Call to Order: 12:07 p.m.

Communication Officer's Report: Minutes of 3/6/2014 were approved as amended.
http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17239

Executive Committee Report

- Distribution of documents to senators had been brought up by L. Lawley at the March 6, 2014 AS meeting. It was discussed at the ASEC meeting and it was decided upon presently (until a better solution can be found) that important documents will be posted to the AS website and the link to these will be emailed to senators, who will then be responsible to send these documents to their constituents.
- Today is the first day of Spring!

Business

Proposed MS in Computational Finance Curriculum Proposal

PPt Presentation: http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17226

Joseph Hornak, Graduate Council Chair presented the proposed MS in Computational Finance. See details of this via the link above. Ashok Robin from Saunders College of Business and Bernie Brooks from College of Science were present as well to help with any questions from the senate. This program had been presented last year and there were some initial concerns (see PPt) and the following modifications were made:

- Credit count increased to 36 SCH
- Two electives added
- Stronger proposal

The Graduate Council voted unanimously to approve this program.

Discussion and Q&A ensued.

- M. Richmond: How many students must enroll to make it financially self-supporting?
  Ashok Robin: About 15 students
- H. Shahmohamad: There are significant math courses that are strong and I am in favor of this program.
- J. Voelkel: I agree that the program looks good. Which students will enter the program, mostly math majors or business majors?
  A. Robin: Math and science majors, but not business majors.
• C. Sheffield: There are no additional library resources requested to support this program, just the Bloomberg terminal, and this is a dangerous precedent. I find this problematic and adding library resources would strengthen this program.

• S. Hoi: I have done research in the last 15 years and have never needed additional resources from the RIT library. So I do not expect our students to need such resources. C. Sheffield: I found it hard to believe (incredulous) that we have every important source in the field of quantitative financial analysis, and that we do not anticipate any new books or new journals in the future that we might need to purchase. Since scholarship and knowledge are constantly evolving and changing, this seems very shortsighted.

• S. Boedo: Why do you need just one Bloomberg terminal?
A. Robin: It is actually 3-9 terminals.

• S. Ramkumar: I am happy to see facets of the academic blueprint and goals listed. But what if the program does not meet its enrollment goals? We need to follow the blueprint more closely.
J. Hornak: There was more information which was not included here.
A. Robin: I do not think that this is information which the program should provide; the College or Institute should provide it.

Provost Haefner: Excellent point S. Ramkumar. All programs have a cost model which takes a couple of years to get settled. We will first have a 3-year review of the program seeing where we are with our enrollments and provide an action plan if need be. There will then be a 5th year review to see if enrollments were met, and if enrollment is not being met after 5 years, we will have to devise an exit strategy.

• S. Maggelakis: COS is excited about this collaboration with SCB and they have put together a robust program with a good combination of skills.

• L. Lawley: I support this program yet have checked if RIT library has access to leading journals and handbooks in this area, and it does not have them. So it is disingenuous to propose a program that claims that no additional resources are needed from the library.
S. Hoi: We can use the inter-library loan (ILL) for missing items.
L. Lawley: ILL is not a substitute for having real resources. Relying on the ILL indicates a lack of commitment and we need the relevant resources of the library.

• Dr. John Tu. Associate Dean of SCB: We support this program strongly and have been working on this for three years. We are excited with the COS collaboration and this model going forward.

The vote passed to approve the proposed Masters of Science Program in Computational Finance with a vote of 18 in favor, 0 opposed and 6 abstentions.

**Proposed Capstone Policy: Comprehensive Graduate Exam Outcome Reporting**

PPt Presentation: [http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17227](http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17227)

Joseph Hornak, Chair of Graduate Council presented this Capstone Policy proposal. [See link to full presentation above and full policy being proposed.]

• The NY State Department of Education states that there are three possible capstone experiences:
  1) Thesis/Dissertation
  2) A Project
  3) Comprehensive Exam

• The CGE is a summative exam at the head of a graduate student’s studies and this determines if a student receives a degree (only SCB and CAST have MS programs that use this).

