Call to Order: 12:07 p.m.
Communication Officer's Report: Minutes of 5/1/2014 will be approved at the May 8, 2014 meeting.
Executive Committee Report: None

Business/Reports:

Modifications to Policy E12.1 (Awards for Outstanding Teaching)
Link of Policy: [http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17275](http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17275)
PPt: [http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17295](http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17295)

See links to the documents for the full presentation and policy being proposed.

- The policy was last revised October 4, 2012 and implemented AY2013-14.
- Based on input from the Eisenhart Nomination Committees and the Eisenhart Awards Committee, proposed changes were presented at today’s meeting.
- There was confusion about the 50% teaching requirement for eligibility, so changes were made to this portion of the policy (see link above to proposed Policy E12.1 and the Ppt.)
- Corrections were made to the nominations and evaluation process.
- Clarifications were made on the process for determination of the recipients by the Awards Committee.
- Jayanti Venkataraman, Eisenhart Coordinator moved that the senate approve the proposed changes to Policy E12.1.

Discussion and Q&A:

- H. Ghazle: He noticed in the past few years that finalists do not find out who won the awards until after the Provost announces this news. Recommendation: To send a letter to all finalists before the Provost’s announcement goes out to the RIT community.
J. Venkataraman: The finalists who did not win are informed after the winners are announced.
H. Ghazle: Could the finalists who did not win be informed privately before the public announcement of the winners?
J. Venkataraman: After the Provost makes the announcement of the awardees, a letter from the nomination committee chairs goes to the participants and the letter states that they were finalists. It is the prerogative of the Provost to announce this first.
J. Venkataraman: Your recommendation would not go into policy, but to Sue Provenzano and the Provost’s office for consideration.

- S. Boedo: The number of courses which faculty must teach is 3 courses per year, so it would be 9 courses in three years. Looking at KGCOE, the three courses per year corresponds to a research portfolio.

J. Venkataraman: Half-time would be 3 courses per year which is 50% teaching. Scholarship is also like teaching, but you need a formal number of courses to be eligible for these awards.

P. Darragh: For a teaching award, you need more than 50%; otherwise there is less contact with students.

J. Venkataraman: It is not just teaching but also the nominees have to do scholarship and service.

- T. Engstrom: Item X.E.2 To maintain parallelism, it should read “select or not select one recipient.” This is a friendly amendment.

M. Kotlarchyk: We have many research-active faculty and some may only teach one course per semester, which equals two per year. Would these faculty then be ineligible for this award?

J. Venkataraman: Yes, that’s correct.

S. Maggelakis: I understand this point, but why are we discriminating against research-heavy teaching? Are we assuming faculty in research are not teaching students, yet they are? And the criteria in this policy does include scholarship as well. Teaching does not just happen in the classroom.

S. Ramkumar: There are other awards for research.

M. Richmond: This is, by its own policy, not an award for teaching since it requires some scholarship.

M. Kotlarchyk: Is this quantity of teaching or quality of teaching?

S. Hoi: This award is for teaching, but is it necessary for a faculty member to do research in order to be a good teacher? It is difficult to assess the quality of one-on-one teaching, so one must assess teaching in a classroom setting.

K. Waterstram-Rich: The senate debated this topic heavily in 2012 regarding “what does teaching mean and how can we create a proper award?” In the past the senate decided on the 50% criterion for eligibility for the award. The revisions today are helping to guide the Eisenhart Awards Committee.

- R. Kushalnager: At NTID there are teachers who act as tutors and there is a formula for the teaching load which includes tutoring. Some of these NTID faculty may be disqualified by the eligibility criteria in the policy.

J. Venkataraman: In 2012 we discussed tutors and some tutors are tenure-track, some are not.

T. Engstrom: The proposed revisions are simply saying how to effectively translate and implement what we have already approved. What is being proposed is clarifying and reasonable. We should trust our selection committees to do what they’ve always done extraordinarily well: the right thing.

J. Venkataraman: The system works and proposed revisions are being made to clarify things for the Awards Committee.

- B. Barry: In CLA the tenure-track teaching load is 5 per semester, and if you make it 9 per semester that is even more stringent. So could you change the 9 to 8 for three years?

J. Venkataraman: We could modify this to read this read 8 instead of 9, but we do not want to go lower than this.

T. Engstrom: Could we have it read “no fewer than 8”?

S. Gold: Suggested the word “normally” and it would read “normally defined as not fewer than 8 courses for the past three years.”

