

ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
ACADEMIC SENATE
DECEMBER 5, 2013: 12:00-1:50 p.m.
CIMS – SLAUGHTER HALL/2230/2240

Present: S. Aldersley (Alt. for F. Walker, Dean); J. Beck; S. Boedo; N.. Boulais (Alt for H. Boice-Pardee); S. Bower; J. Chiavaroli; D. Defibaugh; W. Destler; T. Engström; M. Fluet (GCCIS Alt.); H. Ghazle; S. Gold; J. Goldowitz; J. Haefner; B. Hartpence; J. Hertzson; G. Hintz; R. Kushalnagar; M. Laver; E. Lawley, J. Lisuzzo; J. Lodge; S. Maggelakis; K. Mousley; R. Raffaele; S.M. Ramkumar; M. Richmond; V. Serravallo; H. Shahmohamad; C. Sheffield; R. Stevens; C. Thoms; B. Trager; L. Villasmil Urdaneta; R. Vullo; H. Yamashita

Members Absent: N. Cifranic; S. Hoi; M. Kotlarchyk; K. McDonald; A. Ray; L. Wild

Presenters/Guests: James Fugate, Marianne Gustafson, Dino Laury, Mary Beth Parker, Tracy Worrell, Provost Jeremy Haefner

Interpreters: Nicole Crouse-Dickerson, Patty Sapere

Tech Crew: Jeff Henstenburg

CALL TO ORDER: 12:06 p.m.

COMMUNICATION OFFICER’S REPORT: Minutes of November 21, 2013 were approved with one abstention. <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17144>

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

- Needed: One non-tenured track faculty member to serve on the Ombuds Advisory Committee for a two-year term (AY2013-AY2014).
- Provost Haefner addressed his decision regarding the Institute Writing Committee’s presentation to senate on 11/14/2013 and the proposal to waive the General Education Writing Intensive (GE-WI) course requirements for undergraduate students in the 2012, 2013, 2014 class cohorts.

At the 11/14/2013 AS meeting, the Academic Senate rejected the motion to waive this writing requirement. The Provost overrode this decision and felt compelled to waive the writing requirement for the class cohorts in 2012 and 2013 only. This caught a number of faculty off guard, and he apologized for the abruptness. He had to make the decision in an expedited way as RIT was in the middle of registering students and deeply engaged in advising them. He would have preferred to meet first with the executive committee before making this decision, but time was of the essence. He assured the senators and faculty as a whole that this decision by no means is a reflection of less commitment for the writing program and for the very innovative curriculum approach across the disciplines at RIT. The Provost said he remains committed to the writing requirement and refers to it as a “Jewel in our Crown” when conversing with trustees, parents and others in the community, and the value that we bring to the table when it comes to assuring that students acquire skills that they need when they graduate from RIT. It is a marvelous model and noted that Chip Sheffield, Eugene H. Fram Chair in Applied Critical Thinking is looking at that model as something to look to for Critical Thinking. It has opportunity for a lot of other key areas for cornerstones to a liberal education, which is important for RIT students to have, together with their strong skill sets that they will have in their areas of disciplinary studies in which they major in. He said RIT will continue to move forward with that framework in mind. With the shortage of courses, this will require careful analysis and possibly new resources that will have to go into the writing program. Already substantial resources have gone into the writing program, with well over \$100,000 having been allocated thus far to get us to this stage. We will continue to roll this implementation out. He noted that the original recommendation from the IWC and staff in the Provost’s Office was to waive three years of students, but after reviewing the minutes of 11/14/2013, and taking into

account the comments made by senators at the November senate meeting, the Provost is waiving two years (not three years) of students. This will give sufficient time to put the courses online.

Discussion and Q&A ensued.

- H. Ghazle: RIT has a great writing program and from the perspective of our students, we owe it to our students to do the best for them. I have seen students not happy when forced to take a 2nd year writing course and when the decision was made by the Provost to waive this, students seemed happier and now their graduation is not delayed. It was a good decision by the Provost to do this presently.
- T. Engstrom: One reason that the senate was unsettled and voted in an undecided way regarding waiving the writing requirements was that many felt there were opportunities to fulfill the writing course that were not adequately explored. Perhaps some other time we can explore these opportunities. Also there is now the risk that those departments that did commit to offering writing courses could now appear to be failing to meet enrollment expectations because there is no reason for students to choose these sections.

Provost: Departments will be visited to discuss this and help them move forward as the last thing the Provost wanted to do was to undermine the enthusiasm that departments have shown to try to provide those important writing courses for our students. Moving forward will be important.

NEW BUSINESS

Revised Policy D10.0 (Eligibility for Participation in RIT Athletics)

Link to revised Policy D10.0: <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17129>

Michael Laver commended the AAC for their work and getting this policy to the senate sooner than later. Tracy Worrell, AAC sub-committee chair presented the proposed changes to Policy D10.0. (See link above for the changes that were proposed). The sub-committee members are Minseok Kwon, Paul Stiebitz and Tracy Worrell.

