
Members Absent: H. Ghazle, S. Hoi, J. Lisuzzo, L. Lawley, K. McDonald, J. Voelkl, L. Wild

Excused: K. Davis, J. Haefner, C. Hull, A. Phelps, S. Thomas (SG Alt. for Winter Quarter),

Guests/Presenters: Margaret Bailey, Barry Culhane, Jeff Pelz, Lee Twyman, Kristen Waterstram-Rich

Interpreters: Cheryl Bovard, Nicole Dickerson-Crouse

CALL TO ORDER: 12:09 p.m.

COMMUNICATION OFFICER’S REPORT: Minutes of November 15, 2012 were approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

- Today the AS meeting is being recorded solely for back up for the minutes and then once the minutes are approved the tape will be destroyed. Presently this is a pilot that is being done for two meetings. P. Tymann noted that any side conversations will be picked up on the taping along with rustling of papers, which may muffle the hearing of presenters and those speaking during the senate meeting.

- A Cost Containment Report by Jeff Lasky, RABC chair will be presented at next week’s senate meeting on December 13th with President Destler and Dr. Jim Watters of F&A in attendance as well. The meeting has been moved to CIMS/2230/2240 for more space due to a possibly larger attendance. He asked for senators to reach out to their constituents to attend the meeting or to give suggestions/comments per Cost Containment so all voices can be heard.

- The Faculty Affairs Committee has been working on revisions to B2.0 (Academic Governance Charger) and the Provost has dedicated his Town Hall Meeting on January 10th (8:30-11:00 a.m. in the University Gallery, Booth Hall/2765) for discussion of B2.0. Senators are encouraged to attend this meeting and there will be breakout groups with senators assigned to each of these various groups. Proposed B2.0 will also return to senate in January after the Town Hall meeting and a goal is set for the proposed B2.0 policy to be passed by February 14, 2013. Starting in January for each of the senate meetings P. Tymann has asked FAC representation to come and give a five minute update per changes in the policy so that there is an understanding of what the committee is bringing forth for vote later in winter quarter.

- Four Academic Senate Institute Council members are needed on the Nominations Committee to convene late winter quarter through early to mid-spring quarter to craft a slate for the executive committee elections in April and in addition to secure faculty members for at large positions on Standing and Institute Committees where needed. The workload is not heavy as much can be done online. Please email Viv (asenate@rit.edu) if you wish to be on this committee, and this committee should be formed by mid-winter quarter.
REPORTS

IMAGINE RIT UPDATE
Barry Culhane, Executive Assistant to the President and Festival Chair presented on the Imagine RIT event. The 6th Imagine RIT event, which is 148 days away, will be on Saturday, May 4, 2013, 10:00-5:00 p.m. and exhibitors and food vendors are being asked to stay open until 5 p.m. so no one will miss anything. This event is free and open to the public with live entertainment on two performance stages and food tents. Expected attendance may be over 30,000 people. Parking will be available on campus and shuttles provided from MCC. This is an “All Ages” festival showcasing innovation and creativity at RIT and attracting K-12 students to “STEM” education. The event is a wonderful opportunity for students and the community to showcase much of their work and talents and it has improved the RIT campus. We want this event to be kid friendly but we also want to include high academic presentations, too. Time Warner Cable is the premiere sponsor. B. Culhane said they have met with two groups of faculty to go over the ideas for the poster contest and many ideas are coming forth from the campus. The poster contest prizes this year will be $500 in Tiger Bucks. There will be a corporate tent for those who donated $5,000 or above to this event. A marketing video for Imagine RIT was shown featuring one of the RIT exhibitors from mechanical engineering.

More safety will be put into the E-dragster race (Dr. Destler’s challenge) and there will be an electric vehicle endurance race instead of focusing on speed. We are encouraging more student teams for these races.

Publicity is great through Social Media (YouTube, Flicker, Twitter, Facebook etc.), TV, and Radio, as well as through events like Take Our Daughters and Sons to Work Day which we participated in during the summer at Nixon Peabody. Something new this year as well is a webinar information session for new students, faculty and staff who have never attended Imagine RIT. The “Plan Your Day” website is continuously being updated.

