ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
ACADEMIC SENATE
DECEMBER 19, 2013: 12:00-1:50 p.m.
CIMS/2230/2240 (Slaughter Hall)

Present: J. Beck; S. Boedo; H. Boice-Pardee; C. Calvelli (CHST Alt. for H. Ghazle); D. Defibaugh; T. Engström; M. Fluet (GCCIS Alt.); S. Gold; J. Goldowitz; J. Haefner; B. Hartpence; G. Hintz; M. Kotlarchyk; M. Laver; E. Lawley; J. Lodge; S. Maggelakis; K. Mousley; R. Raffaele; S.M. Ramkumar; V. Serravallo; H. Shahmohamad; C. Sheffield; R. Stevens; C. Thoms; B. Trager; R. Vullo; J. Winebrake (Dean Alt. for Fred Walker); H. Yamashita

Members Absent: N. Cifranic; J. Chiavaroli; W. Destler; J. Hertzson; S. Hoi; R. Kushalnagar; J. Lisuzzo; K. McDonald; A. Ray; L. Villasmiur Urdaneta, L. Wild

Excused: S. Bower; M. Richmond

Presenters/Guests: Margaret Bailey; Neil Hair; Therese Hannigan; Joseph Hornak; Adam Smith; Kristen Waterstram-Rich

Interpreters: Angela Hauser and Susanne Weatherly

Tech Crew: Jeff Henstenburg

Call to Order: 12:11 p.m.

Communication Officer's Report: Minutes of 12/12/2013 are approved. http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17154

Executive Committee Report

- Volunteer(s) Needed: A faculty representative from the senate is needed to participate in a Staff Council session regarding Calendar feedback. Lauren Shields, SC senator said there are a lot of concerns from students and staff about this year’s calendar, and therefore Staff Council would like to put together an alternate proposal and will be meeting during intersession to work on this. Josh Goldowitz, CAST senator volunteered to join this session during intersession.

New/Old Business


PPT Presentation of this program proposal: http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17164

Joseph Hornak, Graduate Council Chair presented the proposed advanced on-line certificate in User Experience Design and Development from CIAS. Present also were Neil Hair, Interim Executive Director of ILI; Therese Hannigan, Interim Director of RIT Online and Adam Smith, New Media Design Program Chair.

- Key points raised:
  - Compressed semesters
  - Available only to online students
  - Shared revenue model of RIT Online
- Material has come from different existing courses.
- No additional faculty resources are required.
- Support for course development and teaching is from the RIT Online initiative and the shared revenue model of RIT Online.
- There are three SCH required courses (12 SCH Total). These are new but have come from existing courses.
- There is one 3 SCH open elective course from RIT Online.

Reviewed the proposed program and shared concerns and discussion that Graduate Council had regarding this proposed program. [See PPT report, slides 4-5, for full report. http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17164]

- Concern over the accelerated 8-week duration classes.
- Concern over the academic integrity of the RIT Online format.
Opportunity to offer multiple sections or multiple courses within the same semester term.

- The required courses have similar outcomes.

- It was a unanimous vote by Graduate Council to approve this program with 15 in favor, 0 not in favor and 0 abstentions. This was a strong message that they believe in this program and want to see this go forward.

M. Laver noted that this the first certificate program coming to senate this year and had sent out the entire zip file for senate review. There may be ways to tweak this process to maximize efficiency and would be more than happy to entertain suggestions.

Discussion and Q&A ensued.

- H. Shahmohamad: How many students are you anticipating that you will have for this program?
  J. Hornak: In a 4-year period, for the first year there may be 10-12 students and then by the fourth year we may have 30-40 students.
  A. Smith: That is just in the program itself. The question that came up in Graduate Council was with the multiple sections. The content around these courses are desired by multiple online degree programs. So we are not just looking at the enrollment for the advanced certificate but the possibility of these courses being taken as open or concentration courses to other multiple online fields. So there would be two sets of numbers. These courses are not pre-requisite courses nor sequential, and are available to all the other online students.

