Call to Order: 12:06 p.m.

Communication Officer's Report: Minutes of 10/02/2014 approved. https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/17379
Note: If you experience any difficulty with the DML links, please email the DML department at: ritscholarworks@rit.edu.

Executive Committee Report
None

Proposed Policy E5.0 (Policy on Tenure)
E5.0 (Policy on Tenure) PPT Presentation of Proposed FAC revisions and motion to approve:
http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17375

K. Waterstram-Rich presented the PPT on the proposed changes by FAC to Policy E5.0.

- The proposed wording keeps everything in terms of academic years which makes for less confusion and ambiguity, hopefully.
- No changes were made to the revised document presented to Senate on 10/2/2014.
- FAC felt that to incorporate the word “semester” into the policy would bring too much confusion.
- M. Laver: This wording is now more generous than the previous wording.

Motion: Academic Senate approves the revised wording in E5.0 with respect to non-appointment during the probationary period, as proposed by the Faculty Affairs Committee. [See link above for the changes that were approved at today’s meeting.] Motion carries with 3 abstentions.

“Greatness through Difference: A Draft”- Proposed Strategic Plan for 2015-2025
PPT and other documents: http://hdl.handle.net/1850/17376
Most recent document of the Strategic Plan on the President’s site: https://www.rit.edu/president/plan2025/greatness

- Michael Laver moved to have the Strategic Plan endorsed and this was 2nded.
- Floor is now open to a discussion of the proposed Strategic Plan once the PPT presentation was completed by Hamad Ghazle/Hiroko Yamashita, SP Steering Committee members. See link above to the full presentation and documents that had been sent to senate.
• J. Capps inquired about the action steps and objectives of this proposed Strategic Plan.

H. Ghazle: The action steps and objectives can be reviewed on the document posted on the President’s website.

In regards to this, M. Laver read the three objectives under Difference Makers #1 taken from an updated version of the Strategic Plan on the President’s site. https://www.rit.edu/president/plan2025/greatness

**Difference Maker #1:**

RIT will model and share a bold approach to academic quality with commitment to: student learning, the success of our graduates, and the continual improvement of our academic environment.

**Objective 1.1** RIT will ensure that every graduate will attain educational learning goals consistent with their programs of study, degree level, and institutional mission.

**Objective 1.2** RIT will be lead the nation in external stake-holder satisfaction with the critical career-oriented transversal skills and competencies of our graduates.

**Objective 1.3** RIT will utilize real-time, contemporary program review, assessment processes, and renewal practices to guide planning, resource allocation, continual improvement, and effective responses to opportunities and challenges.

• H. Yamashita: This document is still in the planning stages.

• C. Collison: This is an ambitious strategic plan which is keen on RIT success and the need for faculty engagement, but what are the resource implications if this is to be realized. How will the goals be accomplished? Without appropriate resources, faculty will be unwilling to support it.

H. Ghazle: This is an excellent comment and it resonates across campus. We heard Dr. Haefner and the President talk about this and the need to prioritize. We cannot accomplish anything without resources.

• K. Mousley asked for a clarification of the word “minorities” and for this to be more clearly defined (i.e. Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing). Could a footnote be supplied in regards to this word “minorities”?

R. Raj: We need more inclusive terms than we have at present. Under-represented populations need to be specified.

H. Ghazle: Please send us an email regarding this.

M. Laver: The SP has a whole section on NTID.

• H. Shahmohamad: At yesterday’s IC meeting, the President passionately discussed this plan and RIT being the first in this and first in that. Some concerns received from one of his colleagues were as follows:
  o The Carnegie classification finding is meaningless as this is true of most universities and RIT will be embarrassed if anyone looks this up. This should be deleted.
  o The goal to be in the top 100 in US News should be restored. Sure it can be gamed, but it is also a measurable achievement and RIT could do it without resorting to the NEU tactics.

Referring to Dimension 2:
  o Trans-disciplinary is either meaningless or means something that is not intended. It should be replaced with “multidisciplinary.”
  o In objective 1.1, the sentence starting with “Among the areas…” should be removed. The areas mentioned as examples do not meet the criteria of the plan and therefore make the plan self-
contradictory. Also, the additional objectives spell out a procedure for defining areas, so why would examples be given before those procedures are even implemented.

- Suggested an objective 3.x that suggests the implementation of a funding model for research MS students similar to what we have in place for Ph.D. students.
- The rush with which this is being pushed through is not helpful to the process, or to the faculty.