- The AAC was charged with reviewing a number of policies and if necessary revising them, and this policy had not been reviewed or revised in almost 40 years.
- The AAC sub-committee met with Alexander Sleeman from the Intercollegiate Office and Sue Provenzano from the Provost's office to discuss if revising was necessary. The committee felt clarification would be good in light of having the first graduate student intercollegiate athlete and the hockey teams becoming Division One. It is an NCAA compliant policy.
- Input came from the full AAC, the Intercollegiate Athletic Office and the Division of Student Affairs and the committee used their feedback to address these changes.
- Proposed changes:
 - Added "Intercollegiate" before the word "athletic" to denote that this is not a policy that applies to students who participate in intramural sports.
 - Removed full-time 12-credit hours as many students still participate in sports when doing a co-op, and are actually enrolled for zero credit hours.
 - Highlighted eligibility requirements for graduate students.
 - In line with the other D policies/governance policies in which Academic Senate is included under Responsible Offices.
 - This policy is NCAA compliant and does not account for all circumstances for athletes nor should it. There are special cases where students can apply for waivers, etc. There is precise wording in the Intercollegiate Athletic Office regarding eligibility.

Discussion and Q&A ensued.

- M. Laver: The policy largely defers to the National College Athletic Association (NCAA) and is compliant, correct?
T. Worrell: Correct.
- S. Boedo Requested a link to the NCAA rules or providing information on where to access this..
M. Laver: Can we place a link to a URL outside of RIT's site in our policies?
S. Provenzano said she will check with Lou Spiotti or Lex Sleeman to see what would be the most appropriate link.
- B. Hartpence: What does the term mean "satisfactory progress"?
T. Worrell: This wording was changed from "normal" to "satisfactory" as satisfactory is determined by RIT based on the SIS system.
- J. Beck: Is an undergraduate student eligible if they are not full-time as the language was removed.
T. Worrell: The NCAA rules states this that to be eligible to participate, a student has to be full-time.
- J. Voelkel: Graduate students must have a BA from RIT and is that above and beyond the NCAA rule that RIT is requiring? And is full-time equivalency accepted?
T. Worrell: According to Lex Sleeman, Division III athletes have to obtain their BA from the university where they are playing. In Division I there are waivers for special cases an athlete can apply for if he or she still has eligibility. This is the blanket coverage for graduate students. And T. Worrell did not know the answer to the question about full-time equivalency being accepted.
Lou Spiotti, Executive Director of Intercollegiate Athletics: Students have to be enrolled for a full load unless they are in their last term or last semester of their undergraduate degree, but they have to be taking courses that are necessary for their degree. A full load for graduate students is 9 credit hours.
- Lou Spiotti raised the following concerns:
 - 1) Some of the wording of the revised D10.0 is redundant Three statements in the policy now say the same thing.
 - 2) Under responsible offices, what role does the Academic Senate play in athletic eligibility (i.e. would this body decide to look at all academic records, student by student?).
- Some senators agreed that the redundant sentences in the proposed policy need to be removed.
- B. Hartpence: If the point of the policy is to reiterate the policy, then it does not make sense to have the AS be a responsible office. If the objective is to be more restrictive than the NCAA, then it is fine. Otherwise we can just point to the rules.
- M. Laver: Why is this being moved into Administrative Policies?
S. Provenzano: It is a compliance policy. In the course of reviewing policies, it was found that many policies did not have a responsible office listed. One result of that is policies, like this one, that have not been reviewed in many years. . More than one responsible office may be necessary for some policies. In that case, a primary responsible office would be designated. For this policy, the Intercollegiate Office could be the primary responsible office.
President Destler: He is not in favor of moving this policy into the administrative policy library nor having the senate be a responsible office. The Academic Senate should remain in the loop for academic eligibility but the primary responsibility should be given to another office.
L. Spiotti: In the by-laws, the President or Chancellor is responsible for choosing whom you will certify; Dr. Destler has designated that responsibility to me and I sign off on the eligibility forms.
- L. Lawley: What is the role of the senate and referred to the 2002 AAUP report regarding "faculty role in reform of collegiate athletics". Faculty should decide whether students are getting a proper education. We need to separate responsibilities (policy versus day-to-day oversight). The issue of eligibility has to do with academic standards and this policy should not be pulled out of governance.
T. Engstrom: Yes, we should separate and distinguish those roles of responsible offices that are operationally responsible from those that relate to governance and the oversight of the policy itself.
- M. Laver: D policies are governance policies overseen by Academic Senate, so there is no need to have the AS be one of the responsible offices as the AS is still involved.
T. Worrell: We were trying to have the oversight be in uniformity with the other policies.
- H. Shahmohamad: Who has the veto power?
M. Laver: The President.