• There is a need to report the pass, fail, or attempted outcome of a CGE on a student’s transcript.

• This proposed exam carries no credit and will not affect the GPA.

• The Graduate Council voted 10 in favor, 1 opposed and 0 abstentions to approve this proposed policy.

Discussion and Q&A ensued.

• M. Laver: Did you look into best practices in other schools across the region or nation.
J. Hornak: I do not believe all states have this and schools that do have different methods of reporting this information.
S. Boedo: What does “attempted” mean in the policy where it reads “attempted outcome.”
J. Hornak: Many programs allow two attempts, and would rather say “attempted” than “failed.” So it means “attempted” and failed at least once, but the student still has one attempt remaining.
S. Boedo: It still seems as if it would confuse employers.
J. Hornak: This was discussed at length at Graduate Council.

G. Hintz: Does “F” mean one can never try again?
J. Hornak: Yes, it does mean that.

S. Hoi: In SCB we have the practice that if the student didn’t pass they can transfer to another program. Would this mark remain on a transcript if a student transferred?
J. Hornak: In general, RIT does not erase grades from their records, so yes.
S. Hoi: Doesn’t this penalize the student who transfers to another program?
J. Hornak: We discussed this at length and felt it should be on the transcript.
J. Voelkel: Could you mark it as “incomplete” instead of “T” for attempted?
J. Hornak: “Incomplete” at RIT has a specific, different meaning and it would muddy the waters if we used “Incomplete”.

H. Shahmohamad: This program seems to solve one problem but creates another, so how does this help a student?
L. Underhill: The state requires the indication of an exit method and a grade, so this meets the requirement of putting a marker on the transcript.

S. Boedo: Will this mark be used for the mid-point exam of a traditional Ph.D. program?
J. Hornak: No, this does not apply to Ph.D. candidates.

The vote to approve the proposed policy for the Comprehensive Graduate Exam Outcome Reporting passed with 12 in favor, 5 opposed and 10 abstentions.

Policy C6.0 and Proposed Policy C6.1

Bobby Colon, Chief Legal Officer presented the revised approved C6.0 (Policy Prohibiting Discrimination and Harassment) and a new proposed policy C6.1 (Resolution of Conflicts and Concerns Among RIT Employees). [See PPT and documents for full details.]

- Michael Laver noted that the final vote of the proposed Policy C6.1 will take place at Institute Council.
- Feedback and endorsement for this new policy was requested today.
- In 2012 the Office of Civil Rights required changes to be made to the previous C6.0 dealing with workplace issues. To make C6.0 legal, changes were made and C6.1 came out of C6.0, which is the portion of the policy where non-legal terms are used.
- President Destler approved the revised C6.0 on September 11, 2012, as part of an expedited process.
- A workplace issue that deals with the “protected” category (i.e. race, gender, age, etc.) will be in C6.0 and other workplace issues are now in C6.1.
- Additionally, private notes are in the revised portion of C6.0, and these are notes one would write for yourself but has to do with one’s job duties.
- See link above for full details of this presentation.

