

APPROVED as amended 2/27/2014

**ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
ACADEMIC SENATE
FEBRUARY 20, 2014: 12:00-1:50 p.m.
CIMS/2230/2240 (Slaughter Hall)**

Present: J. Beck; S. Boedo; Nicole Boulais (Atl. For H. Boice-Pardee); J. Chiavaroli P. Darragh; D. Defibaugh; T. Engström; H. Ghazle; S. Gold; J. Goldowitz; B. Hartpence; J. Hertzson; G. Hintz; S. Hoi; M. Kotlarchyk; M. Laver; E. Lawley; Christine Licata; J. Lodge; S. Maggelakis; K. Mousley; T. Policano; R. Raffaele; S.M. Ramkumar; M. Richmond; V. Serravallo; H. Shahmohamad; R. Stevens;

C. Thoms; L. Villasmil Urdaneta; R. Vullo; F. Walker; H. Yamashita

Members Absent: S. Bower; R. Kushalnagar ; T. Jefferson; J. Lisuzzo; K. McDonald; A. Ray; Brian Trager; Lynn Wild

Excused: W. Destler; J. Haefner

Presenters/Guests: Margaret Bailey; Heather Cottone; Barry Culhane; Carol Marchetti; Sharon Mason; Daniel Ornt; Harvey Palmer; Linda Underhill; Kristen Waterstram-Rich

Interpreters: Cheryl Bovard, Wendi Gammen

Tech Crew: Nick Jones, Vincent Lin

Call to Order: 12:08 p.m.

Communication Officer's Report: Minutes of 2/13/2014 approved with two abstentions.

United Way Campaign Update

Lynn Rowth, Director of Special Events and Conferences, Char Ipacs, Chair of the UW Steering Committee and Carol Reed, Vice Chair of the UW Steering Committee presented a brief update of the upcoming United Way Campaign which begins March 1, 2014.

- Handouts included a summary of the 2013 RIT participation report plus a recap of United Way's distribution of \$15M to Community Fund agencies and programs.
- This year's UW campaign tagline remains LIVE UNITED new theme of "**If I could change the world**" which will focus on Rochesterians telling what they would do to make improvements for those in need in our local community.
- Kick-Off Date is March 6, 2014 in the SAU Lobby Fireside Lounge with the RIT Tiger Olympics and Prize Auction, 11:30 a.m. – 2:30 p.m.
- This is our 2nd year with electronic pledging which we hope will see increased usage this year.
- Focus this year will be on increasing participation with a goal of 1,300 donors.
- A secondary fundraising goal has been set at \$400,000.
- Various student groups plan events in collaboration with the campaign (athletics/Greeks/clubs/MSOs) – on target to raise over \$30,000 this year from student events.
- Steering Committee this year again represents all colleges and divisions along with retirees, students, Osher and RIT Inn.
- Thank you went to Kathy Olsen's design class for the creating the posters.
- Thank you to the poster volunteers Larry Quinsland and Anne Van Ginkel of NTID along with Jennifer Wolfley from CLA for sharing their experiences.

Announcement

Dr. Frank Annunziata passed away recently and his memorial service will be on campus March 3, 2014 at 2:30 p.m. in the RIT Chapel.

E5.0 (Policies on Tenure)

Proposed E5.0 Policy: <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17165> ; PPT presentation of E5.0: <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17181>

Margaret Bailey gave a brief recap.

- Motions 1-6 have passed.

- The newly updated E5.0 was distributed for the 2/6/2014 AS meeting, and incorporates all approved changes from Motions 1-6.
- E5.0 distributed for 2/6/2014 includes suggested changes highlighted (using strikethrough and underscore).

Began with **Motion 7** (see link to PPT) starting at line 450 (Tenure Review and Recommendations). M. Bailey noted that “in consultation with the college faculty” (in regards to forming the tenure committees) in line 500 should have been underlined, as this was an addition to this section and was suggested by FAC in various units.

