CALL TO ORDER: 12:09 p.m.

COMMUNICATION OFFICER’S REPORT: Minutes of October 17, 2013 were approved.  
http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17095

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT
At the next AS meeting on November 14th there will be an update from the General Education Committee and the Institute Writing Committee.

NEW BUSINESS

Better Me Wellness Checks - PPT Presentation: http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17091

Michael Stojkovic, Associate Director for Wellness presented a brief PPT on Better Me Wellnesss. [See link above to view full PPT presentation.]

- Health goals for faculty and staff were listed as the following:
  - To decrease chronic disease
  - To reduce smoking and use of tobacco
  - To lessen impact of musculoskeletal disorders (i.e. low back issues etc.)

- Biometric Screening will be given to all volunteers (faculty/staff) in November with an incentive of $100 given to all who wish to participate. The $100 is taxable income so the payment will be less than $100.
  - Health history questionnaire
  - Blood glucose (blood sugar)
  - Blood lipid Profile
  - Blood pressure screening
  - All employees tied to Excellus will have the results of these tests sent to your physician
  - 850 people have enrolled thus far

- Wellness Actions were discussed (i.e. smoking cessation, personal training, individualized Wellness coaching, weight management programs etc.).

Discussion and Q&A ensued.
- L. Lawley: She said she was happy to see a carrot instead of a stick. Stated the concern of inappropriate questions being asked, as this had occurred at Penn State (i.e. Questions such as: Are you planning to become pregnant?).
M. Stojkovic: We will ask more lifestyle questions (i.e. people overusing alcohol, which can be associated with stress, etc.)

- H. Ghazle: With the Wellness Masters Degree that will be offered at RIT, how involved will your group be with this?
- M. Stojkovic: We are working with Dr. Daniel Ornt and William Brewer, suggesting there be a Wellness Coaching Certification.
- A. McGowan: Will the flu shot clinic always be tied to the screening dates of the Wellness schedule?
- M. Stojkovic: We are looking to do flu shots and blood pressure check-ups by Fall. This year we are late with flu shots.
- E. Saber: Have you considered changing insurance rates for smokers versus non-smokers? That would be an incentive and the Life Insurance agency has done this before in regards to the cost of the premiums. You would allow people to do as they wish, yet they would have to pay more for this in their insurance.
- M. Stojkovic: This would be a big step and they would be a lot of people who would not want this.
- L. Villasmil: This program works!

For further questions and comments, please contact Michael Stojkovic as they want this program to be as robust as possible.

**Comment from the AS Chair:** For the first time in the Destler Administration, we are ahead of schedule!

**Salary Benchmarking Project** - PPt Presentation: [http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17094](http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17094)

Dr. Judy Bender, Assistant Vice President for Human Resources gave a PPt presentation on Compensation and Salary Benchmarking for faculty and staff at RIT. She thanked the RABC for their feedback given for this report. [See link to the full PPt presentation above.]

- RIT is committed to pay faculty/staff competitively and has consistently allocated dollars to help close gaps to market.
- There is now a more standardized process in terms of distributing market adjustment dollars (details are provided on the HR website; the process includes reviewing performance, time in rank, and gap to benchmarks).
- HR utilizes peer institutions and market data for benchmarking – the peer institutions are also listed on the HR website.
- RIT’s pay on average is at the 50th percentile of the market for faculty, exempt staff and non-exempt staff. There are many individuals who are not paid at market, however and the market adjustment process was established to address these gaps. We had very limited funds for the 2013 process due to the current budget issues. Since 2003 RIT has directed over $2 million dollars to faculty positions for this activity.
- There continues to be opportunity to move salaries up in this process.
- Dr. Destler and Dr. Haefner wrote a letter in March of 2011 regarding faculty/staff compensation and targeting the 50th percentile. Peer institutions were used to gather faculty market data (a similar process is used to gather staff data). This letter spoke to RIT’s desire to have faculty salaries, on average at the 50th percentile of the peer institutions that we compare ourselves to. This letter referenced the option to use specific discipline benchmarks as well.
- Historically the RABC used an aggregate target that includes data from peer institutions, the data is reported by the AAUP and it identifies the average pay for faculty by rank in each institution. The results are different when you look by discipline versus looking by the aggregate rank. (If a university has more faculty members in higher paying disciplines, the average pay for that university would be naturally higher than a peer university that may have more faculty members in lower paying disciplines.)
- The history of the market adjustment process and its evolution was shared. RABC pulled aggregate faculty salary data from the AAUP to review this with the President and Provost. In parallel, individual colleges pulled their own market data to determine gaps. For example, a 2008 memo from Dr. McKenzie the Provost at that time, asked the Deans and Dept. Heads to allocate dollars based on discipline specific targets, not on the AAUP targets. Funds were provided accordingly based on the recommendations from the Deans/Colleges.
- Market adjustment re-cap over the past few years was shared.
• Benchmark schools were discussed. Twenty-nine schools were listed and two years ago it moved to 22 schools, which were approved by the BOT. [See Ppt for more details.] The original list had 30 schools and were recommended by a committee that included several faculty members.
• Recommended the path forward to provide more transparency regarding discipline specific market data and discussion can continue on the 50th percentile and benchmark schools.
• There was a discussion with RABC and Dr. Haefner, and a document will be published showing the benchmarking by discipline.
• RIT is in the “master’s” Carnegie level while many of our benchmark schools are at the “research/doctoral” level, RIT is moving toward this as we increase our research levels and increase the number of PhD programs that we offer.

