Call To Order: 12:11 p.m.

Approved Minutes of 3/19/2015:  [https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/17453](https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/17453)
[If you experience any difficulty with the DML links, please email the DML department at:  [ritscholarworks@rit.edu](mailto:ritscholarworks@rit.edu).]

Executive Committee Report
- Executive Committee nominations are coming in. Elections will take place on April 23, 2015.
- Congratulations and a “thank you” went to the Ombuds Office for their 25th anniversary that they are celebrating today. Cupcakes from their office were generously given to the Academic Senate as part of their celebration.

ILI Update
See Power Point Presentation for full details:  [https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/17449](https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/17449)

Neil Hair, ILI Executive Director and Therese Hannigan, Interim Director of RIT Online gave an update on ILI.
- The mission of the Innovative Learning Institute (ILI) and its goals were shared.
- The ILI has two units – Teaching and Learning Services and RIT Online.
- There is an increase in the non-traditional student population, and this population is different from the undergraduate population.
- There is a systemic course transformation underway.
- A surge in global faculty and student mobility is seen.
- There is pressure to demonstrate “value-added” of a degree.
- There are key changes occurring in higher education.
- Many courses have been streamlined and the ILI department is very proud of this work that has been done.
- The initial target audience has shifted: working professional, unemployed college graduates, RIT alumni, HR managers.
- Online courses/programs should reflect the RIT brand and emphasize unique RIT academic strengths.
- The User Experience Design and Development Advanced Certificate was approved last year by the senate. The online program approval process can be up to 16 months – campus approval in 2014 took 6 months and then the state approval took 10 months.
- There was concern in the senate regarding 6-8 week courses as this was questionable in terms of quality. Acceleration is being preferred by the largest proportion of online students.
- The ILI is reporting back on the performance of the new accelerated online courses as promised last year. Adam Smith in CIAS shared consistently positive results from the online courses he taught this year. One negative comment was that students asked that the videos be more tied in with the assignments.
- Student survey results were very positive in regards to satisfaction with the online learning experience at RIT.
• Some students studying online did not feel connected to RIT so we have built a virtual campus (portal) available to all fully online students studying through RIT around the world. There is now an RIT Online Concierge to respond to prospective students and active online students.

• Greater awareness of RIT Online has been generated through a recent marketing campaign which includes press releases, RIT agents of change stories, blog posts, magazine ads, online banner ads, SEO and SEM. RIT Online developed an online press room that showcases great stories from RIT Online students and alumni.

• A website has been developed to help with marketing single courses, all leading towards future online programs.

• Over a 7 day period in 2014 there were 2,570 page views on the site. In 2015, over 7 days (last week) there were 120,886 page views.

Discussion and Q/A ensued.

• W. McKinzie: How many online programs does RIT have right now?
  o There are 23 online programs (1 pending approval) at the graduate level and 4 at the undergraduate level.

• W. McKinzie: How close do you work with CMS?
  o We partner well with Jim Hall’s unit and work very closely with them.

• H. Shahmohamad: What does the certification process entail to be a certified online instructor?
  o N. Hair: It is a very informal process and we certify the quality components. Training is key.
  o T. Hannigan: Once we have done a demand report, we then meet with the professor, department chair along with an instructional designer and we discuss what type of courses and tools would make this a great online experience.

• J. Goldowitz: This was an objection brought forth by Tim Engström last year at senate, and I agree with this in regards to using the word “concierge” or “at your service” as this makes RIT seem more like a service and less like a university. The concept is good but not the words being used. E. Saber agreed with this, removing the word “concierge” and “at your service” as we don’t want this to sound like RIT is a hotel.
  o N. Hair: We are very sensitive to the language we use. Our competition is using the word “concierge” and we are market focused yet also providing quality programs that are robust.
  o T. Hannigan: To put you at ease, the concierge is in beta testing presently and will not go into a full launch until the fall 2015. We still have time to see how we want to word that.

• J. Ettlie: Who are our competitors?
  o N. Hair: There is a list of competitors we have benchmarked against such as Drexel, Phoenix, Southern New Hampshire, and many others. The list includes peer schools, aspirant schools, best in class, etc.
  o T. Hannigan: The competition from online program to program is different. RIT has the ability and is in a good position to compete with many schools in regards to online learning.

