Call to Order: 12:09 p.m.

Note: If you experience any difficulty with the DML links, please email the DML department at: ritscholarworks@rit.edu.

Executive Committee Report

- Protocol dealing with policies coming to Academic Senate was discussed among the executive committee as follows:
  - If the executive committee receives documentation of proposed policies one week in advance, then we can proceed with these proposed policies being voted on at the next AS meeting. This will give senators at least a week to send the documents to their constituents for feedback. If documents are received by the executive committee less than a week before the next meeting, then these proposals will be presented at the next senate meeting, but will be postponed for vote until the meeting after that. This will be sent to everyone electronically as well so all are aware of this.
  - A call was made for one faculty member to serve on the Pedestrian Safety Task Force. Other committees needing faculty representation were sent to senators earlier in the week and all are listed below. Please email the Chair, Michael Laver at mslgsh@rit.edu and cc: Vivian Gifford at asenate@rit.edu if you wish to serve on any of these committees.
    - Pedestrian Safety Committee – President’s taskforce on pedestrian safety
    - Social Media Task Force – need one tenured representative
    - At Large faculty member to serve on the Academic Affairs Committee, 2 year term from 2014-2016.
    - Faculty Leave for Professional Development – need one Professor or Associate Professor to complete another member’s term for AY2014.

Proposed Tobacco Policy

Link to Proposed Policy and Letter of Recommendation from the Task Force to the President: https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/17357

Michael Laver briefly shared the history of the Tobacco Policy.

- Tobacco Policy revisions came to the Academic Senate in 2009-2010 from the Campus Environment Committee (CEC).
- President Destler wanted more study on this and the Smoking Task Force was formed.
- This policy was endorsed by the Senate and Staff Council but the Student Government unanimously did not support this proposal for RIT to become a smoke-free campus.
- The policy then went to Institute Council (IC) and was approved.
- With the unanimous opposition to this policy from SG, President Destler asked the Smoking Task
Michael Stojkovic, Wellness Associate Director briefly reported on the proposed Tobacco Policy for discussion and feedback today from the senate. [https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/17357](https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/17357)

- October 2012 the President charged Michael Stojkovic and Donna Ruben to form a Smoking Task Force to review the Tobacco Policy and bring this before all the governance groups.
- This was the first time a policy was passed in IC despite the unanimous vote from SG not to approve the current policy that restricts tobacco on campus.
- Because one of the governance groups (SG) did not endorse the current policy, the president requested that a sub-group Taskforce be formed to come up with a compromise to this policy that SG could endorse. They worked on the policy during this past summer. Members are: Nicole Howley, Bridget Hurley, Andrea Shaver (all SG representatives); Renee Brownstein, HR; Brooke Durland, Student Affairs; Karen Pelc, Student Affairs.
- With the present policy, students were mainly concerned with those living on campus 24/7. For students who smoke, the current policy would be a hardship as many do not own cars, and the current policy stipulates that smoking would be allowed only in cars.
- The revised policy proposed by this sub-group taskforce is that there be no tobacco use on campus except in private, designated areas. Twelve areas would be designated for smoking (i.e. having a bench with a receptacle nearby and information about smoking cessation).
- This is a very different policy than what was approved last spring in IC.
- Personally, M. Stojkovic said twelve designated areas for smoking does seem like a lot.
- Feedback received today from the senate and the other governance groups will be sent to President Destler.

Discussion/Q&A ensued.
- M. Laver did not feel comfortable as chair of Academic Senate to have it endorse this newly proposed policy as it had already voted and endorsed the current policy. And IC approved the policy. Yet any senator could move to have a vote to endorse this proposed policy if they so wish.
- W. McKinzie moved that the Academic Senate accept this proposed policy and endorse it. H. Ghazle seconded this motion.
- E. Saber: With a new taskforce formed, was there a lot of student input and the compromise you reached, is that satisfactory to that body? The SG vote for the current policy was unanimously “No” for our campus to go smokeless, so it is very important that adequate discussion occur with the students regarding this.
- M. Stojkovic: Three of the members of this small group are from SG. The group met this summer and toured the campus to see where the designated smoking areas should be and later discussed this with the President and then those recommendations came back to M. Stojkovic and Donna Ruben.
- If approved this policy would be implemented for two years and submitted to Dr. Destler, who would be involved.
- Nicole Howley, SG Taskforce member said that they reached a compromise that students could accept.
- J. Beck was ecstatic with the current policy that passed in IC last year and voiced his disapproval of the newly proposed policy coming to senate today.
  - Breathing in second hand smoke is still an issue even with having designated areas and he said that having no designated areas would be best, as they don’t work and data proves this. In the SW corner, parking lot F, this is 10 feet from where he walks two times a day. It is a main artery to get on Campus and thousands of people walk there daily and will be subjected to second hand smoke. Over the past 15 years I have breathed in second hand smoke as I go into the door where I work, as the smoking receptacle is nearby the door that I enter. This is so harmful.
  - The dorms are circled to be designated areas for smoking and is that in the best interest of our students?
  - Another issue with this policy is the delayed start (12-18 months) and now it is a minimum of 2 years. This makes the first part of the policy ironic – “The university is committed to facilitating a healthy working, learning, and living environment. To prevent harm to members of the community and to be consistent with university wellness initiatives...” but not for two more years.