- J. Goldowitz: I have seen RIT improve immensely, but I’m very concerned about the level of hyperbole in this plan. We are claiming we are going to be come #1 in so many areas. My concern is that there are over 3000 universities in the U.S. and all have strategic plans, and none of them are standing still. We are far too overly confident and focused on reputation. Wording should be instead: “we will improve in this area.”.
- M. Fluet: I was concerned about some of the objectives that seemed self-serving in terms of on-campus jobs to meet our co-op quota.
- J. Chiavaroli: The Strategic Plan addresses global engagement but doesn’t do so specifically for local, community engagement. There should be more of a balance between the two.
- S.M. Ramkumar: These comments are related to the co-op experience and one of the difference makers that relates to that. Larry Villasmil will submit some of the other comments from CAST.
  - This particular difference maker does not make sense.
  - The co-op definition has been opened up and expanded to such a degree that it is irrelevant to the program outcome and does not make sense. (i.e. A senior capstone should not be a co-op experience.)
  - Top-down practice of the administration is problematic. The program should say that in complying with the three objectives as faculty and program advisors we are the best judges of quality and what should count as relevant co-op experience and how many hours is essential to be counted as experiential learning for the students.

- A. Ray: The Organizational Agility Task Force’s final report drew on current scholarly and enterprise literature to define ‘Organizational Agility’ in the following fashion: “The defining element of organizational agility is the ability to respond to external dynamics and opportunities without traumatic change to the organization.”

The first part of this definition is addressed in the current draft. But the latter half, “without traumatic change to the organization,” must also appear there in order to reflect the definition of OA as understood by the task force members and, thus, informing the very basis for their recommendations.

- M. Laver: In the past Strategic Plan I remember seeing a portion on Internationals, and is this now blended in throughout the proposed document?
- H. Ghazle: This is now spread out in the proposed document under different dimensions.
- M. Fluet:
  - How are we going to reward faculty for interdisciplinary work?
  - Who is going to fairly evaluate our work/scholarship?
  - What challenges will this impose on our graduates?
- L. Villasmil: Some disciplines in some colleges are less conducive to collaboration than others. Not everyone can embrace this equally, and those who can’t shouldn’t be penalized.
- W. McKinzie: This is the third strategic plan I have lived through. They always talk about interdisciplinary activities. This has to do with rewards and recognition of what one does, and the silo system doesn’t allow for this. Resources are linked to majors and programs, and if you fall between the cracks of this, it is near impossible and it is an unbelievable struggle.
H. Ghazle: There is an assessment piece in the document regarding this and how to assess and allocate, etc. There are some action steps in regards to rewards. The SP Taskforce did a wonderful job in specifying how to move on with this.

- This was sent from one of the CAST faculty and read by J. Goldowitz:
  - The proposed Strategic Plan seems to be trading our unique value proposition for a non-value proposition, prestige without, necessarily, preparing students for careers in industry.
- M. Fluet: This Strategic Plan spreads our students too thin and sacrifices breadth for depth, in my opinion.
- H. Ghazle: Students will have an individual plan – not to spread them thin to prolong their stay here.
- L. Villasmil: Regarding Dimension #4, why are we concerned only with providing service to the Rochester Community only? Isn’t this a bit narrow?
- H. Ghoneim:
  - Do we have an assessment plan?
  - H. Ghazle: Each dimension has an assessment plan – how we assess what we do. In terms of prioritizing, that is done by the President and Board of Trustees.
  - What if some things do not work? Do we have an alternate plan?

- J. Capps: This document is still premature; it is a living document. We’ve noted our reservations. To endorse the plan today seems too soon.
- R. Vullo: Given the fluidity of this document, it would be hard to endorse this today. We need to be closer to the actual document before it is endorsed by Senate.
- M. Laver: To endorse this document today is up to the Senate. And we can bring this back next week as well for further discussion. Even if it is not endorsed, feedback will be taken and ultimately this goes to the Board of Trustees in November. All governance groups have been included in the discussion of this proposal.

H. Ghazle:
- The SP Steering Committee and the administration will take our comments up through October 27 or 28.
- This will then go to the Board of Trustees for vote by November 13 or 14.
- Please send us your comments and concerns.
- Yet we need senate endorsement from this body and to keep delaying is not good.
- Endorsement by the Senate can strengthen what we have.
- We want a united message and want this university to be the best that it can be.