- T. Engstrom: The wording “in consultation” seems unclear; no procedure is described for ensuring the condition is met. It would be less onerous to the process if this condition were absent.
J. Pelz: Without this wording, it would be up to the Academic Senate to appoint members and small units themselves would like to be involved. The list of nominees would come from the small college.
Dean Daniel Ornt: What if a college meets one but not both criteria for this section?
J. Pelz: We were told that no colleges fall into that category.
Dean Daniel Ornt: No, that is not true.
G. Hintz: Doesn’t each college have AS representatives? Those senators should be able to represent the interests of the college.
K. Waterstram-Rich approved to have this phrase removed: “in consultation with the college faculty.”

Lines 540-546 were discussed (Access to Tenure Review Documents). “All the letters of review or assessment shall remain confidential and will not be made accessible to the candidate.” Table 2 was included in this discussion as well. The text was struck about the candidate having access.

- B. Hartpence: What was the thinking behind restricting the letters?
M. Bailey: To promote candid letters.
J. Pelz: No one could remember a case in which the candidate made the request for this information and we wish to avoid awkward situations.
- S. Maggelakis: The current policy says “share content, not the recommendations.”
J. Pelz: Correct, the new version removes this access.
M. Bailey: Currently the policy has this clause to receive letters and contents. We are proposing to remove it.
- S. Manian Ramkumar: Could it read instead “all documents?”
- H. Ghazle: The word “documents” is too general and we should leave it as letters.
- M. Richmond: The AS should consider these changes from the point of view of faculty, not point of view of administrators or lawyers.
- J. Pelz: Some universities do allow access to some of this information (only to a summary).
- M. Laver: Is this best practice in the field?
J. Pelz: It is not universal and you may lose something.
M. Bailey: We must be explicit that the letters are not confidential.
- S. Hoi: Look carefully at the proposals and the proposed versions grant access to some people for external letters.
J. Pelz: This change is a change from current policy but not from best practice.
- M. Kotlarchyk: I support changes to external review letters but this table for tenure review is not the same as that for mid-tenure review, and it seems the mid-tenure review table is stricter.
K. Waterstram-Rich: Mid-tenure review is opportunity for mentoring so the department head would need access to information, but in the case of tenure, the situation is different. To have the rest of the faculty read letters at the time of tenure may not be in the best interest at this time.
- B. Hartpence: Will colleges have to follow this table? We have different tables throughout the college.
M. Laver: Yes, and if they have their own tenure policy, it has to comply with Institute policy. A task force with representation from all units will figure out how to implement this new policy.
- K. Waterstram-Rich: In the case of “can department faculty see external letters” the split was nearly even at all levels so the proposal is defined by college policy. The senate was split and the deans were split.
M. Laver: Some pre-tenured faculty members concerned that their college faculty might not have access to external letters.
J. Pelz: This acknowledges real differences between colleges.
H. Ghazle: Having a split on this (50-50) is not good and if folks have major concerns we need to speak about

this.

J. Pelz: This is not a compromise but acknowledgement of the differences college to college. If senate approves Table 2, then we have to decide on Table 1.

- H. Ghazle: Most of the Academic Senate is tenured faculty but this document deals with pre-tenure faculty. How can we represent them?
- S. Boedo: KGCOE supported this item on external letters and in 32 out of 33 schools the faculty members are permitted to see external letters. Feedback was collected from his constituents in regards to this.

J. Pelz: We reviewed the materials you sent us, and it varied from college to college it varied within the disciplines.

- T. Engstrom: Defaulting yet again to competing college principles, rather than resolving them, is not itself a good principle, and seems out of step with our previous commitment to ensure consistency. Distributing confidential letters to the faculty runs the risk of compromising their confidentiality. And if there is a significant difference in confidentiality, then we don't have a single consistent principle across the university, which at some high level ought to be the case.

M. Bailey: It was not just one college that felt this way.

- H. Ghazle: Did we reach a consensus on one of the earlier points by Dean Ornt?
- M. Laver: We need to focus on what FAC is proposing to us presently.

