Call to Order: 12:06 p.m.

Communication Officer's Report: Minutes of 2/20/2014 were approved as amended. [http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17193](http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17193)

Business

Activity Period Recommendation
[http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17191](http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17191)

Joe Loffredo, Registrar reviewed the Activity Hour recommendations and asked for senate feedback. See link above for PPT presentation. Highlighted points were as follows:

- Quarters activity hour was Friday 1-2 p.m.
- Semesters intentionally did not schedule such a period
- Fall 2013 scheduling showed that classrooms are not utilized heavily in late afternoon, especially Friday
- General purpose classroom statistics were shown in the PPT presentation
- The dominate semester scheduling patterns for classes are MWF with 50 minute blocks and 75 minute blocks
- Proposal: Activity Period would be at 3:00 p.m. on Fridays and at this time there would be no regularly scheduled classes, 3-5. And starting at 3:00 p.m. on M and W, use 75-minute blocks.
- Faculty have reported that they prefer the two/day meeting schedules
- Work with scheduling officers as there are concerns.
- Provide an option for some exceptions, especially for Fall 2014, if this goes forth in the fall

Discussion ensued with Q&A.

- S. Hoi: How would the proposed activity hour affect class scheduling?
  J. Loffredo: This proposal would suggest courses meeting only Monday and Wednesday, not on Friday, starting at 3:00 PM.
- H. Shahmohamad: Math and Physics have strong concerns and noted concerns from various professors who were not in attendance today.
  - M. Kotlarchyk: Expressed great concerns as Friday Activity Hour affects M-W-F and RIT should move very slowly with this. Some units would lose valuable blocks and asked if certain units would be granted waivers. He requested the Activity Hour be at 4 p.m. instead.
  - Professor Cardenga: Both Math and Physics use Friday late afternoon.
  - Professor Young: Asked if Tuesday and Thursday 5-6:15 p.m. could be cancelled. And he had asked how many classes would be bumped to night classes on MTWR?
- M. Richmond: Physics teaches first-year classes in workshop rooms with large numbers of students (1,574 in Spring semester). Two-hour class meetings are MWF, three times per week. Currently classes run until 6 p.m. and if there are no classes after 3 p.m., we would lose all the sections which meet 2-4 p.m. and 4-6 p.m. MWF, which would prevent approximately 400 students from taking these classes.
J. Loffredo: Activity Hour would not prevent classes from meeting after 5:00 p.m. on Friday. We can use 4-5 p.m. for the Activity Hour as well.

- J. Chiavaroli: What is the motivation for this Activity Hour? And my concern is that removing Friday classes causes the loss of the M-W-F block.

Provost: The proposed Activity Hour is to accommodate meetings for faculty and staff but primarily is designed for students who have stated that they miss the Activity House though they made a decision to forego this during semesters, yet now they are requesting this back.

- P. Darragh: SG voted unanimously to have the Activity Hour as clubs cannot find times to meet, and they need to use nights or weekends. Also, it has been difficult for Access Services in getting interpreters. Additionally, students have concerns over lab periods. Under quarters there was a break in lab periods but now the break does not exist.

N. Cifranic: We have had trouble with attendance at SG meetings and we need to have proper representation at these meetings.

- L. Lawley: GCCIS does have some classes offered late Friday afternoon. Two issues of concern: Activity Hour and under-utilization of classes. She asked that these issues be separated and gave an option that classes meet one hour or 1.5 hours on Friday afternoon, and that would address the classroom utilization issue.

- S. Hoi: Students like Tuesday and Thursday meetings and faculty as well. And would it be possible to utilize more the 3-5 p.m. time slot which is not fully utilized and offer night classes on Friday during the day. And do it from 8-5 p.m. which then you would have Friday open for free time. This is an alternative to consider.

J. Loffredo: You would have 9 usable blocks instead of 10 – M-W-F. The Activity Hour is a compromise. One must find the proper balance.

