ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
ACADEMIC SENATE
MAY 1, 2014: 12:00-1:50 p.m.
CIMS/2230/2240

Present: B. Barry; J. Beck; S. Boedo; S. Bower; J. Chiavaroli; P. Darragh; D. Defibaugh; W. Destler; T. Engström; H. Ghazle; S. Gold; J. Goldowitz; J. Haefner; B. Hartpence; J. Hertzson; G. Hintz; S. Hoi; T. Jefferson; M. Laver; C. Licata (Delegate for J. Haefner); E. Lawley; J. Lisuzzo; J. Lodge; S. Maggelakis; K. Mousley; S.M. Ramkumar; R. Raffaelle; M. Richmond; V. Serravallo; H. Shahmohamad; C. Sheffield; R. Stevens; C. Thoms; L. Villasmil Urdaneta;; R. Vullo; F. Walker
Members Absent: M. Kotlarchyk; R. Kushalnagar; K. McDonald; T. Policano; B. Trager; H. Yamashita; R. Kushalnagar; K. McDonald; T. Policano; B. Trager; J. Voelkel; L. Wild
Presenters/Guests: Zack Butler, Joe Johnston, James Myers, Kristen-Waterstram-Rich, Tracy Worrell
Interpreters: Cheryl Bovard, Wendi Gammen
Tech Crew: Nick Jones, Vincent Lin

Call to Order: 12:07 p.m.
Communication Officer's Report: Minutes of 4/24//2014 were approved as amended.
 http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17277

Business:

Approval of At Large Standing Committee and Institute Committee Members
Approved as amended At Large Standing Committee/Institute Committee members: http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17279

Some corrections were made to the list and then a motion to approve the list of at large only Standing and Institute Committee members passed unanimously. The list of the full committees will be distributed once elections are completed in all the colleges.

One full professor is needed for the Grievance Committee to complete Liz Lawley's term in AY 2014. Please contact Eileen Feeney Bushnell if you wish to serve.

Implementation of SmartEvals Report (AAC sub-committee)
PPt Presentation and Report on Implementation of SmartEvals: http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17281

Tracy Worrell, AAC sub-committee chair presented the report on implementation of SmartEvals as this was one of the charges to AAC for AY2014. See PPt. link for full details of what was presented and the full report. Thanks went to Chris Licata's and Joe Loffredo's office for their help on this.

Discussion and Q&A ensued.

- V. Serravallo: In regards to the timing of the evaluation process, why is it so early? Shouldn't students be in the course for the entire time before commenting?
  F. Naveda: This was a request from students and faculty as they want more time to submit the evaluations. Students can change the evaluations at any time up to the deadline.
  M. Laver: Best practices suggest a 3-week window. The survey rating is for teaching effectiveness, not the entire course. We don't want evaluations open during exam period.
- M. Richmond: Will students and faculty be able to see the results?
  M. Laver: After 3 years have passed, RIT will make a decision.
- B. Hartpence: The tenure committees wonder if there is a requirement to use the system as some departments use paper forms.
  T. Worrell: It became a requirement to use the system (not paper forms) this past fall 2013.
  Provost: We are now using a single system to collect these evaluations and that is the StudentEvals system. This moved us forward as of Fall 2013.

- P. Darragh: Students would like to see the results. We often go to RateMyProfessor.com to see student comments. It would be better to have internal RIT-only information.
- J. Goldowitz: We use these evaluations to judge professors for promotion and tenure, but with a 65% response rate, it is not a random sample, and not statistically viable. Is there something we can do to get students to use SmartEvals? At other schools one cannot register for a course if they did not fill out all their responses on the evaluation.
  T. Worrell: This may be addressed after 3 years have passed.
- H. Ghazle: My experience with this system has been great. He commented on P. Darragh's comment about having students see the results, and studies show that if evaluations are made available to all, then students may stop enrolling in some classes with certain professors. On another point, we need consistency with the number of questions asked per college. And can we have the response rates from each college made available?
  F. Naveda: Yes, we can provide that information and every week I am supplying the response rates to the Deans.
- L. Lawley commented on the horrible pictures in the SmartEvals interface and could these be removed and something nicer put on the site, as students may not be taking the evaluation system seriously with such pictures posted.
- Any questions or comments can be sent to Tracy Worrell at trwgla@rit.edu.

RIT Student Code of Conduct (Policy D18.0)
PPt Presentation: http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17272
Proposed Policy D18.0 and Current Policy: http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17270

In response to a charge from Dr. Heath Boice-Pardee, Interim Senior VP for Student Affairs, Joe Johnston, Director of Student Conduct and Conflict Management, Jessica Ecock, Associate Director of Center for Student Conduct and Dawn Soufleris, Assistant to the Vice President, Student Conduct and Conflict Management Services presented code recommendations to the senate in regards to Policy D18.0.

