CALL TO ORDER: 12:10 p.m.

COMMUNICATION OFFICER’S REPORT: Minutes of September 19, 2013 were approved with one abstention. [http://hdl.handle.net/1850/16896](http://hdl.handle.net/1850/16896)

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) has requested that senators please forward any comments from your colleges/constituents in advance regarding E5.0 (Tenure Policy) to Margaret Bailey, [mbbeme@rit.edu](mailto:mbbeme@rit.edu); Jeff Pelz, [pelz@cis.rit.edu](mailto:pelz@cis.rit.edu); and the chair of FAC Kristen Waterstram-Rich, [kmw4088@rit.edu](mailto:kmw4088@rit.edu) as this would be very helpful for the FAC before E5.0 returns to the Academic Senate on October 17th. The whole meeting will be given over to discuss E5.0.

NEW BUSINESS

COACHE SURVEY RESULTS

PPt Presentation: [http://hdl.handle.net/1850/16968](http://hdl.handle.net/1850/16968)

COACHE Executive Summary: [http://www.rit.edu/provost/priorities_keyfocus#Priorities](http://www.rit.edu/provost/priorities_keyfocus#Priorities) (This document can be found on the Provost’s website, under the Faculty & Staff Success section on the Priorities site, which this link will take you to.)

Provost Jeremy Haefner gave a power point presentation of the data from the COACHE survey taken in 2012. COACHE is an acronym for “Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education”. The lead team members who worked on the COACHE survey were: Margaret Bailey (KGCOE, PI in Advance Grant), Robert Barbato (SCB), Paul Craig (Dept. Head of Chemistry), Laurie Clayton (Office of Diversity and Inclusion, Director of Assessment and Research Management), Patrick Scanlon (Dept. of Communication Chair), Maureen Valentine, co-chair of the COACHE taskforce and Associate Dean of CAST, and Lynn Wild, co-chair of the COACHE taskforce and Associate Provost for Faculty Development and Wallace Library.

Important points made:

- The success of a university depends largely on the wonderful contributions faculty and staff make.
- RIT has gone through tremendous change in the last 20-10-5 years and surveys were given last year that will help us to understand how this has impacted faculty and staff and what we can do to make RIT a better place to work.
- The combined data of these three surveys provide a snapshot of our culture. (COACHE Survey; Engagement Survey; and Climate Survey).
• The surveys revealed great strengths among the faculty and also real areas of concern.
• There have been great conversations with the Deans and Chairs, and in the future there will be a Town Hall meeting hoping to maximize attendance regarding these survey results.
• The selected comparison schools included: Purdue, SUNY Binghamton, SUNY Buffalo, U of R, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute.
• RIT’s overall response rate to the survey was 59%, which is tremendous.
• “Results at a Glance” were reviewed (Green: Areas of Strength; Red: Areas of Concern) High in the survey per strengths was Department Collegiality, Personal Family Policies and Health and Retirement. Areas of concern for RIT were Tenure Policies/Tenure Clarity, Promotion Clarity, Post-Tenure mentoring and Appreciation and Recognition.
• Positive signs at RIT in the survey were: Collaboration, Tenure Reasonableness and Mentoring.
• Possible concerns were: Nature of Work: Teaching; Nature of Work: Research; Interdisciplinary Work; and Facilities and Work Resources.
• The COACHE survey was broken down into colleges, men-women-color.
• See Ppt for the full details of these slides.

Q&A:
• M. Richmond: Which classification is RIT now?
  Provost: RIT is currently a Masters’ degree school but will soon be classified as a “Research-High Intensive Institute” as the number of Ph.D. students increase.
• J. Goldowitz: How were the five comparison schools chosen?
  M. Bailey: We had a limited choice and from the list given one dozen people picked the five best we could find.
• S. Hoi remarked that he was surprised at the low score in the “Nature of work: Teaching.”
  Provost: I suspect it is related to loads and research expectations.
  L. Wild: This may account as well to teaching too many courses along with having to do research.
• M. Fluet: The mean on the “Dashboard” slides is “RIT mean”, correct?
  Provost: Yes, that’s right. We do not know the overall mean.
• L. Villasmil: The unhappiness with Promotion is no surprise as RIT’s nature is evolving.
• H. Ghazle: The inconsistencies between colleges at RIT leads to unhappiness. We need to address these inconsistencies.
  Provost: You want some flexibility in the colleges.
• G. Hintz: Included are very broad statements which cover all the colleges and these may be too broad for real clarity and could be a chief problem.
  Provost: We have been careful that statements are all inclusive for all colleges.

Post-Tenure Mentoring

• Provost: Women feel there is mentoring inside the department and outside. Yet the associate faculty are not satisfied with the mentoring. Faculty of color are not as dissatisfied.