M. Bailey made additional clarifications to timelines (line 551) and lines 569-572. [See document with highlighted portions that were proposed – <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17165>]

T. Engstrom moved that in Table 2, that the “No” be put in place under Department Tenure Faculty having access to External Review Letters and “Defined by College Policy” is removed. H. Yamashita seconded this motion.

- S. Boedo strongly disagreed with this motion.
- E. Lawley strongly agreed with this motion.
- M. Richmond: In large departments some faculty may have no expertise in a candidate's sub-field. They would need letters from experts in the sub-field to make an informed decision.
- J. Voelkel: In Engineering it is very common for external letters to be shared. A “No” placed in table 2 under Department Tenured Faculty having access to external letters would put Engineering at a disadvantage in recruitment.
- M. Kotlarchyk: In being asked to write external letters, and whether they were confidential or not confidential, this has not compromised my ability to write a letter and has not stopped me from being candid.
- H. Shahmohamad: There are great arguments on both sides but there must be consistency.
- T. Engstrom: Department faculty do not need to do the work of the Tenure Committee. They are asked to review their colleague on the basis of what they do know, not on the basis of what an external reviewer provides to the tenure committee. Internal letters serve their purpose by being internal, not by being shaped in response to external letters.
- B. Hartpence: Is Table 2 consistent with the wording above the table?
- J. Pelz: Yes, it is consistent.
- S. Mangelakis: I second M. Richmond's comment. What is the purpose of external letters? Are they only meant to be for the Provost and the President? The answer is to help inform others in making a decision about the candidate in his field of study and expertise.
- M. Kotlarchyk: When we are asked to provide letters recommending tenure or not recommending tenure, we substantiate our comments (i.e. teaching, scholarship, concerns) based on the evidence given. Some faculty because of the disjointed nature of the expertise, are not qualified or feel they are not qualified to comment on research unless they have something else to base it on. This is an overriding reason why department tenured faculty need access to external review letters.
- Dean Harvey Palmer: I have trouble with having “No” in place for department tenured faculty to not see the external letters.

The external letters are nonetheless being solicited and nonetheless they will be read by someone who is going to have in impact on the outcome of this deliberation. So by not allowing tenure faculty to see the letters, that means that the tenured faculty have been diminished in their ability to provide input on the viability of the individual for tenure. So either say “External letters should not be considered at all” or you can say, “all those

people involved in making a decision be allowed to access the same information so that there is consistency with all the different sub-sets of the process in respect to the information they are assessing.” Second point made: In a relatively short period of time we surveyed 33 different research-1 universities and all but one had allowed the tenure faculty access to external letters. And the one school that did not allow tenured faculty to have access to external letters did not allow tenured faculty to vote on tenure.

- E. Lawley: Do not conflate the roles of “Tenure Committee” and “other tenured faculty.” If the faculty do not have expertise in a sub-field, you will not become an expert by reading another person’s letter. The external review letters provide input to the tenure committee. Are we using external letters as a crutch? This can be deeply problematic.
- J. Pelz: What FAC is proposing is defined by College Policy and we are respecting the differences between colleges. We were shocked how evenly split this was among the colleges.
- T. Engstrom: It’s a question of maintaining an appropriate division of labor. It is the Tenure Committee’s responsibility to manage and review external materials, not one’s departmental colleagues.
- M. Bailey: As we were collecting data, no units gave us input that our current policy does not work.

S. Boedo called the question on T. Engstrom’s motion to have “No” in Table 2, replace “Defined by College Policy” under Department Tenured Faculty in regards to having access to external review letters.

T. Engstrom’s motion passed with 13 in Favor, 12 Opposed and 4 Abstentions.

K. Waterstram-Rich: On line 496 H. Ghazle suggested “and” be changed to “or”.

M. Laver suggested leaving this as is for now.

Motion 7 as amended passed with 17 In Favor, 7 Opposed, and 4 Abstentions.

Motion 4, already approved by AS except for the Confidentiality section 3.a.3, was re-visited and see link to PPT for full wording. This involves reference to Tables 1 and 2.