- M. Richmond moved to remove Academic Senate from the list of responsible offices. The vote passed to remove Academic Senate from the list of responsible offices.
- S. Provenzano: In regards to consistency, there are other some other D policies that have Academic Senate listed as a responsible office, often with a second responsible office listed. And they are responsible for stewardship. We did not have designate offices until a few years ago. It is a consistency issue and now we are trying to assign policies responsible offices and we can have flexibility around this. There can be a primary responsible office and a secondary responsible office. Some commented that the role of the responsible office needs to be looked at.

S. Provenzano read from the Policies and Procedures site to bring clarity to the role of the responsible office. [See www.rit.edu/polices and go to the Policy Terminology link.]

- N. Boulais: The Office of the President should be listed instead of the Academic Senate as a responsible office as the NCAA by-laws states that the president has oversight. Is the Student Affairs Office then the oversight for operations?
- B. Hartpence: There is a template that says, “Responsible offices should be listed.”
- J. Chiavaroli: Due to no responsible offices being listed in the past, some policies have not been approved for years.
- L. Spiotti: He agreed with L. Lawley regarding the role of the senate academically with collegiate athletics as academic support is vital (quality of life, trust level). Marty Gordon gives oversight and reports to the President on Intercollegiate Athletics. We have been performing high with students having GPA’s of 3.26 and dozens of them having a GPA of 4.0. And the graduate levels are high. But we do need oversight.
- President Destler: I will make sure it stays under the governance purview.

There was a motion to table D10.0 and 2nded. This motion passed.

NTID AAS Proposal from ICC (Associate of Applied Science Degree in Civil Technology - Articulation agreement with CAST)

Link to PPT and Documents: <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17143>

Mary Beth Parker, ICC Chair presented the PowerPoint presentation of the proposed NTID AAS program Applied Science Degree in Civil Technology.

- Guests who also were a part of helping to craft this program were in attendance today: Dino Laury, NTID Engineering Studies Chairperson, James Fugate, NTID Engineering Studies professor, and Marianne Gustafson, Associate Dean for Curriculum and Special Projects, NTID.
- See PPT presentation for full details and the proposal itself via the link above.
- J. Goldowitz: Both Scott Wolcott, Undergraduate Coordinator for Civil Engineering Technology and Todd Dunn, Civil Engineering Technology Associate Professor from CAST, were in favor of this program.
- ICC unanimously approved this proposed program.

Motion to approve the NTID AAS proposal for the Associate of Applied Science Degree in Civil Technology program passes.

Academic Quality Dashboard

Link to PPT on the Provost’s site:

https://www.rit.edu/~w-drupal/sites/rit.edu.provost/files/presentations/aq2013_aspresentation_december2013kr.pdf

Provost Jeremy Haefner presented the PowerPoint presentation on Academic Quality on engaging the Board of Trustees and included in this presentation was the Academic Quality Dashboard. See link above for full details of this presentation. The Provost noted that it was important and helpful to have this discussion with the Board of Trustees

and particularly with the Education Core committee. From this discussion and presentation there were some very positive outcomes which are meaningful for the future of RIT.

Key points: (Please view PPT for details of the full presentation.)

- Why is academic quality important?
 - It is mission-critical as we are accountable for this to the federal and state governments and to the public.
 - Our competitiveness depends on this.
- Presented the discussion trilogy with the RIT Education Core Committee (see PPT starting at slide 8).
 - Started in April 2011 outlining where we should go
 - In July we put a framework on this to be sustained in the future and had a conversation with Middle States
 - Process was reviewed (April 2011, July 2011, and November 2011)
- Roles and responsibilities were discussed.
 - In presenting this to the Trustees, we wanted to make sure they are deeply embedded with Academic Quality as this is their fiduciary role. Most Trustees come from the corporate and business world and are comfortable about finances and strategy but are not comfortable how academics work.
 - It is up to the faculty and administration that this gets done.
 - It is with the Education Core Committee where all the work gets done and this guides the Trustees.
- A reading assignment was given to the BOT members: *Making the Grade* by Peter T. Ewell. At today's meeting the Provost encouraged all senators to read this book as there are so many different perspectives to think about in regards to academic quality, student-learning outcomes, retention and graduation, stakeholder input, program review and accreditation.
 - Some questions you will see in the book were reviewed. (See PPT, slide 12.)
 - One main question was: What are the implications for the Committee in ensuring academic quality is resourced appropriately?
- The Academic Quality Dashboard was reviewed (outcomes). (See link above to full presentation of this starting on slide 14.)
 - Trustees felt they needed a way to look at this that gave them a sense of reference. Peter Ewell's book *Making the Grades* outlines this and the Academic Quality Dashboard was framed.
 - Input indicators were shared as they are important. These indicators were divided into three sections with student and faculty within each section.
 - Environmental indicators were presented (Under Graduate and Graduate students)
 - What are the indicators we need to track and Joan Graham was present at senate today and has helped with this.
 - Informed Trustees of the progress rates.
 - The Trustees are interested in measuring our goals.
 - NSSE (National Survey of Student Engagement) summary questions were asked to students: Examples: "How would you evaluate your entire experience at this Institute? Would you choose this school again? Etc.