Discussion and Q&A ensued.
- L. Lawley: The new and old definitions of “private notes” are very different and she asked for clarification regarding private notes and why does it become a legal document.
  B. Colon: Yes, the definitions and rules for access are different. If a note deals with RIT employment matters, as an RIT document, it becomes a record which would be accessible to others, governed by C22.0.
- M. Laver: This is a matter of Federal Law and private notes could be requested.
  B. Hartpence: L. Lawley’s question was not really answered. What is the legal standing for making a private note into an RIT record?
  B. Colon: If in a lawsuit, materials are discoverable, then they are RIT records, and records are created by RIT by RIT employees. Did I create the note as an RIT employee, or is it a private note? If yes, then it is an RIT record.
- V. Serravallo: Who asks the note-taker to make the distinction, and how do we know that the note-taker makes the right decision?
  B. Colon: The note-taker makes the initial determination. In a lawsuit, parties can request any and all documents. RIT’s Legal Affairs leaves it to the individual’s discretion as there is no over-arching body that does this.
- Raj: Can you refer to a specific federal rule for civil procedures and is it state or federal law?
  B. Colon: Both laws apply here.
- Raj: Can you add references to specific rules in this chart?
  B. Colon: I can do so if you request it.
- V. Serravallo: Seeking advice in the chart distinguishes “protected categories and who decides when an action falls into these categories.
  B. Colon: If an individual approaches any of the listed offices (see Appendix), and in the course of discussion discovers that the issue falls within the “protected categories”, then HR will lead the individual to the proper place. If it is not a legal issue, HR will guide them to C6.1.
  J. Voelkel: What if one is a student, and not an employee, and the issue is not under “protected category?”
  B. Colon: Then the issue does not fall into C6.0, but into D18 and the Student Conduct Office.
- H. Yamashita: does this policy speak to records taken on the telephone?
  B. Colon: Policy C22.0 defines what an RIT record is. There is no distinction between electronic and handwritten notes.
  L. Lawley: C22.0 does not address “private notes” and it would be helpful to have guidelines for retention of notes.
  M. Laver: Please take L. Lawley’s request under advisement with C22.0.
  B. Colon: Yes, we will.
- C. DeFilippo: In C6.1, does “administrative action” mean ”HR investigation?”
  B. Colon: Yes.

The rest of the presentation of the PPT was given and then Bobby Colon asked that the Academic Senate endorse Policy C6.1.

Motion to endorse Policy C6.1 passed with 17 in favor, 0 opposed and 10 abstentions.

Michael Laver asked that any other thoughts or comments can be sent to Judy Bender, Bobby Colon or himself, and this endorsed policy will then go to IC later this spring.

Revised Policy E7.0 (Annual Review and Development of Faculty)
PPT Presentation and Revised Proposed Policy (Marked Up Copy and Clean Copy):
http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17240

Tom Policano, FAC member said the goal for the meeting today regarding Policy E7.0 was to discuss concerns of the faculty as there has been a lot of feedback, mostly around slide 5 (slide of the performance categories.) A clean document and marked up document of revised E7.0 was sent to senators before today’s meeting and that too is included on the link above. [See link above to view the revised policy E7.0 and the PPT. presentation.]

- The 4th category’s name was changed to “Needs Improvement”. (See slides 5 and 6 per the proposed working of the performance categories.)
- Modified the descriptions of the categories so that it would include or exclude any qualifications of what an overall evaluation would be.
- Defined parameters representing what the low bar was.
- Obtaining one “Unsatisfactory” in any category will lead to an overall rating of “Unsatisfactory”.
- There is mid-tenure review and POW’s, and this whole policy is moving toward protecting faculty in the process of doing their jobs.
- Included minimal expectations in the other categories as well.
Question from F. Walker: If you received “exceeds expectations” in all categories, would that qualify you for an Outstanding overall?
T. Policano: You could get this yet minimally you need to exceed three categories to get an outstanding.

R. Stevens: If I have two “Outstandings”, that can’t lead to an overall “Outstanding” the way it is worded.
T. Policano: Yes.
R. Stevens: Isn’t current Outstanding “1” a subset of “2”? Can you say “at least exceeds expectations” in all areas?
T. Policano: This table is not meant to be exhaustive as the committee did not intend in these definitions to outline every possible combination for the overall ratings.
M. Laver: This meeting today is only for advice and feedback and not to have any motions or friendly amendments.
K. Waterstram-Rich: We are taking notes and have understood R. Steven’s point to say “at least exceeds” in all categories.