Question was called on the proposed wording and the motion to approve motion 4A passed unanimously (lines 326-333).

Motion 8, starting on line 605 was discussed regarding Granting or Denying Tenure. Line 608 added the wording after “college tenure committee vote”: **the university tenure review committee vote, if it was involved, and the recommendations from the department head and dean and a summary of the letters of review from the department head and dean.**

- The Provost did agree at a previous senate meeting to the wording added.

Motion 8 passes unanimously – The Academic Senate approves the proposed revision to Policy E5.0 Policy on Tenure Section 3, the Tenure Process sub-sections: d. Granting or Denial on Tenure

Motion 9 – starting on line 617 – The Academic Senate approves the proposed revision to Policy E5.0 Policy on tenure section 4, Expedited Tenure Review with sub-sections: a. Purpose b. Review Process

The following edits were presented:

- Text Line 651 – edit made for consistency
- Text line 657 and 681 – edits made for clarity

- S. Ramkumar: Is this letter from the Provost?
M. Bailey: No, it is from other faculty in the hiring unit. The goal is to get faculty input.
- T. Engstrom suggested to replace the word “implemented: with “considered” on line 642.
It was agreed to as a friendly amendment.
- T. Engstrom: Can the expedited process occur when the candidate does not have tenure?
M. Bailey: Yes.
T. Engstrom: I am concerned about those who come from outside an academic context, but are being expedited

within one. S. Boedo had the same concern.

M. Bailey: We allocate more time for such candidates in this policy. The proposed policy states “within a week” for those with tenure and “within a month” for those without tenure.

S. Boedo: I would prefer more time.

- S. Hoi: I am concerned that the proposed policy allows teaching evaluations not to be included.

M. Richmond: Some candidates may have no teaching evaluations.

Amendment passes.

- G. Hintz: He asked to replace “publications” with “scholarly works”.

This was a friendly amendment to line 644.

- H. Shahmohamad: Per line 675 – to change the working of “within 4 weeks” to “the semester.”

This was seconded.

J. Pelz explained that this will not be an issue in practice. You need to work on a short time frame.

H. Shahmohamad withdrew his motion.

Motion 9 passes unanimously.

Motion 10: Starts on line 681 – The Academic Senate approves the proposed revision to Policy E5.0 Policy on Tenure section 5. Addendum for Implementation of Tenure Policy.

Edits are: Eliminate lines 686-689.

- Dean Daniel Ornt: The process of “approving college expectations” may run beyond the timeframe for some incoming candidates for review. If this issue arises, how will we address those if we remove lines 686-689.

M. Laver: Senate approved a document that covers this concern. A taskforce will deal with this matter.

J. Pelz: Everything is frozen at the third year review.

Motion 10 passes unanimously.

Michael Laver asked that all senators and their constituents review the entire E5 document once a clean copy with all changes to Policy E5.0 per the motions that have been approved by Academic Senate are sent to them. E5 returns to senate on February 27 for a final discussion per any inconsistencies that may need to be addressed. Any inconsistencies will be voted on.

Christine Licata, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, said that the Provost would like to express his appreciation for all the hard work of FAC and the Academic Senate.

- S. Hoi: One item in the past was passed by a single vote but confusion was expressed by a number of senators.

I therefore request that the item be brought back to senate for re-consideration.

M. Laver: Parliamentary procedure provides for that to happen.

- F. Walker asked that it be clarified whether we vote again on the full document.

M. Laver: I do not plan to have a vote on the complete document.

R. Raffaele: I believe that contradicts an earlier statement made at another senate meeting.

M. Laver: I will check the minutes if this statement was made.

T. Engstrom: Any senator can move that a vote be taken on the entire document.

- F. Walker: Last year a summary vote of “no” caused problems and how can we avoid these problems?

M. Laver: We can consider individual motions.

Adjournment: 1:41 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael Richmond, Communications Officer

Vivian Gifford, AS Senior Staff Assistant