Comments and Q&A:
• B. Hartpence: In Golisano the change in promotion requirements is very sharp and maybe the step is too sharp or the rules changed rapidly, so there is no clarity.
  Provost: We need to fill in these gaps more linearly. There is a group of associate professors who are caught in this change as RIT was once a more teaching university and the research portion they didn’t expect. We need to work on the wording in Policy E6.0 in one particular sentence.
• M. Richmond: A big problem here is not clarity or working or policies but an unfortunate circumstance of evolving expectations and there is no way for older faculty to catch up to new standards, in many cases.
• C. Thoms: The reason there are so few numbers with those of color could be because there are so few here on campus.
  M. Bailey: Our faculty of color responses compared well with the total survey cohort.
• Provost: We need focus groups to tease out the information not in the data.

**Tenure Policy Clarity**

The strengths and areas of concern were reviewed. [See PPT.]

- S. Boedo: There are not a lot of green areas (areas of strength).
  Provost: Today we are sharing only what is in the lower percentage. Yet we cannot forget to celebrate our strengths.
- R. Stevens: We must be careful to draw conclusions on small sub-samples.

**Appreciation and Recognition**

- H. Ghazle: I am puzzled by this data.
  The Provost said he is making department visits to clarify the issues faculty have.
- M. Fluet: Why are there so few responses from pre-tenure on upper management?
  L. Clayton: There is the possibility of low/no responses from the pre-tenured faculty on the survey item(s).

**Employee Engagement and Climate Survey**

2012 Employee Engagement and Climate Survey PPT presented November 2012: [http://hdl.handle.net/1850/15485](http://hdl.handle.net/1850/15485)

Laurie Clayton reviewed this portion of the slide presentation. This survey, both for faculty and staff was administered April 16-May 4, 2012. Total response rate (faculty/staff) was 55%. Total faculty participation was (40%). Tenure and Tenure Track faculty response rate was 41% (327/790).

**Important Points Made:**

- The administration and results were provided by Avatar HR Solutions, a national employee-survey consulting firm.
- There is a difference in the type and detail of questions between the COACHE and the Engagement and Climate Surveys.
- “Recognition and Appreciation” questions had lower percent favorable responses from faculty on the Engagement and Climate Survey.
- Overall job satisfaction for RIT faculty and staff were 73%, for faculty it was 68%. Lower percent favorable for professor, tenured and Associate Professors.
- The Engagement and Climate Survey reflect lower % favorable responses from faculty regarding necessary materials and equipment (55-63%) when compared with rest of the organization and lower mean scores with “lab, research, studio space” on the COACHE survey.

**Q&A/Discussion:**

- J. Goldowitz: Does the COACHE survey give uncertainties in values. Please keep track of these uncertainties before drawing conclusions.
  L. Clayton: We do not have the raw data for these surveys, only summaries. The raw data is retained by COACHE and by Avatar Solutions. We can look to dig deeper into the data.

**COACHE Survey Continued**

The Provost continued his presentation, with the slide on Drilling Down, which would tell us what the number one thing is to improve the workplace for the faculty. He said in this section of the data we should be looking at where we are and where comparable institutions are. See link above for the full presentation.

- M. Richmond: There is no reason to be unhappy or concerned about tenure, as overall faculty are less concerned about tenure than at other universities.
- S. Hoi: Why would the full professor not be concerned about the teaching load while the assistant and associate professors are concerned?
Provost: There would be tensions between performing research and for them to be teaching. We need to dig more deeply in this area. Full professors have obtained the highest rank and may not be worried anymore.

- V. Serravallo: Is the Digital report Portfolio available to us at RIT?
  Provost: The team needs to go through these results carefully first and the Provost said he has not even seen all of this yet. Right now this is where they are with the analysis.
  M. Bailey: We may need IRB’s approval to release the full qualitative results and it may be impossible to release some of the full comments.
  V. Serravallo: You could summarize and categorize the comments.
  M. Bailey: Yes, that’s possible.

- H. Ghazle: You stated that the Deans would be preparing presentations for their specific colleges. I want to see the leadership in my college address the concerns which COACHE raises for my college. And we need to compare colleges across the campus as well and see us move to the next level.
  Provost: Right now we are not on-track to share across the colleges. Within the colleges you will see the areas of concern.
  M. Bailey: We are suggesting each college compares their data to the overall RIT data vs. specific colleges.
  L. Clayton: You will be able to view your college’s “Results at a Glance” relative to the Institution.

- B. Harpence: Will faculty in a college see their college’s data?
  Provost: Yes.
  M. Bailey: We suggest colleges show their numbers together with the overall average from RIT.

- J. Goldowitz: Could CQAS help with the interpretation and analysis of the data?
  Provost: Yes.
  L. Clayton: Carol Marchetti from the College of Science/ADVANCE team is conducting COACHE data analysis.

The Provost reviewed the next steps for 2013 [See end of slides of the PPT for full details.] This semester we want to share the data and work on areas of concern. By the spring of 2014 best practices and recommendations on promotion clarity/post-tenure mentoring, tenure policy clarity and appreciation and recognition will be implemented. In the summer semester 2014 implementation of best practices and recommendations will be assessed and then shared. The next areas for improvements will be identified and addressed (or continue to work on these three if needed) in 2014-15.