Discussion and Q&A ensued.

• S.M. Ramkumar: Is there a minimum number of schools required to get the data? J. Bender: Yes, in order to report information survey companies generally require a minimum number of schools to participate. This is done to maintain anonymity for the providers of the data. For the CUPA survey a minimum of three schools are necessary per position – generally the number of benchmark schools that provide data for the positions that RIT has matched was between 8 and 10.
• S.M. Ramkumar: Can we get more information to understand the process in a greater way? J. Bender: Survey companies will not report which schools provided the data (to maintain anonymity); also, we cannot control which schools participate and which positions they match. We want good data and not self-reported data, therefore we use third party surveys. There are different surveys available and some colleges within RIT have utilized more specific surveys for their disciplines (GCCIS, SCOB).
• T. Engström: Are the upper administration salaries included in the 50% benchmarking calculation targets? If our CFO’s salary is anything to go by, it would appear as if RIT has expressed exceptional gratitude to its upper level administrators when it comes to compensation. Is he not at 98% of his benchmarking category? And as a class, are our upper level administrators not already well above the 50% for compensation? J. Bender: A sub-committee of the Board of Trustees is dedicated to reviewing executive compensation and they use the same peer schools as used for the balance of RIT. In addition, we have an external compensation consultant who assists us in gathering this data. Similar to our other populations there are some individuals who are paid above the 50th percentile of the market for their role and others who are paid below the 50th percentile. The BOT has an obligation to ensure that our executive compensation is reasonable. There are regulations from the IRS that address this.
President Destler: We have an outside consultant and the information we get is from our benchmark schools. The majority of the RIT administrators are at the 50th percentile. Some of the VP’s with exceptional performance are at the 75th percentile and some are below the 50th percentile. The market varies for each position, for example, the VP of Student Affairs position is typically a lower paid position in the market. He noted that Stevens College was taken off the benchmarking list of schools as they were paying their president $1.4M.
• E. Saber requested that the data be released to the RABC and would like to see the raw data. Targets should be based on performance, not just the 50th percentile.
J. Bender: Colleges recommend increases based on individual performance during the merit process. The 50th percentile is not a stopping point for pay; many individuals are paid above this point and exceptional performers should be targeted above this point. Benchmark data will be sent out in November to the RABC.
• H. Ghazle: Where does the health-care professions come in with the calculations? Few comparison schools have healthcare professions.
J. Bender: We do sometimes look to schools other than the standard 22 benchmark schools in order to obtain benchmark data. For example, this was done for the Physician’s Assistant position within IHST.
• J. Beck: The AAUP numbers are far below the 50th percentile at RIT and he requested that the data be shown.
J. Bender: The AAUP numbers pool all disciplines together, so these numbers are very different.
• M. Laver: These are good questions that need to be flushed out.
Dr. Hector Flores and Dr. Ag Crassidis presented a PPT on the Graduate Education Strategic Plan at RIT. [See link above for the full presentation.]