Important Dates to Remember:
Call for Proposals: January 14
Field House Deadline: February 15
Poster Contest Deadline: February 15
Print Program Deadline: March 15
Exhibitor/Service Requests: March 29
Call for Volunteers: Early March

B. Culhane thanked everyone for their help with this as it is a great day of pride for the campus.

Q&A ensued.
• V. Serravallo: What is Free Scale who is one of the sponsors?
  A: It is a Semi-Conductor Manufacturing Company.
• V. Serravallo: Who is Trident, another sponsor?
  A: Trident Precision is a Dye Company from Webster.
• Ram: Who is TATA, another sponsor? And did TATA come to campus?
  A: A computer consulting firm. Yes, TATA and the sponsoring companies sent representatives to RIT campus to give out prizes and connect with colleges. Companies will usually send a contingency of people here to campus.
• H. Shahmohamad: Will you have enough money to run this event as it is free?
  A: This is the most fiscally tight event on campus as it takes in 2/3 of what we spend. We want it to be a free family event, open to the public and we have not gone to a fee structure. B. Culhane
read a letter from a family in Auburn who attended Imagine RIT and how their young children are already getting interested in coming to college. They were encouraged to see that RIT is not only a place to learn but a place to do things.

- E. Saber: As a former football coach he said he had heard of Imagine RIT and so this is a great marketing tool to let many know of this event.
- B. Culhane said word of mouth is key in getting folks to know of this event. Some people in the past had asked that the festival be for two days but it was decided upon that one day is enough and it always brings folks back for more.
- S. Boedo: If you have a projection of 30,000 people for this event, is space a concern? B. Culhane: Last year was the largest crowd ever in attendance and he said they do not want to get much bigger this year as there would then be problems of long lines as they have in Disney World, and these long lines could make people unhappy. E. Saber: Disney World has the fast pace and draws very large crowds, and they run it well.
- Ram: The video shown today was nice but it appeared to be advertising for Mechanical Engineering. B. Culhane: The following year a 2-year video of this event will be shown that will be across the board of those who presented here at RIT, and not just focusing on one college or department. The future video will be a bigger span of things and will have a different format.

OMBUDS REPORT
PPt Presentation: http://hdl.handle.net/1850/15543

Lee Twyman, RIT Ombudsperson gave a report on the number and types of issues that come to the Ombuds Office. The number continues to grow for the total cases. One of the reasons for this is that the awareness of this service has been extended more on campus. From 2010-2011 there have been 431 cases of people or groups coming to the Ombuds office and in 2011-2012 that number grew to 543 cases. The largest group that came to the office was students. A letter is sent out to the parents of first year students so they are aware of this service also.

Employee, student and parent issues were reported. For employees during 2011-2012, most came to the office for consultation or evaluative relationships. Some wanted consultation of where to go for what they were asking about. The PPTs slides 5 and 6 shows all the various employee issues during the past year. RIT has been going through enormous change and conflicts can come or there are communication breakdowns. A conference is being planned on the topics of “change and conflict” that will be of help to many. Another employee issue Lee touched on was generational dynamics, which is having younger faculty/staff working with older people and it can be a pull and tug situation.

L. Twyman reviewed the student issues and said the number one issue that students come to talk about is academics. The top four student issues she had listed were grading issues, policies and procedures, timeliness and quality of feedback from instructors and variable use of MyCourses and “Early Alerts.” For the MyCourses and Early Alerts, not all faculty use this and students do appreciate this valuable feedback from their teachers. Syllabuses’ are not always detailed and students complained of this. She said she is seeing more students come with complex issues in trying to navigate at the university. These students had a lot of support during their K-12 years, but need more support here. Stress can be high and for homeschoolers there are issues of socialization. Additionally, there are a number of RIT policies that need to be clarified and revised, particularly academic policies. There is the Policy Committee headed by Kathleen Martin and Sue Provenzano that will be addressing a number of these issues over time.
Additionally, Lee will work with AS subcommittees to address some of the more problematic policies this year (see slides 7-8 per student issues).

The parent issues parallel the student issues. In the last three years financial issues have been a great stress among parents with other added layers of stress with their child attending school. Parent concerns and questions ranged from the academic progress of their child to the co-op process. (See slides 9 and 10 for more detail of what was presented.)

The Looking Forward part of the PPt went into having mediation and group facilitation, giving quarterly/semester reports to governance groups, deans etc. to bring issues to the floor to be addressed, evening hours in residence halls (students and employees) and much improved marketing efforts (website, information, outreach efforts, training). Additionally, L. Twyman hopes that the conference “Change and Conflict” will have some Academic Senate and Staff Council involvement.

Discussion and Q&A ensued.