B. Hartpence: I object to this as we do not know what the loads are across the colleges. If you have a good researcher/scholar this could exclude them from the process. This award was created in the 1970’s and we should think about the goal of why this was created at that time. How we define teaching should be a topic on another day.

M. Kotlarchyk: All courses are not created equal.
Motion on the floor to change the wording to read: “Normally defined as no fewer than the equivalent of 8 courses” to be placed under III. Eligibility, A3.

Motion does not pass with a vote of 7 in favor, 11 opposed and 13 Abstentions.

- Question was called on the original motion to approve the revised policy E12.1 as presented.
- H. Palmer: This policy requires the candidate to teach at least three course in the year he wins, but if the candidate is on sabbatical, he won’t qualify.
- J. Venkataraman: The policy explicitly does disqualify anyone who is on sabbatical.

Motion to approved the proposed revised Policy E12.1 passes with 13 in favor, 8 opposed and 10 abstentions.

- B. Hartpence commented on the policy being sent for review last Friday, but typically the turn-around time is longer than one week.
- M. Laver: We do not have a policy on this, yet there are guidelines. Getting the document at least one week before is best practice.
- T. Engstrom: In CLA we have the practice of bringing an item up for discussion in meeting A and then having a vote on this no earlier than meeting B. This permits time for deliberation and feedback.

**Revised Policy D1.0 (Policies for Curriculum Development)**

Proposed Policies: [http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17274](http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17274)
PPT: [http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17296](http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17296)

See links above to view the revised Policy D1.0 (Policies for Curriculum Development) and the PPT presented by Mary Beth Parker, ICC chair.

- From November 2013 through last week ICC worked on Policy D1.0, with GEC, Grad Council and IWC also reviewing the policy.
- State regulations were looked at.
- D1.4 is a new policy
- D1.5 is the former D16.0
- If individual colleges do not have policies in place regarding curriculum development, they need to align with this policy.
- Sue Provenzano requested that the re-numberings of these policies be checked to make sure there are not any reference problems in other policies.

No discussion from the floor.

Motion to approve the reviewed Policy D1.0 passes with one abstention.

**ICC’s Final Report** (Comments and Q&A)

Final Report: [http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17297](http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17297)

See link to the final report presented by Mary Beth Parker, ICC chair. Any comments or questions can be sent to Mary Beth Parker.

- T. Engstrom: What does “review” in the report where it reads “review by ICC.” Does it mean ICC reviews proposed new programs only or also critically assess existing programs? Could you please clarify and could ICC be more robustly charged?
M-B. Parker: We are charged with both and ICC will start a 5 or 7-year rotation review process, contacting colleges for these reviews.

**Academic Affairs Committee’s Final Report with Q&A/Comments and Update on the Honors Program:**
AAC’s Final Report: [http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17298](http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17298)

J. Hertzson focused on the Honors Program update today (only informational) but reviewed briefly the following:

- The AAC charges were reviewed.
- The real work was done in the sub-committees who have been active all year. All their reports and any policies presented have passed. See Ppt (link above) for full details.
- Update today on the Honors Program was done in consultation with Dr. Danielle Smith, Honors Program Director.
- Issues from the approved recommendations of AY2012-2013 were reviewed.
- Michael Laver: This came to senate last year and we brought in an external reviewer, to go from a point based system to a more rigorous model. This was approved by senate last year.

Q&A and Comments per the Honors Program Update.