- V. Serravallo: Do you have program level outcomes available?
  A: These were displayed per the zip file that had been sent to senators prior to today’s meeting. Link to this document: [http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17166](http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17166)

- L. Lawley: RIT has just gone to the semester model that the longer period of time benefits our students and improves our teaching model, so for this program to be 8 weeks versus 16, she had concerns about this as she had heard from other colleagues outside her college that with semesters the quality of work among students has improved significantly. To compress a class and have the same kind of pedagogical outcome as a 16-week class concerned her. Additionally, because it will count as the same number of credits, the potential for a student to become completely overloaded is extraordinary as essentially you are doing an entire semester’s work in 8 weeks. Are all the additional elective classes offered in this 8-week format and has that been approved by their curriculum committee?
  A. Smith: The targeted audience is not the on-campus students. The surveys of this community given indicate that 16 weeks is too long a time to spread out these courses. The people taking these courses want them to be shorter in duration and more focused.
  L. Lawley: Is it also a different outcome and are we getting comparable outcomes? If not, then that is a concern regardless of who the targeted audience is. There needs to be clear evidence that the outcomes are comparable for this online compressed program and programs at RIT.
  A. Smith: The outcome is the same and we are expecting the same out of both groups of students.
  T. Hannigan: One of the examples when they met with Graduate Council was her own personal experience having been with CIAS and the new media program, that during the summer she had to teach 10-week material in two weeks (similar courses), and these courses had the same rigor and the same course outcomes, yet the way she worked with the content and students was different. She said she is very confident that in 8 weeks this is something the students will be able to digest and they will get the skills and competencies they need out of these courses, just as if they took this for 16 weeks. This particular program works out well to be taught in 8 weeks and all the faculty in her college have had to teach accelerated courses at some time, so they would feel comfortable with this. And the online community is very savvy with an online environment and would be comfortable with this material at that pace.

- V. Serravallo: In the program goals listed and the Academic Program Profile, a question was raised to clarify the global connectedness listed in the program goals and the ethical aspect as well.
  A. Smith: These originally come from the approval Visual Communications Design Program. With global connectedness, we are talking about design, digital devices, products, etc. Everything is global.
and global issues arise (localization, communication across boundaries, the impact, how you are presenting the information, etc.). Marketing discussed in America versus Asia or Europe or other places outside of America will be different. There are also global teams and issues of dialoguing and problem solving come up. In regards to ethical reasoning, it has to do with the ethics around the content you are using (copyrighted, trade mark materials) and how you leverage your own materials in the workplace as well and protecting these materials and that is why this is checked.

- D. Defibaugh: It sounds like a good program but a concern he had was having faculty to teach these courses and adjuncts would be used, but someone still has to run the program and coordinate everything.

- A. Smith: Coordination of this program would be moving to the school level, housed in the School of Design in its own program. So it would be a combination of faculty and the administration of the School of Design. As far as faculty, the first year this program would be treated as an overload, using the seed money to get this off the ground for course development and teaching.

These are online courses so the majority of them are online synchronous. The lecturing and the lab would be taken care of before summer. After the first year we will move to the shared revenue model. It is a self-sustaining model and allows the flexibility to look at not just having adjuncts teach but visiting professors and other options as well.

- S. Manian Ramkumar: This requires the development of three new courses with a maximum enrollment of 10 for the first year. So you have to have separate sections and the critical number is not there to justify running these sections until you build the critical mass. And it will be developed by someone on an overload basis, and they may not be the ones to teach it. And teaching it is different. How will this all work?

- T. Hannigan: We already have a lot of existing online programs lacking online open electives to choose from. These online courses can be taken as open electives by those students in an online program. There is already a need for these online courses so classes will be filled with more than just those enrolled in the program. The numbers we gave are conservative. And we are looking at introducing some other advanced certificates in the online space, and some of these can be used as well.