- E. Saber: Has anyone come to your office in regards to Cost Containment?  
  A: Anecdotally yes, but not that much as this has been channeled through AS and SC.
- C. Lundgren: When the load is exceeding national cases, at a certain point in time the effectiveness starts to be hampered. He recommended to break down the number of issues among students, faculty and staff into percentages and additionally this will help the office to see where time should be spent on certain issues.
- H. Yamashita: With students complaining of harassment, some complaints may be due to their perception. It can also be a generational gap of how perceptions come about and she asked if the office has guidelines on communication with students and faculty relating to each other.
  A: RIT has a Policy on Sexual Harassment (the legal terms). Yet from those who came in to talk about harassment situations they feel they are in, it was seen that it was how people are treated that was the issue and this is so important in terms of respect and civility. L. Tymann noted that actual harassment is dealt with in another office.
- M. Ruhling: Harassment and discrimination didn’t show high on the charts shown today and would the perception of a student with a harassment issue go into another category?
  A: Students come forward with this but Lee said she does not evaluate this. Usually it is how people feel they are being treated. Over the years, a pure case of harassment or sexual harassment she said she did not see as much of and in talking with other Ombuds colleagues, the cases at RIT’s campus were not as typical as they were at other colleges.
- H. Shahmohamad: How is RIT doing compared with other schools and are we at the peak of grievances?
  A: Not every university has an Ombuds office. The U of R (medical center) just established one. Having a window into the other campuses that have Ombuds offices, the trend and types of issues we have are comparable.
  Q: Are percentages the same?
  A: I can look into this. We have common issues when comparing with other places that have an Ombuds Office.

L. Tymann said if anyone has other ideas of making the Ombuds office more known at RIT, to please contact her.

**POLICY PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSED REVISIONS TO POLICY E5.0 (Policy on Tenure)**
Margaret Bailey and Jeff Pelz, FAC members have been working on this policy for a long time and presented a Ppt reviewing the proposed changes to E5.0. Kristen Waterstram-Rich, FAC chair was also present.  The proposed revisions were presented to highlight significant changes proposed by the Faculty Affairs committee.  No vote was to be taken on this policy. Documents were distributed [Current Policy E5.0, Revised Policy E5.0 (Clean copy) and the Ppt presentation]. All documents distributed today can be viewed via the links above.

M. Bailey reported that the policy had some differences with usability in many cases. The policy has been reorganized and updated with suggestions from faculty and administration.  A table of contents has been added and in doing this they saw that some of the sections in the policy were not in the right places and that some information existed in multiple locations within the existing policy.  M. Bailey and J. Pelz wanted to make it more readable so most of the work with this policy has been with re-organization of the policy. The existing policy has four sections and the revised policy has five sections.  (See Ppt via the link above for a more detailed report of the revised policy).

The Preamble, with reference to the AAUP 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure (See Ppt, slide 3) had been re-written along with the goals of the Preamble to make it more readable and more reflective of the Institute today (slides 4-6 of the Ppt.) Each slide of the changes with the goals shows the existing policy and then the proposed portion.

Comment

- President Destler commented on the Preamble changes saying that he would have a very hard time with the Board of Trustees agreeing to the inclusion of the AAUP statement and is concerned as this is a striking change being made to the Preamble in regards to tenure and promised economic security. He said this is a very dramatic statement.

J. Pelz and M. Bailey reiterated that at the meeting today the proposal is only being shared for informational purposes and input is greatly encouraged from others. J. Pelz said the AAUP’s 1940 Statement of Principles is completely defensible. Yet all are encouraged to give input to the document for further discussion and vote later in January.

There are new changes in the goals in this policy. Revisions were reviewed in the following areas: 2.b.(1) Tenure Location; 2.c (2) Reduction of the Probationary Period; 2.c.(2).iv. Reducing Equivalency Credit; 2.c.(3) Hiring with Tenure; 2.c.(4) Extension of Probationary Period; 2.d. Criteria for Granting Tenure; 3..a.(3/4) Confidentiality and Disposition of Documents; 3.c.(2).i Composition of tenure committees for small colleges; 3.c. (2).iii. College Tenure Committee Vote; 4. Expedited Tenure Review; Appendices A and B Access to Documentation for Tenure Review. (see slides 7-18).

The Probation Period portion has 5 sub-sections. For the reduction of the Probationary Period, J. Pelz said that part of the confusion in the current policy was that in some places the policy said six years and in some places it said seven, and so this had to be clarified (starting at line 145 of the revised policy, see link above to review this.)

Comments and Q&A

- F. Walker, Dean senate representative said to be really cautious and is concerned that we don’t imbed hiring stipulations – opportunities, yes, but contract points, no. There are differences in the hiring contracts.

J. Pelz said to look at the permanent policy and compare the changes being proposed. He said the
only thing changed was the years and this was pointed out by the Provost as this was a typo in the policy. Line 145 starts that discussion.

M. Bailey: Please let us know your concerns.

F. Walker said faculty try to step forward and say “your policy says this”. He said he was concerned about hiring contracts and entitlement.

K. Waterstram-Rich: That provision exists in the current policy but now has been made more clear. The only thing that changed was the number of years.

J. Pelz: You are suggested to remove this from policy yet the deans like the flexibility.

F. Walker: He said he likes the flexibility but does not like to be pinned against the wall with expectations of this policy.