- Provost: There was a robust data search and class scheduling was discussed in detail. We looked for the schedule that was best for students. I am all in favor of transforming classes, but right now we are just wanting to do some tweaking in regards to student requests for an activity hour.

- T. Engström: For a great many students it is not clear if they are enjoying an activity or in-activity hour. We don’t seem to know if instituting it for some might be educationally disruptive to the schedules of many. Do we know what fraction of the student body is pursuing a legitimate activity, such that we can assess the tradeoffs of having or not having an activity hour?

Rachel (Scheduling Officer): For this fall in CLA, we have a fair number of classes from 3:00-3:50 and 4:00-4:50 that would not easily convert, and this would make for a scheduling difficulty for Fall 2014. Students are enrolling for fall in just a few weeks.

- G. Hintz: Does the survey include computer labs?

J. Loffredo: No, only general-purpose classrooms.

- G. Hintz: It is very difficult for some classes to avoid Friday afternoon (lab classes) and asked for flexibility for some departments.

J. Loffredo: It seems clear that we will need to grant exceptions.

H. Ghazle: I am happy to hear that there may be flexibility.

- Provost: We wanted feedback from the senate, so we have received it. In regards to T. Engström’s question, I will have the SG conduct a survey on how students use the Activity Hour. We will consider options and probably not move forward with this for Fall 2014.

- H. Boice-Pardee: We will ask the students to provide this information about how they utilize the Activity Hour.

Any additional feedback can be sent to Joe Loffredo and Sue Provenzano.

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

Proposed Policy: [http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17190](http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17190)

Tracy Worrell, AAC sub-committee chair presented the changes to this policy. See link for full details of proposed policy as the AAC sub-committee went back to their stakeholders and discussed the issues raised by AS in a previous presentation at senate.

Revisions include:
1. Adding the URL for the NCAA policy
2. Highlighting the basics of the academic eligibility requirements
Discussion and Q&A ensued.

- S. Boedo: Does the “basics” statement of academic eligibility requirements come from the NCAA or RIT?
  T. Worrell: From the NCAA.
  Lou Spiotti: We added the “basics” statement because this appears in an academic policy. We could put in parentheses “This is part of the NCAA policy).
- S. Ramkumar: Who defines good academic standing and is this a particular GPA?
  T. Worrell: RIT makes that determination and is listed as “in good academic standing” in SIS.
- M. Laver: Is this language in all the policies and where would they be defined?
  S. Provenzano: Yes, they are defined in D5.1 and D2.
  S. Ramkumar: Could we put a link to those policies in this policy?
- S. Boedo: Could we replace “academically” with “in adherence with the NCAA eligibility requirements.”?
  Lou Spiotti: That would be fine and this reinforces the paragraph.
- H. Ghazle: Some programs have additional requirements for students regarding to be in good standing and may exceed what the NCAA is asking for. So the change which was just requested may confuse people. We need to have academic requirements in the policy.
- T. Engström: Persnickety, I know, but the wording should be “adherence to” and not “adherence with”.

Accepted as a Friendly amendment.

- B. Hartpence: He asked that the last line of the policy be struck which reads: Academically, a student-athlete shall be matriculated in a full-time program of study, be in good academic standing and maintain satisfactory progress toward a baccalaureate, graduate, or equivalent degree.

Accepted as a Friendly amendment.

Motion to approved Policy D10.0 as amended passes.

Policy E5.0
http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17192

E5.0 returned to senate today for discussion regarding any inconsistencies that the revised policy may have. The draft of this policy was sent to senators prior to today’s meeting and reflects all changes made per the approved motions 1-10.