- A. Smith: Each course is only offered once the initial year. For the initial launch of this program we are only offering one section at a time and have built a gap and a window to rebuild the content when we move into the spring. We are well aware of the concerns and are working to alleviate as many of those as possible. It was more the Graduate Council that had concerns about the sections.

- T. Policano: Are these courses for others to take?

- T. Hannigan: These courses are only for students enrolled in an online program at RIT students to avoid cannibalization. However, if there is a big demand for this, we could open up some sections for campus students.

- J. Goldowitz: Regarding compressed semesters, if this becomes an option would one of my courses be an 8-week course? And what would prevent any other program from doing this?

- T. Hannigan: Last year when we first started working on this, we worked many months on researching the targeted audience. We are not unique at RIT going to this 18-week format and some like even shorter courses (6 weeks). This decision did not come about quickly. These adult learners will only be online and most are taking one course per 8-week session. These courses will allow people to acquire credentials or build up their skill sets and still keep their jobs or move into a new position.

- N. Hair: In regards to compression, we looked at a number of studies and have done extensive research around the issue of compression, looking at both the pros and cons. Looked into alumni coming back and the more seasoned students wanting to take these courses. With the on-line MBA program, there was phenomenal support for 6-week courses to be offered. It is a competitive advantage and we have exceptional courses.

- J. Voelkel: Is the tuition cost the same with these courses being compressed?

- N. Hair: The tuition costs have been reduced significantly, with having roughly a 40-43% discount for this program to remain competitive amongst our peers.

- B. Hartpence read some comments from GCCIS faculty: This program overlaps with GCCIS’s program.

- A. Smith: A meeting is scheduled tomorrow with GCCIS.

- S. Boedo: We want this program to be revenue neutral and what number of students would you need to keep this going and have these costs been brought in for maintenance? And for an online section, will you
have a tuition benefit if it opens up to RIT students?
N. Hair: The magic number is six for the number of students to enroll but we are pushing for 8-10 students.
In regards to financing, a lot of the students on campus can apply for financial aid. This is not an issue to prevent us from moving forward.
- S. Gold: In regards to compression, in many programs we are flexible as our summer courses offered are 5 or 10-week courses. The 8-week course offered on line seems consistent with what we are doing. On another note, our current academic calendar has a lot of problems with having 16 weeks and 15 weeks would work much better.
- C. Sheffield: The supporting document, table 2, has a lot of misspelling of words.
- L Lawley: There were concerns from faculty and also documents for review were distributed just yesterday. Therefore it is difficult to make a decision and vote in favor of this today not knowing all the details of it (research cited in the documents, cost model etc.).

Motion on the floor to approve the Proposed CIAS Advanced On-Line Certificate in User Experience Design and Development did not pass with 8 in favor, 12 opposed and 7 abstentions.

- Point of order from T. Engstrom: Is there any opportunity for this conversation to continue and to have them return with adjustments to the program for another vote?
  M. Laver: Yes, this can return to senate.

E5.0 (Policies on Tenure)
http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17165

Margaret Bailey, FAC sub-committee co-chair presented the motions for the proposed E5.0 Policies on Tenure with Kristen Waterstram-Rich, FAC chair in attendance as well. See link above of the full proposal which was discussed at this meeting and sent to senators prior to today’s meeting.

