Zion

Excused: B. Trager; Taylor Deer, J. Haefner, K. Mousley, S. Thomas

Guests: Kristen Waterstram-Rich, Jayanti Venkataraman, Tomika Wagstaff

Interpreters: Nicole Crouse-Dickerson; Aaryn Adams

CALL TO ORDER: 12:07 p.m.

WELCOMED NEW SENATORS AND RETURNING SENATORS

Each senator introduced themselves for this first meeting of the year.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

- P. Tymann explained the general rule of engagement for senate meetings and asked that all name plates be tilted toward him so that names can be easily seen and if one wishes to speak hands need to be raised and everyone will have a chance to speak in the order the hands are raised.
- The Professional Development committee is in need of one associate professor or professor to serve a three-year term and they must be from one of the following colleges: CAST, COS, KGCOE, CHST or NTID. It does not have to be a senator who serves on this committee and anyone who desires to serve can contact Vivian Gifford (asenate@rit.edu) as soon as possible.
- Discussion ensued on the Academic Senate minutes and whether to have them remain as detailed as they are or if they should be less onerous, as most minutes are a summary of a meeting and not have them be verbatim. The chair asked for senate input today and later further discussion will ensue among the executive committee members.

Comments:

- E. Saber: Agreed with simply reporting the motions, actions and primary items.
- S. Maggelakis: It is important to show what the main concerns are for the minutes, for and against and these can be bullets.
- L. Lawley: Detail is important and colleagues like to know they are being represented. She is very much in favor of recording the meetings to make this available to all faculty as opposed to having the entire meeting rephrased by Viv Gifford and Andy Phelps. As once being a communications officer, she said it would be easier doing a transcript from the recording and would love to hear what someone has said.
- J. Voelkl: Commented that Vivian, AS senior staff assistant is doing a good job with the minutes and asked on comments from both her and Andy Phelps, communications officer.
- P. Tymann said this is not a reflection on the work presently being done but was asking if a summary version would be better. If the senate decides to go with more detail then the meetings would need to be recorded.

- J. Lisuzzo: The Staff Council minutes include discussion and the presenter's portion is sent to the presenters for review.
- V. Gifford: Commented that having the summary of the minutes would be good but not to exclude main points discussed at the meeting, as it is so important that some detail does remain in the minutes.
- A. Phelps: He said we try hard to represent everyone's point but cannot capture this word for word and we do go back and clarify when needed statements that were made and this takes time and effort. Some statements may not be captured and we have to be responsible for those statements. There are lots of possibilities of what to do in preparing the minutes.
- J. Strine: For Deaf people, audio recording of the minutes would not be useful unless the recording was fully transcribed.
- J. Hertzson: As a past communications officer, she said she started with taking notes, and then brought the laptop. A summary is valuable yet it is helpful to have more information from the meetings and this can be used for what is needed.
- C. Hull: Suggested that someone else help with the power point presentations and Viv can focus more on the minutes. We presently have detailed minutes.
- M. Ruhling: Was concerned about the difference between what was said at the meeting and what one meant to say.
- C. Lundgren: The executive committee has discussed this in past years and with recording the meeting, some things can be misspoken and we have to allow for editing of the minutes.
- P. Tymann: Andy Phelps will be taking a set of minutes from last year and will generate what he thinks to be a reasonable summary and both will be sent to the senate for review. He said we could physically record the meetings but there may be some legal aspects that need to be looked into.

TREASURER'S REPORT for AY2012-13: <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/15297>

Charlotte Thoms, AS Treasurer reported that last year was an excellent year and one of the busiest years in many. This year a much needed computer was purchased as the senate computer was almost 6 years old. The amount of \$1,916.74 non-salary monies that was not spent in AY2011-12 was used to offset staff and student salary due to increased work and increased work hours. Amazing with all that the senate achieved, that there was only a deficit of \$642.11 which will be covered by the Provost's office. This deficit was due to added student help for the website this past summer and the work on the New Faculty Resource booklet online. A detailed report has been posted on the AS DML site and the link is found above.

McNAIR SCHOLARS PROGRAM

Information Sheet & McNair CSTEP and LSAMP application: <https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/15307>

Tomicka Wagstaff, Director of the McNair Scholars Program reported that this program is designed to increase the number of students from underrepresented populations and disadvantaged backgrounds in graduate study. The Ronald E. McNair Post-Baccalaureate Achievement Program was named after the late Ronald E. McNair and is a federal TRIO program funded by the U.S. Department of Education at 185 institutions across the U.S. and Puerto Rico. This program is dedicated to the high standards of achievement inspired by Dr. Ronald E. McNair's life.

The program has been again funded and this year will recruit 15-20 new scholars and will offer 8-10 weeks for first generational low income families, providing a \$2800 stipend and students can receive room and board in the summer. GRE support is offered. Students need to have a 3.0 or above GPA.