- Three-year history of data was put together in regards to sections taught and section sizes, students per faculty ratio, FT faculty are rated. These are key metrics that the U.S. News reports take.
 - Per the faculty being rated, Deans are asked to provide faculty who are rated for their teaching effectiveness.
 - Particularly important to the Trustees is the Output Indicators. This shows best in class and return on investments.
 - How successful are the students once they come into a career? (Employer satisfaction - includes co-op students).
 - Office of Career Services provided this data (Slide 17 of the PPT)
 - Ann Wahl's office worked on the Student Learning Outcomes – reporting on Dashboard aggregation of all this area.
 - Alumni Survey was taken and a third party vendor is used every three years for this survey. (See graph on slide 17 and 18)
- The AGB (Association Governing Boards) Teagle Project was presented (PPT slides 18-20)
 - Focused on improvement of undergraduate students learning in arts and sciences.
 - Objectives: More effective engagement of college and university boards in overseeing educational quality and student learnings. Creation of resources and best practices.
 - Nine institutions were selected for this project and convened September 2012- September 2013.
 - RIT was more advanced than most participants.
 - This was highlighted in the Trustees Journal and we are proud of RIT.
- RIT Work Plan was reviewed (Slide 20)
- Education By-Laws
 - These can be changed once a year
 - No reference made in the by-laws to Academic Quality
 - Charlie Brown took on the project to re-write these by-laws.
 - The actual by-laws will be posted on the Provost's site

Discussion and Q&A ensued.

- M. Richmond: Suggested that when the Provost is speaking to the Trustees in the future, he use the example of the Writing Requirements (this being one of the “jewels in our crown”, to use the Provost's words) as an example of Academic Quality being compromised by lack of resources.
Provost: Yes, that is one possible example.
- T. Engstrom thanked the Provost for involving the Academic Senate with Trustee issues. There was a very positive interaction with the Education Core Committee. Per the slide showing tenured/tenured track faculty versus Lecturers and Adjuncts, there was a goal of having fewer than 50% of the sections taught by tenured/tenured track faculty. It's not clear how this is related to sustaining or improving academic quality. Why not set the goal to be no fewer than 60% or higher?
Provost: We need to be more reliant on lecturers, particularly moving more toward scholarship and research. We have to be careful not comparing apples with apples (percentage of head count). Teaching assignments are much different. We have to beware of using statistics of “headcounts” and it would be better to use “sections taught” or “credit hours generated.”
- H. Shahmohamad: There are three key players – faculty, administration and the Board of Trustees. It was said RIT's Trustees do show an interest in academic quality yet I've heard few if any of the Trustees have PhD's as they are mostly from industry. How difficult has it been to educate the Trustees about academic

quality?

Provost: This did take time yet they are very open and not resistant. A groundwork had to be laid of student outcomes. Fortunately the Chair of the Education Committee is dedicated to this work. And sometimes with the Trustees seeing things from a different viewpoint, this can be helpful. Additionally, the Trustees do request input from the Academic Senate at times and the Provost said he is grateful for the involvement of the Academic Senate.

- H. Yamashita: I hope there will be some dialogues with the Trustees to improve the situation by lowering the percentage of sections taught by adjuncts, as it is critical to ensure and further improve the quality of instruction.

Provost: Part-time faculty and adjuncts play a critical role and some come from industry bringing special skills. Full-time faculty bring advantages to the curriculum. You are seeing changes in those ratios and it will be interesting to compare this under the semester system versus the quarter system.

- B. Hartpence: He asked where the Provost sees the numbers going (50% T/TT, 25% lecturers, and 25% adjuncts that was listed in the presentation today) as RIT is tuition driven but going towards scholarship and research. How will you manage the transition?

The Provost said he would like to hold to these numbers. RIT has a larger percentage of T/TT faculty than any other large institute and much higher sections taught. He said we do want to maintain certain metrics for that Academic Quality and try to keep class sizes small, which is difficult. There is a mixture of what we have to balance.

- B. Hartpence: It seems difficult to move tenured/tenured track faculty from teaching to research, and at the same time maintain Academic Quality.

Provost: I welcome discussion with the Academic Senate on this issue.

M. Laver encouraged senators to talk to their constituents about this to get feedback to the administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully Submitted,

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