- President Destler: It used to be AAUP had six years and you may be denied one year, so is that where the 7 years came about?
- F. Walker: Does the proposed policy say one needs approval from the dean?

J. Jeff Pelz: This policy is more flexible and asking for the 1st year of reduction is just by notice and then if I want more than one year, one would have to go to the dean for approval.

Fred Walker: He felt that this language is not working in section 2c.

The presentation continued with sharing changes made by FAC. Under 2.c.(4) (Extension of Probationary Period) an automatic extension was added for one year for faculty who become a parent by birth or adoption. This extension may be waived by the faculty member.

- M. Richmond asked if the Institute investigates such a claim. Faculty would need to inform their dean and it would be written out.

J. Pelz said no, there will be no investigation, but since it is written out it can lead to fraud charges if found to be inaccurate.

The chair of the senate asked to hold all questions until the full PPT presentation was given on changes being made to E5.0.

M. Bailey continued the PPT presentation with 2.d. Criteria for Granting Tenure. This section was re-organized and many definitions replaced with references to E4.0 (Faculty Employment Policies). There was some slight re-wording. The rest of the policy was reviewed showing re-organization and some areas having language changes. (See full PPT presentation and Proposed Policy on the links above next to the title of this agenda item.)

Appendices A (access during the tenure process) and B (access during the mid-term tenure review process) were reviewed per Access to Documentation for Tenure Review. It was made clearer in this portion of the policy who has access.

Comments and Q&A.

- P. Tymann: Where do teaching evaluations fall in these charts?

M. Bailey: In the Portfolio.

- Ram: In looking at the process, 2/3 of the tenure committee votes and then the Deans write their recommendations. The Provost convenes a meeting and then a decision is made per the faculty person getting tenure. What if all say YES and the Provost says NO, or if all say NO and the Provost says YES. How would this be handled?

M. Bailey: We gave it a label to the process within Section 3. See lines 485-494 in the proposed E5.0 document per the University Tenure Review Committee. The committee simply gives advice to the Provost and the President gives the final word.

Ram: On the Tenure Committee, 3 out of 4 may say Yes or No and the Deans may say Yes or No
but we are asking for 2/3 to approve or disapprove. Can this be put into the policy?
K. Waterstram-Rich: A couple of years ago when the Tenure Committee and the Dean had a dispute, the Provost called the chairs of the tenure committee or there was a discussion between the dean and the Provost. If you want the committee to be able to vote regarding faculty receiving tenure, then you can suggest this be put into the policy. Again, the final decision ultimately goes to the President.
J. Pelz: If 2/3 of the committee approve, then it should go forward.
Ram: It could go both ways.

- H. Shahmohamad: When we vote on E5.0, if we don’t agree on the sections will we then be voting section by section? It seems so controversial and what will our procedure be?
K. Waterstram-Rich: She said she envisions that senate vote on the entire policy.

- M. Laver: He said he was under the understanding that the external review letters are seen by the tenure committee and department heads do not have access to the external review letters.
M. Bailey: Good point. If there are colleges that do not do that and feel strongly about this, then we can edit this.
P. Tymann: He asked if M. Bailey could double check the current policy and then see the new changes and she agreed to do this.

- C. Sheffield: Do the Board of Trustees play any role in this. If so we need to include this in the policy.
J. Pelz: The President used to make recommendations to the BOT.
K. Waterstram-Rich: This was changed in senate where now the President makes the final decision. Earlier Dr. Destler made that comment concerning the Preamble because tenure is a financial commitment but they do not go pro forma to the Board of Trustees.

- T. Policano: The history of the University Tenure committee was to give advice and it was initiated by the Provost and if we want the University Tenure Committee to vote, then this part of the policy would have to change, and that would be a huge change
E. Saber: It did come up with the Provost to have an ad hoc committee but not to have a vote with them.

- M. Richmond: Regarding the Preamble, slide 6, have you removed the implication that if you do not continue to grow you will be punished?
J. Pelz: In the existing policy it somewhat talks down to us and can imply punishment (but there is no punishment) and now the new language makes the policy more representative of what tenure policy is. (See Slide 4 of the Ppt.)

P. Tymann asked senators to discuss the proposed E5.0 Policy with their constituents and please forward suggestions and comments to Kristen Waterstram-Rich, chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee. All documents will be sent electronically to the senate shortly. K. Waterstram-Rich encouraged senators that if you hold meetings with your colleges regarding E5.0, to include your college member who serves on the Faculty Affairs Committee to make it an efficient process. This will return to senate in late January.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Respectfully submitted,

Vivian Gifford, AS Senior Staff Assistant
Heidi Miller, AS Operations Officer