- Charge was given by Dr. Haeftner and Dr. Flores in October 2102 to form a Task Force to craft a Strategic Plan for Graduate Education with representatives of all stakeholders in graduate education at RIT. Dr. Crassidis came on board shortly afterwards as he was the chair of Graduate Council at the time.
- The Task Force had extensive outreach meetings with each college, with special invitees (Jim Watters, VP for Finance & Administration and Jim Miller, VP for Enrollment) to gather information and regarding benchmarking etc.
- A draft of the Graduate Education Strategic Plan was delivered to Dr. Haeftner in late May 2013. This was vetted at the Academic Affairs retreat in July 2013 and by the BOT sub-committee in July 2013.
- This was endorsed by Graduate Council in October 2013.
- A survey was sent to Program Directors and Graduate students regarding academic excellence and most of the students felt that they were getting a quality education here at RIT. These were open questions and very detailed. All is documented in a full report.
- Would like to work with the alumni as well.
- A collaboration is just beginning with Dr. Heath Boice-Pardee in Student Affairs to look at the Graduate student life issues here at RIT.
- Sustaining and enhancing excellence is critical and there is always room for improvement.
- There are huge opportunities for uniqueness, distinction, and visibility. There are things to be done to enhance RIT’s Graduate education.
- The Strategic Plan principles and themes were outlined. (For more details see link to PPT above.)
- RIT is not alone among aspirational peers, such as MIT, regarding challenges and opportunities.
- The Graduate experience at RIT needs to be unique to RIT, making it distinctive, visible and globally relevant. We should build a rich, diverse graduate culture.
- Timeline was given in the PPT presentation regarding the college feedback, vetting process, prioritizing recommendations for the implementation plan, implementing the Strategic Plan for Graduate Education in 2014 (Jan-November), and implementing the recommendations.
- 17% of the RIT community are Graduate students

Discussion and Q&A ensued.

- S. Boedo: He asked about the PhD students and the survey.
  
  A. Crassidis: There were responses from the PhD students and all responses were pooled responses to multiple questions.

- T. Engstrom: So students reported that RIT is excellent?
  
  H. Flores: No, there was a perception survey filled out by graduate students, with both positive comments and criticism, reflected in the ranked distributions and in the open ended responses.

- L. Villasmil: What about the students who strongly disagree that their graduate education is excellent?
  
  H. Flores: We had numerous, thoughtful responses to the open questions, over 100 pages, which are being analyzed and discussed. We are now discussing things with the Graduate student organization at RIT.

  J. Pelz: Regarding cost and revenue, we need to think about this in terms of self-sufficiency and this is a difficult thing how to do this. This can be a non-attainable goal. We need to set up an intermediate goal and then evaluate how we are doing on that.

  A. Crassidis: Hopefully we can come up with a compromise but the ultimate goal is to be self-sufficient. Some of the verbiage was changed.

- H. Shahmohamad: Self-sufficiency is very valuable and it is heartwarming to see a collaboration with the administration and the Graduate Program. The drivers have to be sustainable to be successful and to become self-sufficient. What drivers are there for these programs to become financially self-sufficient? We have seen some programs fail that have tried to be self-sufficient on their own.

  H. Flores: Two items that elicited the most discussion and thoughtful dialogue were 1) Looking at the budget and looking at a self-sufficient model for Graduate Programs in the future; and 2) the classic tension with Decentralized Graduate education and college/program-based accountability.
President Destler: There was never any intention that individual programs had to be self-sufficient. The masters degrees are more for cash generation and the PhD programs usually are losers. If the individual programs had to be self-sufficient we would never have any PhD programs.

H. Flores: The Task Force took this into consideration. The master’s programs take in about $6M in revenue and all the PhD programs cost $7.5M. So there is a deficit of $1.5M at present. We have to look at this and see how to bring this deficit to $0M. In visiting the U of R, they have the same percentages as RIT in regards to the PhD. Programs, in that 80% of the cost is absorbed by RIT and 20% is external monies. Maybe RIT needs to consider graduate endowment to attract the best students.

- T. Engström: The collaborative model you employed for developing strategic plan is terrific. Perhaps it will be a model to the Trustees as they initiate RIT’s strategic planning process for this semester. But self-sufficiency appears to be a financial, budget balancing goal, not a strategic goal. What are the strategic goals for developing new programs independent of their self-sufficiency?

A. Crassidis: This has already been taken care of in the Academic Blueprint Portfolio.

- T. Engström: What mechanisms would you identify for improving an integrative graduate culture? And are you hoping there will be some sort of an integrative curriculum to achieve this?

A. Crassidis: That is not what we are thinking of but we are doing small, simple things to enrich RIT, such as providing more office space etc.

H. Flores: For example, our office for the first time has a year program for professional development and to bring others in with the arts etc.