L. Lawley: In discussing this with T. Engstrom, the following concerns arose:
- Numeric Approach (1 in column A and 2 in column B approach) – this should be a judgment call by the supervisor. This can be problematic as there are so many combinations and you cannot have a formula. Is it sufficient to say that “Performance represents a truly exceptional level of accomplishments.” This is done with guidelines yet in the long run it does far more harm than good. I would strongly urge the committee to re-think these extensive, detailed attempts to prescribe what goes into determining outstanding versus exceeds expectations, and we are uncomfortable with this wording and prefer to remove all such explicit formulas. T. Engstrom worries about the attempt to define the scope of norms.
- S. Hoi: My concern is with the first sentence in having a uniform evaluation of teaching. I believe we have the same standards for all teaching, across rank and across colleges. Right now the wording implies that we are going to evaluate teaching based on cross-rank across colleges. Could a footnote be placed here specifying how you would evaluate teaching.
- V. Serravallo: Is it appropriate to compare faculty across rank, when determining merit? “Norms within the field” is too vague and how do you identify these norms?
  T. Policano: The intent here was to remove the competition between individuals and the main goal of the evaluation is to see if you are doing your job, not “should you get a merit raise?”
  J. Voelkel agreed to remove numeric/scoring elements.
  T. Policano: As long as we keep elements in the “Unsatisfactory” category, we are open to removing them from others.
  Provost: Be thoughtful about the challenge a supervisor has in assigning these ratings and to be consistent as inconsistency between overall ratings of different faculty can lead to trouble for the supervisor and the Institute. A supervisor needs some rubric to be consistent and there needs to be dialogue with the department when they are assigning these ratings. This needs to happen and this is the clarity faculty would like to see.
  L. Lawley: Yes, there is value in rubrics, but we must be careful not to be too strict. I would prefer to have each department work out its own rubrics rather than have an Institute-wide standard. We cannot have a “one-size fits all.”
- K. Waterstram-Rich: What the committee needs to talk over is the introduction before the chart. When evaluating a full professor, it is not the same as a lecturer. And the term “norms within the field” in this document is intended to address some of the concerns L. Lawley has raised and has been in policy a long time. Each faculty member has an individual plan of work and this evaluation is based on that plan. And the expectations will be set by each college as that may differ college to college.
- R. Raffaelle: In the past the Nobel Prize winner was used as an argument for why there should be numeric scoring, and now it is being used against the same idea. We must also think about how variations across campus can hurt faculty.
  J. Goldowitz: If I ever win the Nobel Prize, I won’t care about my rating. It is good to have a rubric but it can be problematic when comparing one division to another. But within a department this is not a problem.
  S. Boedo: This is a year-to-year rating and the Nobel Prizes are not awarded until many years after the work was done. It is an interpretation issue regarding “Outstanding.”
- J. Goldowitz: Corrected the word “character” to read of a “characteristic” in the “Needs Improvement” category.
• G. Hintz: This is an institution of higher learning and there should be a minimum level of achievement in teaching for one to reach “Outstanding” as teaching is the crux of what we do.
• T. Policano asked for a straw vote to keep minimal standard for each category in the policy or remove all references to this. M. Laver asked that there not be a straw poll vote as they do not help.

Presentation continued with slide 7, Section II E2. Annual Evaluation Documentation (Changes) – see link to PPT above. The proposed revision is that the college would be assigned to set up an evaluative tool to handle other courses and sections that are not included in the RIT Student Rating System.

• S. Maggelakis asked for clarification. Would there be cases where we would not be able to evaluate some courses?
  T. Policano: It would be when the Smart Eval (RIT Student Rating System) is not available in evaluating instructors (i.e. it may be the case with a summer course or a course taken during intersession.)

T. Policano reviewed briefly reviewed slide 10 – Revisions to Section III Faculty Development Process. [See PPT via the link above.] Faculty (tenure-track, senior lecturers, principal lecturers and lecturers) with multiple year contracts should have access to resources and that is why this change is being proposed.

Adjournment: 1:39 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

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