- H. Yamashita: If you have comments or concerns on curricular matters, this should be addressed as well.
- S. Hoi: Dimension 4, Objective 1.6, in the President's document states that all degree programs with a required or optional co-op experience develop online courses that can be taken when students are on co-op assignments. This could have a potentially broad and deep impact on our curriculum.
- J. Ettlie:
  - The problem of imperfect forecasting and predicting the future is always impacting a Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan by its definition will not occur over night.
  - This is one body on this campus that should influence direction to really fulfill our destiny.
  - Absence of resources makes it folly.
  - Scarce resources helps us to set priorities. I need a better understanding of how these priorities will be set.
  - If STEM should be in the top three goals, then we need to say this.
  - Read a comment from his colleague: How many undergraduate students can you cram onto this campus in order to fund this plan?
  - We need to leverage our best capabilities.
  - Regarding research and contracts, this is not a reasonable goal.
Scarce resources needs to be discussed.

- C. Collison:
  - This is a guiding document and needs to return to faculty and staff before it is ratified.
  - I agree with J. Ettlie’s comments on prioritization and scarce resources. There needs to be a document on resource allocation. Without resources how can we be behind this?

- Provost:
  - This has been a rich conversation and it much appreciated. Thank you.
  - There is no urgency in endorsing this today.
  - We’ve all been advocating for resources to be mapped against this plan in a more direct way. The decision was to separate resources from the initial framework. These priorities will be vetted with you and will have an action plan.
  - This proposal before the Senate today is intended to be a framework and a guide.
  - It captures aspirational goals that are attainable.
  - You have our commitment to provide resources with a plan around the resources, timeline etc.
  - This Strategic Plan will inform the capital campaign.

- C. Sheffield:
  - My major concern is with the title itself “Greatness through Difference.” What is greatness and why should this be an aim? Why not “High Academic Success or Intellectual Excellence or Academic Strength or Rigor or Intellectual and Personal Achievement through Difference?”
  - There is a consistent emphasis on quantity, uniqueness, and “being the first,” throughout the document that I find very problematic. What happens when quantity is emphasized above quality and products over process, facts above values? I could care less about our graduating the second highest number of STEM majors in the US (or aspiring to be the first). I’d much prefer for us to be known as graduating some of the highest quality STEM majors, the very best at critical thinking and problem solving, creative and innovative solutions, and a broad, well-grounded humanistic perspective. In other words, they are agile and nimble thinkers and model global citizens.
  - I firmly believe that “less is more,” and that a sense of modesty and humility is seriously lacking in this document. Unbridled growth and expansion is unsustainable. The hyperbole and professed belief in our own exceptionalism is repugnant. The goals must be more realistic and obtainable.
  - One of the only places that I find a hint of modesty is in the preface where the Athenaeum and Mechanics Association are described as a “down-to-earth place.” Planning and aspiring to achieve greatness, prestige, and reputation may in fact be self-defeating, especially if one isn’t focused on the tasks at-hand which include hard-work, focus, discipline, academic rigor, and good luck. I’m concerned that raising the ideal of Greatness to the central aim of this strategic plan could have the ironic effect that there will be less of it. Colleges and Universities are about a great deal more than measurable utility, rankings, a corporate business model, economic growth, and short-term values. Price and revenue enhancement is a very feeble proxy for judgments of quality, especially since a university education is what some analysts regard as a “post-experience good;” its intrinsic benefits, in other words, cannot be known in advance.
  - We should not lose sight of a critical perspective that looks far beyond the immediate (short-term) and which also recognizes our vital historical role as society’s critic and conscience, the university as a place for dissent, reflection, discovery, doubt, civic dialog and social engagement, and actual learning.
  - Finally, if we must aim for global rankings, then I would suggest that we aim for the Times Higher Education-QS World University Rankings and that we set our sights to be within the top 200.
This is perhaps much more realistic.

- T. Policano:
  o Can we compare this plan to our earlier plan of 2005?
  o We can get behind the proposed Strategic Plan if we can see a grading of the past plan and how we did.
  o We need to review what areas we did well in and this analysis would be very helpful.

- Provost: If you can capture the most salient comments shared today and submit them, then we can incorporate them and send this out before next week’s senate meeting. Time is of the essence. The President’s Roundtable is also having a discussion as well on this Strategic Plan today.

- H. Shahmohamad:
  o I would like to applaud what many of my colleagues said.
  o The date of November 13 when the Board of Trustees will vote on this is looming over us. This document is more important than this deadline.
  o What if we were to miss this deadline? Is there an alternative?
  o It is important that the senate approves this and feels good about this proposed Strategic Plan.

  Provost: This is a fluid document and it will change over time. Taking it back to the Trustees with our endorsement is important.

- H. Yamashita: Faculty ownership of this plan is important and we need to be excited about it. Please examine this document as the general direction that we will go.

Motion to postpone this discussion until next week (October 23, 2014) carried.

Adjournment: 1:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Chip Sheffield, Communications Officer
Vivian Gifford, Senior Staff Assistant