- S.M. Ramkumar: Programs which carry out the core mission of RIT should not be judged by financial self-sufficiency.

H. Flores: We are here to seek feedback and we will take this feedback and incorporate this into the reports. This will be discussed with the Task Force.

- M. Richmond: If graduate students move into academia, you might look at how RIT judges new faculty in order to make sure RIT prepares graduate students properly for their careers.

M. Laver asked that the senate be kept updated on the Graduate Education Strategic Plan. This will be presented to the Board of Trustees at the November 2013 meeting.

**Proposed Policy E5.0 – Policies on Tenure (Presentation of Revisions and Vote)**

Drs. Margaret Bailey and Jeff Pelz continued their presentation on FAC’s proposed revisions to Policy E5.0 (Policies on Tenure) which began on October 17, 2013 and motions were given for the various sections where proposed edits had been made. Recap of the October 17, 2013 meeting was given as follows along with the proposed motions for today’s meeting.

**Recap from the October 17, 2013 meeting:**

- **Motion 1**: Passed on October 17 with edits in lines 96-97
  - **BEFORE**: Tenure decisions shall be based upon the criteria and documentation outlined in the following policy.
  - **AFTER**: Tenure decisions shall be based upon documentation that meet the criteria outlined in the following policy.

- **Motion 2**: Passed on October 17 with edits in line 128
  - **BEFORE**: All Statements of Expectations shall be governed by university and college criteria
  - **AFTER**: All Statements of Expectation shall be governed by university criteria and individual college expectations for meeting the criteria.

- **Motion 3** (Conditions of Tenure Appointment- Teaching Equivalency/Adoption and Birth) was tabled on October 17, 2013, with needed edits beginning at lines 149 and 175. There was ambiguity in this portion of the policy around teaching and research, so this part of the policy went back to the FAC for further discussion. For today’s meeting it was proposed to remove the limit for two years. The proposed wording
wanted the statement for year to year to apply for teaching but not for scholarship. The current Lines 149-161 were read and then the proposed wording.

**Lines 149-161 Proposed wording** (Equivalency Credit):

i. For each year of equivalent teaching experience, the probationary period may be reduced by one year. Equivalent teaching experience normally shall be full-time teaching at the rank of instructor or above in a regionally accredited institution of higher learning, or full-time teaching in a non-tenure-track position at RIT.

ii. A reduction in the probationary period may also be given for scholarship in the subject-matter field in which the candidate is expected to teach and conduct scholarship. (Remains the same.)

iii. The equivalency of previous teaching and/or scholarship shall be evaluated by the department head and dean, and approved by the provost. (Remains the same.)

iv. The probationary period may be reduced by a maximum of two years, except by action of the provost in special circumstances, or in accordance with the Expedited Tenure Process section of this Policy.

Discussion and Q&A.

- L. Villasmil: He asked for clarification regarding hiring someone new and asked what happens if someone is hired and the department wants to grant them tenure before the six year time (accelerated tenure process)?
- J. Pelz: If the person did not request tenure during hire and then later on they want to accelerate the tenure, there is nothing in policy now regarding this. He said this did occur in COS when he was on a tenure committee, and it was brought to the committee and they had to respond at that point.

**Lines 175-181 Proposed on 10/17/2013** (Current Line 175 was presented along with this proposed wording from 10/17/2013):

A pre-tenured faculty member who becomes a parent by birth or adoption before the tenure documentation is due is automatically granted a one-year extension to the tenure probationary period upon providing written notice of birth or adoption to the department head, dean, and provost within six months of the birth or adoption and before the tenure documentation is due. The automatic extensions may be reversed if the faculty member so desires and so indicates in writing to the dean before the first day of the Spring term preceding the requested tenure consideration date.

New proposed wording made at today’s meeting:

**Lines 175-181:** The word “Each” would be placed before the words “birth or adoption” so it would read “providing written notice of each birth or adoption...”.

To lines 175-181, M. Bailey clarified the changes that were made to the probationary period and the birth/adoption section.