• E. Saber: In terms of online courses, what is the faculty workload? Additionally, last year KGCOE offered online courses and are these part of your online courses?
  o N. Hair: There are some programs that are excluded from the work we do; yet some programs such as the MBA on our site we are helping to advertise. In regards to the workload for online faculty, it is up to the department chair to make that decision. Departments are actually compensated when online students do take these courses online from a department.
  o T. Hannigan: Those online KGCOE courses were for campus students taking online courses. RIT Online currently supports and markets fully online programs and courses.

• K. Kurz: Will faculty be required to have a certification to teach online courses in the future?
  o N. Hair: It is not a definitive “yes” to have certification but I would strongly encourage all faculty to get certification and training to make this experience as successful as possible.

• H. Yamashita: Some universities have different models and I appreciate when faculty, for example, got engaged with the Study Abroad program, as it was then that students got interested and this was good. Also, will you have an online Open House, can we visit your virtual campus portal, and can we visit any online classes?
  o N. Hair: We will announce at the end of the semester a number of those types of programs and possibly have an Open House to raise more awareness as to what we are doing in regards to online courses.

• J. Hertzson: She commented on faculty load and how this impacts the on-campus courses. Adam Smith has taken on the online courses and some are under staffed, and this is a bit of a concern. We have RIT degrees but are you working with other colleges, and students may also be taking a class from Stanford, MIT or any number of other schools?
T. Hannigan: We were at first not positive of where this would be heading, but we now have had the opportunity to talk to the head of EdX recently and we are exploring possible ways to collaborate. EdX offers a beautiful open source platform online delivery that we can experiment with. We want to focus on perfecting online graduate level program and course delivery at RIT before exploring external opportunities. We are open to working with others in the future.

- Provost: A lot of the work which ILI is doing is for graduate programs. This year I asked them to look at undergraduate courses. One of the challenges we see is in regards to the Gen Ed courses. I have asked the ILI department to work with the colleges to come up with a portfolio to help students who want to do a co-op but who still need to take certain courses, or some may go study abroad. If we are concerted in this effort we will make great strides.

Any questions or comments regarding online courses can be directed to Neil Hair and Therese Hannigan in the ILI department.

**College Tenure Expectations**

Proposed College Tenure Expectations (Draft): [https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/17454](https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/17454)

Michael Laver, chair of the E5.0 Taskforce reported briefly.

- Last year a new E5.0 was approved by the Academic Senate, and a provision was made that senate would need to approve all the college’s tenure expectations, once they are approved by the faculty of that college.
- A taskforce was formed to facilitate this work, having one representative from each college, one member from FAC, the Provost, and a Dean’s representative.
- The E5.0 taskforce met three times, reviewing and discussing all the college tenure expectations, making sure all of these aligned with the university tenure criteria of Teaching, Scholarship and Service as laid out in Policy E5.0.
- Some minor changes were made to the documents submitted. (i.e. The committee asked COLA to insert external peer review in their tenure expectations.)
- The College Tenure Expectations documents were sent to senators two weeks in advance for review and discussion among their constituents.
- These expectations will be discussed and voted on as a whole at today’s meeting.

Discussion/Q&A ensued.