There is funding for faculty mentors as well. Students in this program can go on to Graduate School (Carnegie Mellon, John Hopkins and hopefully RIT).

Dr. Wagstaff reported that C-Step is a newly funded program for 2nd year graduate students interested in STEM disciplines and NYS licensed professions.

Lewis Stokes Alliance Minority Preparation Program for AALANA students in STEM receive a \$3500 stipend and room and board is not covered.

- Q: C.Hull: How does it work for a graduate student obtaining a graduate degree to get a PhD?
A: They would qualify for C-Step.

There was a request for the documents discussed today to be sent electronically to Academic Senate. These are posted as well on the AS DML site (link is above under the title of this agenda item).

The website is: <http://www.rit.edu/mcnair>

STANDING COMMITTEE CHARGES

Proposed Draft: <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/15309>

Final Approved Copy: <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/15310>

The executive committee presented the charges for each Standing Committee and Institute Committee one by one, for discussion and vote.

Academic Affairs Committee: Approved as presented (29 in favor, 3 abstentions)

Academic Support Committee: Approved unanimously as modified (33 in favor, 1 abstention)

Discussion prior to vote:

- Comment: S. Hoi: Recently he could not retrieve information from the new SIS system.
Response: Dr. Destler said this is being addressed.
- E. Saber: Suggested that the ASC review the availability of classrooms to support the school's mission.
- M. Ruhling: Suggested the last charge under ASC (*complete an inventory of RIT museum resources and their impact on academic support*) be taken off the list of charges.
Response: P. Tymann said that under the description of the committee in B2, it states that this committee is responsible *to monitor and review cultural programs, museum and library services of the university*. ASC can prioritize these charges as they see fit.
- Q: J. Hertzson: She asked what museum resources are being talked about as collections are in various places. The GeneSIS project is huge and some have met from different galleries. Can the ASC work on this?
- A friendly amendment to remove the last bullet per museums was agreed upon by the executive committee.
- C. Hull: Commented per students registering for classes and having to wait until spring semester. He said this killed his enthusiasm and was not sure where this policy came from.
Response: P. Tymann said bullet 2 addresses this per reviewing the current implementation of the GeneSIS system and determining whether or not the needs of the users are being met. This charge is an attempt to look at online learning at RIT and position RIT in the online space.

Campus Environment Committee: Will return to senate for further discussion and vote.

Discussion prior to vote:

- Comment: E. Saber: Was concerned about the space issue across campus, teaching versus research and which committee would this go under?
Response: P. Tymann: Long Range Planning Committee
- K. Waterstram-Rich: There are two space committees and she suggested to ask the space committees to report to senate per this issue.
- J. Hertzson: Suggested the CEC look at the cultural environment and take up the museum issue.
Response: P. Tymann agreed to consider adding the completed inventory of museums to the charges of the CEC.
Response: Shirley Bower, Director for the Wallace Library: The committee could evaluate this as a whole as both resources are in the library.
- J. Hertzson: Do we need to have a separate place for museum inventory.
- K. Waterstram-Rich: In the recent past, the environment committee has focused on what environment means and it could mean space for teaching, cultural space, etc.
- M. Ruhling: There is a need for faculty review and not being directly related to Academic Senate. There is a new push towards performing arts and the cultural environment.

P. Tymann said this charge will return to senate for further discussion and vote on September 20, 2012. Needs to be reviewed and further crafted.

It was suggested by C. Lundgren for this charge and all charges to be numbered in order of priority.

Faculty Affairs Committee: Approved unanimously (34 in favor)

Discussion prior to vote:

- C. Hull: Raised the point about proliferating colleges and committee, and would like FAC to consider that committees not have every college on each committee.
Response: P. Tymann said this is the intent of one of their charges. There are some committees which the executive committee struggled with per charges. He said he is concerned though about the proliferation of standing Committees.

General Education Committee: Approved as modified (33 in favor, 1 abstention)

Discussion prior to vote:

- K. Waterstram-Rich: Suggested to move bullet 6 (*Identify the process by which non-credit hour degree requirements are added to the curriculum*) to be placed under ICC and Graduate Council.
Response: P. Tymann agreed to this.
- E. Saber: Suggested to removed bullet 4 (*Determine how general education is handled within the IAP process*). There should be a vision and strategy to be sustaining.
- S. Boedo: Suggested that the committee assess our current programs as well.

Graduate Council: Approved as modified (33 in favor, 1 abstention)

Discussion prior to vote:

- Bullet 6 was moved to this Standing Committee: *Identify the process by which non-credit hour degree requirements are added to the curriculum*.
- C. Lundgren: Suggested that bullet 4 in the draft: *Assess our progress toward making PhD programs, where appropriate, financially self-sustaining* be moved to the RABC charges.