- Motions 1-6 have been passed and the new E5.0 distributed includes these changes along with the corrected “numbering” schemes, and the yellow highlighted text on lines 332-336 (text from motion 4 that has not yet been voted on).
- Motion 7 starts on line 449, section 3C. Tenure Review and Recommendations (regarding the College Tenure Committee)
- Clean up needed to occur in the following areas:
  o Text line 469: Suggested it read “university tenure criteria”
  o Text line 470-471: Suggested to strike “where applicable”
  o Line 486-487: Suggested to add “The committee shall select its chair from its membership.
  o T. Engstrom: In most of these cases the word “shall” has been used and suggested it should be “shall” where it says “the committee will select…”
- L. Shields asked for a point of clarification in line 479 regarding membership of the dept. head being on the tenure committee as in her college an associate dean was asked to serve and asked that this portion have added wording to say: “…and includes anyone in an administrative role who does not have direct input into evaluations may serve on the committee.”
  M. Laver: You may find a fair amount of resistance to this and this may open many more doors.
  L. Shields: Her committee has battled with this membership question but she then dropped the suggestion.
- Clean up of other portions of the policy continued:
  o Line 510, another edit: “university criteria and college tenure expectations”
  o Line 518: The input should shall include…..
  o Line 536 was an incomplete sentence and is now complete
Grammatical error on line 522 and suggested it say “shall make an additional attempt”.

- B. Hartpence regarding Lines 509-510: Are the college tenure policies considered to be the university criteria as we have individual college tenure policies approved by senate and what is the tenure committee actually looking at? He asked about the words policy, expectations and criteria.
  M. Laver: College tenure expectations are going to have to be in line with university criteria.
  M. Bailey: We recognize that there is university and college policy. A policy could include both criteria and expectations.

- External Review Letters (starting at line 523) now mirrors the policy E6.0 somewhat.
  - AS approved that the committee chair would solicit the letters for the mid-tenure review (two letters needed for mid-tenure review).
  - For tenure review it is four letters needed.
  - Suggested Change for text line 523:

    External Review Letters: The committee chair shall seek to obtain a minimum of four letters from external reviewers, upon consultation with the candidate’s department head, in the candidate’s field of scholarship. Reviewers will be requested to evaluate the candidate’s scholarship according to university tenure criteria and college tenure expectations. If fewer than four letters are received, the committee chair should make an additional attempt to obtain four letters. The external review letters will be received by the dean’s office of the candidate.

    The committee chair must seek letters from at least two reviewers suggested by the candidate. A maximum of one reviewer may be a co-author and all other external reviewers shall not have personal ties or conflicts of interest (C4.0) with the candidate. In all cases, the reviewers should have fields of study within the candidate’s expertise. Letters from thesis advisors are not to be used in the official list of external letters. However, they may be included in the dossier as further evidence of the candidate’s work.

Discussion ensued.

- M. Fluet: There is a minor difference in emphasis between the tenure and mid-tenure process with the letters (line 397.)

L. Shields: The only person who can create the list for mid-tenure is the dept. head and for tenure the committee has input for this.

M. Bailey: They can get additional letters and the committee can get that list for tenure but for mid-tenure it is only two letters, one from one list and one from the other list. This list is developed upon consultation with the dept. head so they would be very engaged in this process.

J. Voelkel: This seems to preclude focus on lines 524 and 525 and it sounds like it precludes the committee chair from asking others for sources of review letters. Was that the intent?
M. Bailey: That was not the intent. Before the final list is made, it is made with the consultation of the department head.

Friendly amendment for line 524: “…upon after consultation with the candidate’s dept. head…”
• S. Maggelakis asked about the timetable of when the chair will solicit these letters before summer so deadlines will not be missed as letters need to be received on time, and are we going to pay the chair during the summer to do this work?
  K. Waterstram-Rich: Line 575 addresses this later.
• H. Yamashita: Commented on Line 470, the word expectations may not address the department’s expectations. If department expectations are provided by the college, then that should be in print, available to the tenure committee as guidelines.

**H. Yamashita’s motion:** To add “department expectations” after the wording of “college tenure expectations” where applicable. (Line 470)

M. Laver: This document tries to ensure that college expectations are in line with university criteria, and then by extension department expectations must be in line with college expectations. This document does not go down to the department level. In the added wording this means that the committee should be armed with department expectations if applicable by the college.

K. Waterstram-Rich: A college policy would address the department.

S. Boedo disagreed as we are tenured at the college level and any expectations that the department would have should be in the college level document which will be brought forth to senate anyways. The wording should remain as is.