- M. Richmond: Regarding Faculty resources, is the $5500 listed for the new honors courses monies per course?
  J. Hertzson: Yes, beginning in the fall it will be $5500 for each Honors course.
- T. Engstrom: Some assumptions are bothersome with the program itself and the pedagogical model seems skewed. It seems the privilege regarding seminars seems unfair. We have committed to investing in a first-year seminar for Honors students only, but we are not committed to the first-year seminar for the many more non-Honors students (who could benefit more from this seminar).
  J. Hertzson: I don’t disagree with you and much of this has been discussed. The Honors sub-committee was addressing the charge given.
- P. Venkataraman: We followed the requirements for implementation.
- D. Smith: It is not fair to say that the Honors students are more privileged than other programs. Honors courses are open to many students and I am not sure what the alternative would be.
- H. Ghazle: Is $5,500 given to the college or the faculty person.
  D. Smith: If faculty teach an Honors course as a course overload, then $5,500 is paid to the faculty teaching the course. If faculty teach an honors course as part of their regular load, then $5,500 is paid to their department toward adjunct replacement and honors course development. Compensation for honors courses come from the Honors Program budget.
- S. Hoi: If you look at the core model, there is a 3rd year discipline specific or research seminar. Why is there no money for compensation for this?
  D. Smith: Those courses are meant to be existing non-honors seminar courses with an additional component which counts for the honors requirements. However, if they are developed and taught as honors seminars, then the compensation is the same as the compensation for honors courses: $5,500 paid to the faculty member if taught as an overload or $5,500 paid to the department if taught as part of the faculty’s regular course load.
  S. Hoi: I think you are asking faculty to do additional work in these courses with no compensation.
- V. Serravallo: Item 7 says there are no additional resources required but how does the creation of a “Faculty Fellow” not require resources?
  D. Smith: There are two RIT faculty (Jessica Lieberman, CLA and Uli Linke, CLA) who have agreed to work as Honors Fellows for a three-year term, beginning in 2014-2015. They will help to develop new courses that the Honors Program requires. Honors Fellows are compensated by a reduced teaching load, minimal departmental requirements and a $3000 stipend.
C. Licata: Regarding the recommendation related to additional resources, given the current tight budget circumstance, we did not request additional resources in FY 15. However, given the size of the program and the need for additional staff support, we will in all likelihood be required to infuse some additional resources into the Honors Program moving forward. We are looking to Dr. Danielle Smith and the Honors Faculty Curriculum Committee for a recommendation regarding incremental resource requirements and will revisit this next year as part of the FY 16 budget process.

D. Smith: Having an Honors curriculum committee for each of the colleges was constituted in the fall.

- B. Hartpence: A student in one of my courses asked for additional work and what is this called?
- D. Smith: That is called a “contract course” which is an ordinary course which has additional worked added through an agreement between the student and the instructor. Those are not compensated.
- H. Ghazle: I also perform Honors contracts. Have the Deans of the colleges been involved with the planning of the Honors Program?
- D. Smith: I have met with the Deans and kept them up to date. We have Honors Advocates (faculty) in each college. We now have an Honors Curriculum Committee which has members from each college as well.
- C. Sheffield said he would like to second T. Engstrom’s comments. He read the report of the external reviewer (Dr. Robert Spurrier) very carefully. Among the key recommendations was to replace enrollment management (the admissions office) as the gatekeeper for our honors program, to strengthen the administrative support by adding an Associate director, and to increase faculty oversight and strengthen their commitment. We need to address the issue of the gatekeepers, as well as how we define academic rigor. Furthermore, will honors sections solely be restricted to the honors students? When they are co-mingled with non-honors students, who have entirely different course requirements and expectations, then these sections have different standards. This can, and often does, lower the bar and diminish rigor, which is very problematic. Smaller class sizes would improve rigor, but when we increase the class size by admitting non-honors students, we defeat this goal. Demanding a foreign language or study abroad would be appropriate, as well as requiring an honors thesis, but these require increased funding. Until these issues are addressed, there is not adequate support for a truly rigorous and robust honors program.
- F. Walker: At Deans Council there was a conversation about some of the desires to grow an Honors Program and we asked for a report. There has been one conversation per year on this.
- M. Laver: Feedback on this should go back to Danielle Smith and the RIT community should be informed as to who is your college representative on the Honors Curriculum Committee. And encourage your deans to meet with the Honors Curriculum Committee members.

**MS in Accounting Program for Conversion**

PPt and Proposal Documents: [http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17299](http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17299)

Joseph Hornak, Graduate Council Chair presented the MS in Accounting Program for Conversion. See link above to the full presentation of this proposal and the proposed documents.

- Reasons were given for the late conversion.
- The courses in this program already exist and are part of the MBA in Accounting Program.
- If the number of students in this program are less than 30, there will be no need for additional resources. Only if it is over 30 will there be a need for additional resources.
- This is a standard conversion, Type 1. The program existed in the past.

Comments and Q&A.

- T. Engstrom: What is it meant by “critical thinking” in regards to financial statement preparation?
  Bill Dresnack: A lot of judgment and estimation goes into how this is presented.
Motion to approved the proposed MS in Accounting Program for Conversion passes.

Adjournment: 1:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

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