- Michael Laver: Were any inconsistencies found within this clean document of E5.0?”
  Kristen Waterstram-Rich: There were no inconsistencies to the document reflecting the approved motions 1-10.
- T. Engstrom: He moved that Academic Senate approve the proposed E5.0 Policy in its entirety.
  The motion was seconded.
- M. Laver had spoken to a Parliamentarian and the Parliamentary procedure suggests motions are introduced to achieve some change. So the motion on the floor is asking to approve what has already been approved. So why have this motion?
  T. Engstrom: This motion is to affirm the policy in its totality, as a single coherent document, and not just piecemeal parts. The integrity of both the policy itself and the Senate as a body able to complete and affirm its own work would benefit from our affirming the whole.
- L. Shields: A question was raised about line 364 and the department head having access to external letters, but the department head’s letter is supposed to be based on the candidate’s documentation and are external letters part of the candidate’s documentation? Should we have definitions here to define their documentation. Also, the timing seems off of forwarding the portfolio to the tenure committee.
  K. Waterstram-Rich: Documentation begins on line 300. The candidate’s documentation does not include external letters. For mid-tenure review, the department head writes the letter first, and only then looks at the external letters. For tenure review, the department head may read the letters before writing a letter.
- S. Boedo: He moved to postpone the impending vote until the start of Fall 2014. The charge to the Academic Senate was to improve the current tenure policy. Some changes had nearly unanimous support, while some were strongly split. He requested that the RIT administration review the issues about the sub-motions which had strong splits and asked that the entire document be reviewed by Legal Counsel. There are no additional specific changes being recommended.
  This recommendation was seconded.
T. Engstrom: Every senate vote of approval is a recommendation to the RIT Administration, which can then do as it chooses. But it certainly does not make sense to tell it to delay what we’ve just affirmed it should do.

- B. Hartpence: What is the implication to vote or not to vote today for proposed Policy E5.0?

  Provost Haefner: This policy would not be implemented in the Fall 2014 as each college will have to review its policies and even if the President moves to move this forward, the earliest it could take effect would be Fall 2105.

- M. Laver: There is a task force which will be charged with timing and implementation of this policy. So if we did vote today to approve E5.0, we can then move forward.

- L. Lawley: Academic Senate has already approved each sub-motion and any vote we take now doesn’t change those approvals. The already approved motions have been sent already to administration so there is no point in having a motion to delay the vote today.

  M. Laver agreed with this.

- T. Policano: The administration has already been heavily involved with FAC and agreed with L. Lawley as well.

- Q: What now can the President do?

  M. Laver: All AS votes are recommendations to the President.

**Question was called on the motion to postpone the vote today on E5.0 and the motion does not pass.**

Senate returns to T. Engström’s motion to approve the proposed E5.0 policy.

- H. Shahmohamad: School of Mathematics is very large, nearly 70 members, and he introduced Dr. Michael Barbosu who is the head of this school.

  Dr. Michael Barbosu made these suggestions based on his past experience and his recent experience:

  1. Line 498 – Should consider these letters from faculty to be made anonymous
  2. In Table 2, the department (unit) should be able to see the letters so that he can defend the candidate, if circumstances arise
  3. In Table 1, for consistency the department heads should be able to see external letters before writing their own letters.

- M. Laver: Presently we are affirming the document of E5.0 as a whole, or do we re-open the motions for discussion, which is something separate.

- M. Richmond: Since the President will do whatever he wishes, shouldn’t we move on?

- H. Ghazle: We should re-open discussion on sub-motions, rather than vote on the proposed document as a whole. The one contentious item of external letters should be discussed.

  M. Laver: It is possible to vote on re-opening the sub-motions for discussion.

- L. Lawley: Called the question on the motion on the floor to approve the proposed Policy E5.0.

- Provost: If you wish to give the President the greatest flexibility, with the 10 motions coming to him individually, he would then decide on these individually. If you affirm the entire policy, it would be more difficult for the President to overturn this.

  T. Engström: The Provost has made explicit what I intended implicitly: that the President consider the policy as a whole and not in terms of this or that part he might or might not like. If the Senate completes its work and affirms the policy as a whole, it should be accepted or rejected as such.

**Motion to approve Policy E5.0 in its entirety, in current draft form passes with 20 in favor, 8 opposed and 3 abstentions.**

Michael Laver thanked the Faculty Affairs Committee for all their hard work.

Adjournment: 1:41 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

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