 See links above to the presentation and proposed policy for full details of what was presented.

- Codes are now up-to-date**.**
- Needed to be in line with federal guidelines/statutes (Title IX, VAWA, Safe Act, etc.)
- Wanted it to fit RIT culture.
- There is now clearer language.
- Changes were not huge.
- Asking for endorsement from the senate on the spirit of the policy.
- The policy itself must be approved by Institute Council.

Discussion and Q&A.

- H. Shahmohamad: In the past 13 years I have had the best students. What percentages of students do you have that have committed crimes (e.g. vandalism, theft, etc). and how has this changed over the past decade?
  J. Johnston: Most of the students who make mistakes do so in a moment of stress (e.g. pending divorce of parents, etc.). Students want us to hear "why" they did what they did. Our process is intended to help these students find resources on campus to help them.
- M. Laver: I respect the work that has gone into this.
- B. Barry: Does this movement toward restorative justice focus on RIT students, or on all people?
  J. Johnston: Our policy has no force over non-students. Public Safety teams are trained to take restorative action. Getting arrested on RIT campus is hard.
  D. Soufleris: We have a relationship with many universities around us, so we can call another campus about a student that is on our campus who may be causing trouble. We are all working together.

Vote to endorse proposed Policy D18.0 passes unanimously.

Renewal/Continuation of the Global Education Taskforce

- The Global Education Taskforce needs senate vote to be extended for another two years, as it is ending its term this spring 2014.
- The motion is brought forth is to approve extend the GETF for two more years.
- Zack Butler presented the PPt on GETF's future goals. http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17282
- M. Laver: This GETF is an opportunity for faculty to have a voice in Global Education issues.
- T. Engstrom: A two-year renewal is a modest proposal as this taskforce has tremendous value and requires sustained continuity. Moreover, academic governance is one of the goals we should consider, in part because some of our partnerships have come about in the absence of any engagement with shared governance, and because academic governance can vary widely and problematically between host cultures. And we could focus too on some of the impediments to making additional partnership agreements. I propose a 3-year extension.
  J. Myers: Faculty governance is vital to our work. I would welcome a 3-year extension (rather than a 2-year extension). And we would be happy to modify our plan of work on discussions with other bodies.
- The 3-year extension suggested is a friendly amendment to the motion.

The motion passes: To extend the Global Education Taskforce for three years.

Revised Policy E10.0
PPt Presentation (this link also included the Proposed Policy E10.0 and Current Policies E10.0, E11.0 and E15.0):
https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/17273

Kristen Waterstram-Rich, FAC Chair presented the revised Policy E10.0 for senate vote. **See link above for full presentation.**

- FAC proposes the combining of the current policies E10.0, E11.0, and E15.0 as they all deal with faculty development
- In 2009, when the initial project to revise the Policies and Procedures Manual was underway, suggestions were sent to FAC suggesting that E10, E11 and E15 be combined as one.
- The new E10.0 Section II is the former Policy E11.0 (Institute Effective Teaching Policy). E11.0 was never put in the Charter though it was stated as a standing committee.
- Policy E15 would go away but FEAD is addressed in E7.0.

Discussion and Q&A ensued.

- V. Serravallo: What does "productivity of teaching" in line 15 of the proposed policy mean and how does this affect teaching?
  K. Waterstram-Rich: This is old language and I don't have a good answer.
  V. Serravallo: He recommended to instead use the wording: "to improve teaching effectiveness."
- H. Ghazle: Is this consistent with the policies in the past? The "E" in FEAD stands for "evaluation", doesn't it?
  K. Waterstram-Rich: There were two different types of FEAD grants. One was for Faculty Evaluation, for faculty who did not meet expectations; one was FEAD for which faculty could apply for and those are addressed in E7.0.
- B. Hartpence: In line 67, the wording "to increase productivity of teaching" is also there. Another suggestion would be to change this wording to "quality of teaching".
- J. Lisuzzo: There are other RIT grants which pertain to teaching, such as mentoring grants.
  K. Waterstram-Rich: Yes, we didn't intend to include those here because those are separate programs that the administration funds. This could be a charge for next year.
- V. Serravallo: Referring to line 22, he asked about the wording "to foster collegiality and mentorship" and where did this wording come from?
  K. Waterstram-Rich: That was the original wording and was once known as "the Coffee Hour" to encourage collegiality.