**Motion 3 was approved as presented.**

**Motion 4:** To approve the proposed revision to Policy E5.0 Policy on Tenure, section 2, Conditions of Tenure Appointment sub-section d.: Criteria for granting tenure

1. Criteria
   i. University Criteria
      a. Teaching
      b. Scholarship
      c. Service
d. Balance

- The term “college requirements” would be used in this section, rather than “college criteria” or “college expectations.”
- Within Sec. 2.d (1), rearrange and add sub-headings to add clarity between “University Criteria” and “College Requirements.”
- Starting at line 239 changes were introduced.
  1. Criteria
     i. University Criteria (insert new sub-heading)
        a. Teaching...(see lines 262-269)
        b. Scholarship (see lines 270-272)
        c. Service (see lines 273-278)
        d. Balance (see lines 279-283)
     ii. College Requirements (insert new sub-heading)
  2. Statement of Expectations and Plan of Work (No changes made)

- Starting at line 240 proposed changes (“requirements” has replaced the word “criteria”)
  o Each college shall develop, approve through a vote of the tenure-track faculty, and publish its own additional specific tenure criteria requirements, as well as acceptable forms of documentation based on the general criteria of this policy. College criteria requirements for tenure and for acceptable forms of documentation shall be no less specific than, and must be consistent with, this policy and those criteria listed in Policy E.4. The criteria requirements used for granting tenure, including specific qualities sought and achievements shall be defined in each college’s published tenure policies. Faculty within each administrative unit may define specific standards or qualities related to scholarship that are consistent with college policy. All college tenure policies shall be reviewed by the university president and made available through the provost’s office.

- S.M. Ramkumar: The second to the last sentence should say “college requirements” as well.
- J. Pelz: Right now it is saying “consistent with the university.” And it does say “consistent with the college policy.”
- T. Engström: There is a difference between “expectations” and “requirements” and he moved that “expectations” replace “requirements” throughout the entire document per what was approved on October 17, 2013. “Expectations” are adjustable, need to be balanced, and can be met in a variety of ways; “Requirements” are either met or not met, are not flexible, and failing to meet them can only appear negative. We should return to the better and already approved language of tenure “expectations”.
- J. Pelz: This vote on October 17 per replacing “requirements” with the word “expectations” was not an edit for the entire document but just for the portion at that time (line 241) that was being discussed.
- T. Engström: In regards to the question of review, it was proposed that the Academic Senate would review and ratify each college’s tenure expectations and the Provost spoke in favor of this motion as well. It is important and this body should live up to its representative responsibility for oversight. Moreover, it would be odd for this body to be asked now to vote for its own removal in a system of shared governance, and hand over the responsibility for this review to the Provost or President alone, especially after the Provost himself has agreed that he would want the Senate’s advice and recommendation in the process.

M. Richmond: On page 8, motion #2 by T. Engström was tabled on 10/17/2013 and reads as follows:

Add this wording to line 240: Expectations shall be approved by the tenure-track and tenured faculty of the individual colleges and then be approved by the Academic Senate.

- V. Serravallo: There is administration unit policy and university policy. If the Academic Senate is involved with approving this, then how would this affect departments in the colleges as they also come up with policies specific to their needs?
- T. Engström: If there is a university policy, the department or college could not violate this. In the same way that a college brings forth curriculum, it goes to an Institute Committee for a vote, and if not approved
the department cannot say “we will offer this anyway.”
V. Serravallo: Yet tenure is a different situation with having a set of expectations. There is much variation within departments in regards to expectations.
T. Engström: We have institutional criteria and these permit variety. Colleges are not free to do what they choose to do and then worry about the point without concern for consistency with University Policy. For example, we have a curricular blueprint that the Senate has approved. Departments and colleges propose curricula by reference to its institutional criteria. We as the senate would simply be exercising oversight for consistency with these criteria, which would already be built into part of the process they pursue in the first place.
J. Pelz: He voiced his concern over having the Academic Senate be the right group to review tenure expectations.
L. Lawley: The AS had this argument years ago and moved this from the department to the college level. We should not as a body be wordsmithing expectations. We are contradicting our past behaviors.
- J. Goldowitz: He argued against expectations coming to a vote at senate as college expectations can be voted down at senate.
T. Engström: College tenure policy will be reviewed by the Provost. Without the Senate, however, he could turn them down too, and there would then be no recourse to the governance system. This is why even the Provost too argued that he would benefit positively from the consistent maintenance of our system of shared governance. Academic proposals are not good enough with only him reviewing the policy and it should not by-pass but, rather, come to senate.
S. Hoi: This must be shared with all faculty in our colleges and those in his college are very concerned about this proposed wording for the senate to have oversight and vote to approve college expectations. He made a motion to table this.

E5.0 will be returning to senate on 11/14/2103 and M. Laver encouraged senators to share the proposed document of E5.0 with faculty in all the colleges.

ADJOURNMENT: 1:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

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