B. Hartpence: If my department chair says “these are my expectations for you for tenure” what is my response to that? Do I say we already have a college tenure policy, or do I say yes to this.

H. Yamashita’s motion was seconded by L. Lawley.

H. Yamashita: There is one set of criteria and the college criteria needs to be in line with the university tenure criteria. Within the college there are different disciplines that evaluate performance and method of scholarship, and for some colleges it is important for departments to have aligned expectations that would accurately reflect the level that meets the criteria of scholarship or reaching. Now with this motion it is more specifically defined.

C. Licata: This statement from H. Yamashita is covered under line 118, Statement of Expectations. Every candidate’s file will include the departmental expectations.

K. Waterstram-Rich: In Line 321 it mentions “other material in college tenure policies” and I presume college tenure policies should refer to this, that academic units may have specific standards or qualities (Lines 286-287).

L. Lawley: We spent most of last year working with the president and provost on a specific set of guidelines for people in Interactive Games and Media because the nature of our scholarship is often very different from other areas in computing. Our college policies point to the university policies. I agree with H. Yamashita’s motion and her points made. Separate definitions are very important and it is a valuable thing to pass on to the college tenure committees as there are so many multi-faceted and diverse colleges on our campus and giving examples of scholarship in a particular field is valuable. To add this wording of departmental expectations and getting their guidelines does no harm to the work of the tenure committee and this should be explicit.

T. Engstrom: This is a timely point, and if it confirms a level of explicitness that would be appreciated, and then it should be supported. It can cause no harm and only reduce potential confusion it is included here.

T. Policano: Tenure is with the college. He has no problem with the department having these additional nuances to what their expectations are for tenure and they should be included in the college policy and therefore would be forwarded to the tenure committee as they would be part of the college policy. Yet this would be an additional complication for the tenure committee to try to navigate and negotiate the validity of independent department criteria for tenure.

K. Waterstram-Rich: Earlier in the document the departments are called “administrative units” and it says “specific standards or qualities related to scholarship,” so if this is approved the wording should be consistent.

M. Laver: We can just vote on the principal of this for now and FAC can take it from there and return to
T. Engstrom: We are not just voting for the principal; we are voting on very clear and specific wording.

The motion was amended to say: “where applicable to department tenure expectations.”

- T. Policano: This was discussed and decided upon in senate before and now is being re-introduced into the policy again. It is not harmonious with the way we have structured the rest of the document. Before we vote on this we should respect the committee’s work and try to have verbiage that is compatible with the rest of the document.
- S. Gold: There should be one spot in the document where this wording is more clearly stated.
- T. Engstrom: It is not so obvious that it is not harmonious. It may not be applicable if decided so, or it may be that it may be applicable. Should there be such expectations, it makes sense that this be specified at this point in time.
- M. Bailey: This is the only time it is called “department tenure expectations.”
- K. Waterstram-Rich: Should we in Line 321 place an e.g. after “other material as specified in college tenure policies” and have it say: (e.g. department expectations if applicable) as then you have everything in on list and you don’t have it scattered in the policy? Or do you want this wording in both places (Lines 321 and 470).
- M. Laver: That is not the motion on the floor.
- S. Boedo: The wording “where applicable” does add accountability to this issue.
- J. Voelkel: If this wording is placed, here it would naturally have to go into other places, and that would be left up to the FAC.

The motion as amended passed with 21 in favor, 8 opposed and 0 abstentions.

FAC will bring this back to senate as another motion if they find places where wording needs to be consistent.

Motion 7 continued with a discussion led by M. Bailey regarding Access to Tenure Review Documents and FAC was included to delete this wording in policy but wanted first to get input and guidance from Academic Senate on this wording in relation to the footnote in Table 2, as the footnote points to the fact that faculty in the tenure process can have access to these letters.

Lines 547-549:
“The letters of review or assessment from the department head, dean, committee, and provost shall be made accessible to the candidate by the dean at the end of the tenure review process upon request.”