P. Tymann: Agreed to move this fourth charge to the Resource Allocation and Budget Committee.

- Q: H. Ghazle: Asked why charge 6 (*Define advising roles as it applies to graduate students.*) is being separated from undergraduate advising roles?
- A: A. Phelps: This is a systemic concern and Graduate advising is sometimes an afterthought, so therefore this charge was decided upon.
- M-B. Cooper: There are non-credit classes that need to be represented under Student Affairs and she said there is a concern putting this agenda item on two committees.
Response: P. Tymann: We can discuss this with Ag Crassidis, Grad Council chair and form an ad hoc committee and add the classes under Student Affairs.

ICC: Approved as modified (28 in favor, 4 opposed, 2 abstentions)

Discussion prior to vote:

- Bullet 6 was moved to this Standing Committee: *Identify the process by which non-credit hour degree requirements are added to the curriculum.*
- S. Hoi: His concern was about the GPA requirement. The key point he made is that now as an Institute we are requiring a higher GPA for minors than for majors.
Response: Last year ICC brought forth a minors policy and it was amended in regards to the GPA requirement. A senate vote was taken and 25 were in favor of this and 6 opposed. The executive committee discussed this and decided not to put it in a charge and the question is, is it appropriate to give a charge regarding something that was voted on last year? He asked how the senate feels about this.
- M. Ruhling: He felt not to bring the charge back since it was already voted on. And minor is a different degree program.
- M. Laver said he voted against this in senate last year, and asked that we wait a year to see how this works out and give the approved motion from last year a change to play out.
S. Maggelakis agreed.
- P. Tymann: The ICC charges, as modified, will be voted on without adding the minors policy.

IETC (Institute Effective Teaching Committee): Approved (33 in favor, 1 opposed)

IWC (Institute Writing Committee): Approved as modified unanimously (34 in favor)

LRPC (Long Range Planning Committee): Approved as modified (30 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstentions)

Discussion prior to vote:

- Ram: Bullet 3 (*Review long range plans developed by the various Institute space committees for research space*) should include assessing current plans as well. Additionally, he added that this charge should include “teaching and research.”
- M. Ruhling: Last year recommendations were made for spaces other than teaching and research.
- C. Lundgren: Spaces should include lab spaces as this is separate from teaching spaces.
- P. Tymann: It is best not to get too detailed.
- E. Saber: Important to open this up to all spaces on campus being used and evaluate their use.
- S. Hoi: It is time for the parking office to reserve space for only faculty and staff in relation to charge 1: “*Review long range plans for parking on campus in consideration of loss of parking areas due to new construction.*”
G. Zion: This does sound self-serving.
- It was suggested to add to the LRPC charge “*to review policies and procedures per parking spaces.*”

- P. Tymann: An executive committee member is assigned to each standing committee when the first meeting convenes per discussing the charges approved by Academic Senate.

MCC (Multidisciplinary Curriculum Committee): Approved as presented unanimously (34 in favor)

RABC (Resource Allocation and Budget Committee): Will return to senate for further discussion and vote.

Discussion prior to vote:

- Bullet 4: *Assess our progress toward making PhD programs, where appropriate, financially self-sustaining* was moved to this standing committee.
- Discussion ensued per the budget being finalized by December and reporting back to the BOT. It is important to get feedback on recommendations. P. Tymann said the president will implement some of the costs for the budget cycle.
- E. Saber: Spoke of reviewing research dollars, research overhead policies and review the final reports.
- Ram: RABC will put forth the recommendations.
- H. Shahmohamad: Suggested prioritizing these charges and all charges for Standing Committees.
- P. Tymann: J. Watters is meeting with the chairs where recommendations come forth and will put forth a list of options. The president's intention is to implement some of the options in the upcoming budget and will come up with recommendations. We can give our feedback and the president will take that into consideration.
- F. Walker: The budget committees are not staffed by colleges and recommendations go directly to the committee chairs. We need to ask the right people.
- E. Saber: Suggestion: Put the budget chairs on the senate agenda to give their reports.
- M. Ruhling: Who reviews policies pertaining to discretionary spending etc. as there may be some issues with these policies?
- P. Tymann: This charge will be re-crafted and asked M. Ruhling to help and additionally will discuss this with others.

SAC (Student Affairs Committee): Will return to senate for discussion and vote.

Due to time constraints there was no time allowed for discussion.

PROPOSALS

Policy E12.1 (Eisenhart Awards for Excellence in Teaching) and E12.3 (Richard and Virginia Eisenhart Provost's Award for Excellence in Teaching)

Ppt Presentation: <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/15311>

Proposal of combining E12.1 and E12.3 (Clean Copy): <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/15312>

This agenda item was deferred due to time constraints and will return to senate in fall quarter.

ADJOURNMENT: 1:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Phelps, AS Communications Officer

Vivian Gifford, Senior Staff Assistant