- V. Serravallo: Referring to lines 32-34, in regards to having past Eisenhart recipients on the committee, he asked why as it may intimidate someone who did not win an award to be on the committee.
  K. Waterstram-Rich: The goal of the committee is to foster effectiveness in teaching, so we left this part of the policy as is in regards to the construction of the committee, and having past Eisenhart recipients on board we thought would help the committee. We can take this back to FAC and look at this wording this year or next year.
  M. Laver: How to constitute this committee is a larger issue that what is presently being discussed on the floor.
- M. Richmond commented on the phrase "whose major responsibility is teaching" (line 31) might be interpreted in terms of the terms under which new faculty are hired and is that the intent?
  R. Raffaelle: I echo M. Richmond's remark.
  T. Engstrom: The words "should be" in line 31 reading: The faculty members **should be** those whose major responsibility is teaching, …." allows for exceptions.
- T. Engstrom called for a point of order in regards to what Vincent had commented on, and asked FAC what the senate is being asked to do today?
  K. Waterstram-Rich: FAC wants to hear the views of the senators, and we can consider suggestions from the floor if this is the will of the people.
- G. Hintz: Can lecturers serve on the committee.
  A: yes.
- V. Serravallo asked to have the sentence in line 31-34 read as follows: The faculty members should be those whose major responsibility is teaching. ~~and if possible, past recipients of the Eisenhart Excellence in Teaching Award, the Richard and Virginia Eisenhart Provost's Award for Excellence in Teaching, or the Outstanding Teaching Award for Non-Tenure Track Teaching.~~
  J. Goldowitz objected to this amendment as it is a great idea to have Eisenhart awardees on board as well.
  Motion to amend lines 31-34, to remove the list of faculty who were previous outstanding teaching award recipients was seconded and the motion passed with 17 in favor, 4 opposed and 5 abstentions.
- H. Ghazle: A friendly amendment was made to consider adding a reference to the PLIG website (lines 74-75).
- C. Sheffield: In lines 55-56, regarding PLIG, he had concerns about the conjunction of the two items listed, that being "quality of educational efforts and reducing the financial cost of instruction." Why are we adding "cost" into this discussion?
  Provost: Where did this wording come from?
  K. Waterstram-Rich: This is the current wording for PLIG.
  Provost: I have no objection to removing the mention of "cost" in line 55.
  This is now a friendly amendment to strike the words "and reducing the financial cost of instruction."

  Several other suggestions came from the floor and the suggestion for wording of lines 54-55 reads
  as follows:
  This grant aims to maintain, and where possible, improve the quality of educational efforts.
  The amended wording was seconded.

  L. Lawley: Please keep the number of nouns constant.
  S.M. Ramkumar: You are watering this down as this is a learning innovation grant. Why do we need a grant to maintain something?
  M. Laver: There will be a link to PLIG.
  T. Engstrom: It is a very specific grant, so the original language might have given it more focus, to have it now read "**These grants place emphasis…**"
  R. Raffaelle: Isn't the emphasis to improve and not to maintain? Should we drop the word "maintain"?
  Provost: I am supportive of some of the phraseology, but don't eliminate the spirit of the grant, that being an innovative grant and revolves around the word "innovation".
  M. Laver: If this language gets voted down then we will go back to the original wording, minus the cost model.
  B. Hartpence: There are three different grants listed on the PLIG website, and maybe we could just tell people to read the PLIG website.
  K. Waterstram-Rich: We did not want to repeat the text on the PLIG website.
  R. Raffaelle: Could all three grants be described as "improving teaching"?
  M. Richmond calls the question on the amended wording that was seconded.

The vote to approve the amended wording in lines 54-55 does not pass. The senate then went back to the original wording minus the cost model wording.

- K. Waterstram-Rich read from the PLIG website page that was not in policy: "*The PLIG program was developed to broaden and enrich the learning experience of RIT students by funding faculty-initiated projects that enhance student learning.*" Do you want this sentence in policy rather than what is there?
- T. Engstrom suggested the following wording in line 55: "**These grants emphasize improving, through innovation, the quality of our educational efforts.**"
  M. Richmond: He asked in this wording that the word "educational" be changed to "education" and to remove the word "efforts".
  T. Engstrom objected to this change.
  M. Richmond withdrew his amendment.
  There were no objections, so this is accepted as a friendly amendment.
- H. Ghazle: We should be consistent with the Provost site regarding the PLIG grants and suggested this wording (bolded) be placed in the policy, line 55, "…the quality of our education efforts, **and to explore new technologies and methods to enhance student learning.**"
  This is accepted as a friendly amendment.

Motion to approve the proposed new policy E10.0 (University Administrations Commitment to Effective Teaching Development) to serve as a replacement for the existing policies E10.0 (Projects Relating to Teaching Productivity, E11.0 (Policy on Effective Teaching Committee) and E15.0 (Faculty Education and Development – FEAD). Policies E10, E11 and E15 that existed at the time of this motion will then be deleted.

Adjournment: 1:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

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