Concerns raised by faculty is that these letters would be written with the thinking that the candidates will not see the letters, and also deleting this portion would have an impact on the footnote of Table 2. Faculty are split in regards to faculty access to external letters and were troubled by the inclusion of this. FAC was not sure if this was some kind of legacy policy and were intrigued that this was in policy.

Discussed ensued.

- M. Laver: I just completed the tenure process and had no idea this was in policy.
- S.M. Ramkumar: This could become a problem if it remains in policy as the candidate could be rejected for tenure and now requests all the documents.
- T. Engstrom: Q: If were someone denied, would they have the legal right to access the letters for the purpose of filing a grievance? In effect, is this a choice of policy or does the law decide this? Next Q: If the letter is from the committee and the committee’s letter itself refers to the external letter writers, then we are in effect giving a certain kind of access to the candidate to letters that should be confidential. And if the letters are made available, we would have to make explicit in the policy and to potential letter writers that one cannot assume that their letters are confidential, which changes significantly the character of the letter
and the potential honesty of the review being offered in the first place. Given these complications, I tend to ere on the side of not permitting this wording in the policy.

- L. Lawley: We cannot make a decision without hearing from RIT Legal Counsel what we can or cannot restrict from the candidate. There will most certainly be legal issues if candidates cannot access materials. If a candidate would be reviewing the letters, the reviewers name could be kept confidential by putting in Reviewer A or Reviewer B so there would be no identification made and this would not breech confidentiality.

K. Waterstram-Rich: FAC will check with Bobby Colon in regards to this.

- J. Goldowitz: If a candidate does not get tenure, they do have access to the entire tenure file. He agreed to have no access to the tenure committee’s letter.

H. Shahmohamad: In teaching, a student is entitled to see how they perform and are entitled to know why they failed the exam or the course. And then they can learn from the mistake. In the same way, if I do not get tenure, I would want to know why. How else would someone know why they failed to meet the requirements of tenure. This can be a learning opportunity and some feedback should be provided.

- Dean’s response (Dan, Dean from CIAS??): As a Dean I would not want to share the letters and if a candidate is going to grieve or go through a legal process, they will have access but process can set whatever guidelines one wants to and institutes have the latitude to see whatever policies they want to.

S.M. Ramkumar: As chair of the department, they have the responsibility to tell the candidate along the way whether they are doing the right things in making the right progress toward tenure. So that in itself should be an indication for the candidate to change course and work with the chair of the department and the dean, and make the necessary adjustments to be successful at the end.

T. Engstrom: If candidates are denied, they need to know why, which is why they do, in this case only, legally have access to the letters. But the wording being discussed is inclusive and means everyone, not just those being denied.

- Kristen Waterstram-Rich asked senate the following so FAC would have guidance in working on this portion of the policy and Bobby Colon will be consulted as well in regards to the legal aspects involved.

1. Should the letters to go the candidate upon request at the end of the tenure process?
2. Could a straw vote be taken of who sees the external letters and have the wording in the policy adjusted according to the straw poll of the senate?

- T. Engstrom: It does not have to be all or nothing. The committee’s work does need to be confidential. There’s no reason, therefore, why the file cannot be made available and confidentiality maintained. We could simply specify that the committee’s letter be taken out of the general file.

M. Laver said he would like to forgo a straw vote regarding “should the letters go to the candidates upon request at the end of the tenure process.” RIT Legal Counsel will be contacted.

A straw vote was taken in regards to departmental tenured faculty members having access to external letters. A suggestion came from the floor for a third response, that the college would make the choice regarding department faculty having access to external letters or not, as colleges differ so much here at RIT. This suggestion was not accepted.

Results of the straw vote:

13 Yes - Departmental tenured faculty members should have access to external review letters.
11 No - Departmental tenured faculty members should not have access to external review letters.

Adjournment: 1:53 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Vivian Gifford, AS Senior Staff Assistant