M. Stojkovic: Correct, the best practices do not work concerning this. Regarding the dorms, smoking would again only be in certain areas.
In Chip Sheffield’s absence the following email was read on his behalf by H. Shahmohamad:
I would like for us to consider, however, the larger context of our Campus Smoking Policy. Namely, do we hold any institutional investments in ANY tobacco corporations, any corporations which have tobacco as a subsidiary, or which might supply fertilizer, water, packaging, insurance, or transportation to the tobacco industry? If this is the case, then I would encourage RIT to divulge them, to divest itself of such investments, and to publicly note this accomplishment.

E. Holden: In Croatia one cannot smoke in the buildings but can smoke outside the buildings. It is very difficult and here as well, there are smoking receptacles just outside my door. There is a concern that we make sure we are respectful of people who smoke, yet now in classes we have to allow 10 minutes every hour for a break and does this mean we have to plan around the smoking habits of students. Being against smoking in general, this may be a selling point for perspective students. And where will the students smoke in the winter?

S. Bower: There are signs that say not to smoke 25 feet from the building. She did not see how designated areas will work. People complain daily of walking past smoke.

J. Goldowitz commented that there are a lot of students that are addicted to smoking and many are from other countries. Could we add to the policy that “smoking and non-smoking areas will be strictly enforced?
M. Laver: Today we are only asking for feedback, and not to make any amendments to the policy.

Question was called on endorsing this proposed policy.

Bridgett Hurley, SG member on the Task Force made a clarification regarding comments made by some senators. Designated smoking areas will be plowed in the winter to make them more accessible.

Nicole Howley, SG member on the Task Force made the following comments:
- We did not want to eliminate smokers with the proposed policy, but to have less smoke on campus.
- There are seven locations in the residential areas that are designated areas so people on the campus side will have less exposure to smoke.
- Enforcement has always been an issue, and it may be good to have this in the policy to enforce designated areas.
- It would be ideal to help students quit smoking, yet many are addicted and quitting now while they are in school may cause additional stress during the already hectic school year.
- These smoking areas may not work and we have two years to determine if they are working or not.
- The University of Buffalo (UB) campus was mentioned during the last deliberations of the RIT Tobacco Policy. UB had banned smoking on their campus a few years back, yet it was told by a UB student that the ban has been ignored by many and students smoke anyway. UB was used as an example because the campus size and the separation of on-campus from off-campus areas was similar to RIT.

The motion to endorse the proposed Tobacco Policy passed with a vote of 15 in favor, 10 opposed and 5 abstentions.

Any further comments should be emailed to Michael Stojkovic at mrspsn@rit.edu or to President Destler directly. This policy will be returning to IC this fall, possibly in October. All IC meetings are open to the public.

**Policy E5.0 - Policy on Tenure (Proposed Revisions)**

E5.0 (Policy on Tenure) PPt Presentation of Proposed FAC revisions: [https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/17361](https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/17361)

Kristen Waterstram-Rich, FAC Chair presented the proposed revisions to Policy E5.0 regarding the notification date of non-reappointment for non-tenured faculty for discussion and possible vote.

- Edits were made in Section 2.C.5 of this policy in regards to the notification date of non-reappointment of non-tenured faculty in their first year of hire being changed. Here is the link to the changes made, showing both current policy and edits being proposed: [https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/17361](https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/17361)
- The changes were made so that the faculty member would have appropriate notice and also this would alleviate the potential problem of possible retaliation.

Discussion/Q&A ensued.

- M. Kotlarchyk: The policy needs to be made clearer in that it must be general enough to handle any point of hire. What if someone is hired in the Spring or any other time during the year?
K. Waterstram-Rich: FAC will discuss this and review the proposed policy wording in regards to faculty that are hired in the Spring or any other time besides Fall.

- H. Yamashita: What would be the cause of first year dismissal and is that in the policy?
- K. Waterstram-Rich: In January there is an extensive evaluation but also an evaluation is given before notice of dismissal is given by June 30. We will review the wording again and look at terms and semesters.
- H. Ghazlew was concerned about the performance of someone who is going to be dismissed and they have one more semester on campus in the classroom. What will happen?
  K. Waterstram-Rich: Those arrangements are up to the department head.
- S. Hoi asked for clarification of the re-wording of A. and B. as it does not say how long the faculty can stay after receiving notification.
  C. Licata: If notification is given by March 1, then the end of their contract year is when they leave. In year 2 it would be by the 15th of January.
- T. Policano: We are trying to be as generous and fair to the professor in this policy so students are not at risk. It is probable they will not be given another year. On the other hand, someone who has moved to the area, we would want to give them 6 months. Yet anyone hired at RIT, ideally we would love to have tenured faculty here for life.
- S.M. Ramkumar: As department chairs we do not have the extra funds to hire an adjunct to fill the place of the non-tenured faculty person who is being dismissed.
  K. Waterstram-Rich: Junior faculty members do not have a 3-4 course load, just two.
- K. Mousley: Do you expect each new faculty to teach two semesters? This is not clear.
  K. Waterstram-Rich: Faculty hired have to be told by the start of spring regarding non-reappointment and their contract would end in June. And the chances are they would not be put back in the classroom in the spring.
- C. Collison suggested the following wording for a clearer policy under Section 2.C.5:
  (b) In the second year of a tenure-track appointment, notice of non-reappointment must be given before the start of classes in spring semester in the fourth semester of the tenure track appointment, the second semester of the current contract period. The faculty member’s contract ends at the end of the current contract period.