Comments & Q&A:

- M. Laver: Does RIT have an existing mechanism to accumulate faculty feedback on an on-going basis, not as part of a specific survey?
  President Destler: There is feedback on the “Ask the President” website, though this is not advertised as a mechanism for faculty and staff. This site is used heavily by parents.
  Provost: There is also “Ping the Provost” on my website.
  B. Harpence: It would be great to have a repository or an electronic suggestion box for faculty and others to give input. Surveys are okay but they are not exactly as anonymous as they should be.
  Provost: This is certainly something in our capability to put together.

- S.M. Ramkumar: Will the college have a level of flexibility to address what they need to do to improve? And will each college have its own list of areas of concern, in addition to the areas which are institute-wide?
  Provost: We want the colleges to assist in the broad areas and they should have the flexibility to work with this. There are opportunities for Deans to identify different areas of concern or strengths for each college. It’s a matter of bandwidth.

- S. Hoi: Regarding the next steps, are these your top priorities?
  Provost: Yes, these are the top priorities of what we want to work on in the next year to help move the institution forward, with regards to the COACHE data.
  S. Hoi: He asked that “teaching concerns” be included in the top priorities.
  Provost: We need more information on unhappiness about “teaching.” Let’s study these things through Focus Groups and obtain more information where we can.

- H. Shahmohamad: Commented that this was a great presentation. Yet why do we choose different benchmarking schools for different purposes? Statistics can be tricky when one compares x vs. y. How one chooses comparison items can affect outcomes strongly. Over the years we have used different lists for
benchmarking and shouldn’t this be one unified list?

President Destler: There is one set of official peer schools for RIT. This was revised last year or the year before (20 institutions). It took out some of the SUNY Institutions and included more of the private institutions. The official list was approved by the Trustees. We try to use that set as much as we can, but we cannot always get data in every category from this set of schools. When we get the results we are then allowed to work with only three or four schools. This list has changed once in the last ten years.

Provost: For the COACHE survey we could not use those schools (we did not have a choice) and I was not happy with the five schools used in COACHE. Per the President’s request, I will send to faculty the official list of the current peer schools (20 institutions).

- H. Ghazle: We are in the midst of change and some people will be unhappy. We should focus on changes in attitudes and behavior, moving forward from our current position.

  Provost: That is the exact intent that we had and we are always looking at how we perform now against how we performed in the past.

K. Martin – With the Engagement and Climate Survey one of the reasons we wanted to partner with the Office of Diversity and Inclusion was to be able to replicate the survey over time. Some of the most valuable data is not how we compare to the outside, but how we compare within RIT from previous times.

- J. Voelkel: CQAS could be more than happy to make suggestions on the slides presented today. Twenty years ago faculty came to RIT with the expectation of having little research with their teaching load to obtain tenure, and now the pressure is greater as they must now do much more with research plus their teaching load. This is one source of unhappiness over teaching and there is no easy fix to this problem.

  Provost: We have made some substantial changes to the teaching level and we have settled on what we could reasonably fund and have made some adjustments. We have invested in some ways with course reductions with Associate Professors doing research, but it has been spotty. To cover the classes when course reductions are given, adjuncts or lecturers are used to teach these courses.

- G. Hintz: I have worked here at RIT for 30 years and nothing has changed per my workload and contact hours.

- F. Walker: We have been given guidance through the Deans community to very proactively look at workloads for the most needy, which was pre-tenured faculty. And these pre-tenured faculty had the same teaching loads as the tenured faculty. In the environment where scholarship and productivity was going up, I’m not comfortable with the information that came forth as the Institute made a substantial investment with this. Some of this investment came from the Provost’s Office or the college budget. And there was some teaching relief for the Associate Professors so they could move forward for promotion processes.

- S. Boedo: One of the aspects that stood out was facilities and are you going to bring in the interest of the infrastructures?

  Provost: As we pull out more data, for example from Focus Groups, we can identify some of these problems with the facilities and infrastructure.

- S.M. Ramkumar: What was done to make the jump in the Recognition/Career Advancement area?

  Provost: We looked into career ladders for staff and now for lecturers as well.

- M. Laver asked if the COACHE survey will come to the colleges and who should we contact regarding the survey per any comments or questions?

  Provost: All this information is posted on my website and there will be a Town Hall meeting. Encourage your faculty to come to the Town Hall meeting. And there will be individual college meetings dedicated to sharing the COACHE information for each particular college. For questions/comments you can contact Lynn Wild and Maureen Valentine (the two taskforce co-chairs) or myself (the Provost).

M. Laver asked again that senators and their constituents send their comments on E5.0 to FAC.

ADJOURNMENT: 1:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael Richmond, AS Communications Officer
Vivian Gifford, AS Senior Staff Assistant