Motion to table Policy E5.0 passed and will return on October 16 for vote.

Policy E6.0 – Policy on Faculty Rank and Promotion (Proposed Revisions)

E6.0 Documents and PPT Presentation (Policy on Faculty Rank and Promotion): [http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17363](http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17363)

A summary of major revisions of Policy E6.0 was presented by FAC members Eileen Feeney Bushnell and Rajendra Raj. The full PPT presentation and proposed documents can be viewed in detail above. The following was presented:

- General revisions for clarity and consistency (i.e. use of wording “department head” instead of “chair” etc.)
- Categories and ranks of faculty
- Promotion committees
- Promotion criteria
  - For associate professors
  - For lecturers and senior lecturers
- Schedule changes and access to documentation

Brief time of Discussion/Q&A followed.

- S.M. Ramkumar: Isn’t there a rank called University Professor?
  K. Waterstram-Rich: This is not a rank.
- S.M. Ramkumar: Will this policy apply to visiting lecturers? And will the revisions made bring confusion to this issue. Lecturers enjoy benefits but visiting faculty do not.
  K. Waterstram-Rich: Everything being proposed has gone through HR and Legal. We used to define in different ways different units. The committee wanted to define rank in the policy. Some colleges have lines for visiting professors and a visiting lecturer would fall in the same category. The issue was that many lecturers were hired to fill an empty position. We added the descriptor Term Limited. Visiting lecturer already exists in policy and they need to know where they stand.
H. Shahmohamad: How can a department head who has the rank of associate professor have access to documents for a candidate if the candidate is the rank of associate professor as well? The cell containing the words “Yes, if department head is higher in rank…” should be changed to “Yes, if department head is equal or higher in rank…”

G. Hintz: This policy is tying my hands. We have several different programs in our School. If I am unable to access outside letters, it is difficult for me to give a fair recommendation to my faculty because I may not be an expert in their area. It would be a tremendous help to get the opinion of other professionals in the applicant’s field.

K. Waterstram-Rich: RIT allows lecturers to be department heads who could actually be evaluating faculty for promotion and the Faculty Affairs committee felt this was not appropriate; therefore this wording was added in the Access to Documentation chart for review of external letters: “if Department Head is higher in rank”. This is the reason we added this caveat.

E6.0 will return to senate this month for further discussion and possible vote this month.

**Title IX [Presentation Only]**

Link to Title IX Ppt Presentation: [https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/17360](https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/17360)

Judy Bender, Assistant VP for Human Resources and Title IX coordinator gave a PowerPoint presentation on Title IX. This was presented to inform all of the Title IX policy (Education Amendments of 1972 and RIT Title IX Policies and Procedures). Dawn Soufleris, Associate VP for Student Behavior and Critical Incidents was also present. The following was presented and see link above to view entire Ppt presentation.

- Information was provided on Title IX’s prohibition on gender based discrimination – received volumes from the government
- Reviewed RIT policies and procedures implementing the requirements of Title IX
- Identify your role in the Title IX process
- Who is required to report an incident: any responsible employee
- Call Public Safety if danger is involved
- An investigation will occur once there is a complaint

**Brief Discussion/Q&A.**

- H. Shahmohamad referred to slide #10: What should the role of a faculty member be if he passes by two students who are shouting at each other? What does misconduct mean? Should faculty be passive and non-interfering or we should be vigilant and observant of such “misconducts”?
- D. Soufleris: We are responsible for each other and for example, if there is a student fight, please contact Public Safety or if you feel comfortable you can intervene.
  J. Bender: We always go to the complainant if this goes to the police, the law etc. and people will be called as a witness.
- R. Kushalnagar: Where do you draw the line of reporting an incident if what you heard from a third party and you are not sure it is true?
  J. Bender: Please report any way, so we can follow up with an investigation if this is needed and see if there are recurring patterns to the incident being reported. Usually incidences of violence are not random stranger violence but generally the parties know each other. And mostly incidences occur when alcohol is involved.
- M. Laver: We have seen several presentations of this and are very impressed with your diligence.

Adjournment: 1:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Chip Sheffield, AS Communications Officer
Vivian Gifford, Senior Staff Assistant