- J. Beck noted a possible discrepancy under the CIAS tenure expectations, in that developing new courses in the curriculum was placed under service, yet this is a teaching component, and other colleges did place it under teaching.
- T. Policano noted as well that this curriculum development item should go under teaching as well, and not service as it is a huge difference to put curricular items under service. And if this remains, now this college’s service will be a different kind of service, and it will not be the kind of service the rest of us are trying to achieve.
  - M. Laver: We left it up to the individual colleges how to approach this.
- H. Ghoneim noted a few discrepancies. For example, advising students, would this be placed under Service or Teaching? Secondly, COS has added Community Service, and shouldn’t there only be three areas in the tenure expectations, that being Teaching, Scholarship and Service?
  - S. Maggelakis: Community Service is not an added area but is actually under Service.
- Provost: I have not officially approved any of the tenure documents yet and will receive whatever small changes are being made today. I am taking notes today and if the senate has a consensus on any items, that will help me in making a decision to get back to the college regarding the change being suggested. We want to make sure that the colleges have enough flexibility in their promotion and tenure documents to meet their disciplinary requirements.
- Discussion returned to the issue of having curricular items placed under service, as per the comments made earlier by J. Beck and T. Policano. M. Laver asked if the senate would like to ask CIAS to move this from service and place it under teaching?
- H. Ghazle: We have to respect each college and not force them to make changes. We can make recommendations but not have it be forceful.
- S. Ramkumar: Consistency is key in the terminology being used across the colleges. The taskforce should look into this and look into all the recommendations coming forth today. The updated document can then return to senate
Provost: I hesitate to go back to the taskforce as the tenure process begins in May, so we need to move rapidly on this to finalize these tenure expectations. I will review the feedback and will work closely with the Deans and their colleges and respect their autonomy in regards to changes being suggested. The language can be flexible in the colleges but broad consistency on how we define faculty work in these three areas is needed.

M. Laver: As chair of the taskforce I would be reluctant to convene again.

- E. Saber: It is important what T. Policano said as we need consistency across the colleges and suggested a motion that all the policies (tenure expectations) be consistent with E5.0 and the three categories defined (teaching, scholarship and service).
- L. Villasmil: Can we define “consistency”?
- M. Laver: The taskforce defined consistency as follows: Colleges cannot exceed what is stated in the tenure criteria in Policy E5.0 – that being teaching, scholarship (research) and service. If a college had a fourth category, then that would be inconsistent with Policy E5.0. However, with the role of external grants, this is within research and each college can deal with this under scholarship, as they see fit.
- T. Policano: I would like to simplify the motion Eli has suggested by saying the following: “Allow the Provost to finish this work on the college tenure expectations, but have this return to senate for approval.”
  - M. Laver: I oppose bringing this back to senate as these policies are time sensitive and we do not have to draw this out.

Motion on the floor from E. Saber that all the policies be consistent with E5.0 in regards to the three categories of teaching, scholarship and service was seconded.

- W. McKinzie: Is what was shared regarding curriculum development being under service already listed under E5.
  - M. Laver: No, but we are discussing the fact that other colleges put this item under teaching while CIAS placed it under service.
- S. Hoi: In Policy E5.0 the teaching section is very specific and it is about effectiveness of being a teacher. It does not talk about curricular development. What CIAS has done is fine, and that is their prerogative. Policy E5.0 is written to give colleges flexibility and we don’t want to tie their hands with what they choose to do, as long as it is consistent with the tenure criteria in E5.0.
- L. Villasmil: We have to have flexibility at the college level and respect each college. I see both sides in having some flexibility at the college level but to have consistency with E5.0.
- V. Serravallo moved to table the motion on the floor. Curriculum development is something that is rewarded as an expectation for tenure. And expectations need to be consistent with criteria.
- M. Laver: It is not the purview of the senate to recommend to colleges how they structure their tenure expectations. Today we are simply making sure that these tenure expectations are consistent with university criteria.

Motion to table the motion that E. Saber suggested regarding the tenure expectations having consistency with E5.0 is seconded. Motion to table does not pass.

- J. Beck: I suggest going back to the CIAS taskforce representative and this could have been an oversight.
- R. Stevens: Where are the boundaries of the word “consistency” and shared that advising grad students in one college is under teaching and in another college it is under scholarship. Where do we draw the line in regards to consistency?
  - M. Laver: The taskforce avoided that level of detail.
- Provost: Policy E4.0 defines service very similar to how CIAS has defined service. In fact CIAS is the only one who is consistent with E4.0. This cannot be solved in today’s session but next year the senate can take up the definition of service in E4.0.
- J. Hertzson: Defining consistency comes in the three areas of expectation. It doesn’t matter where curricular development goes, as each college deals with this in a different way.
- E. Holden: Because of the timeline, we should move on with this.
- H. Shahmohamad: Many remember the revisions made to E5.0. Should the time come, if the faculty want to re-define their expectations in the future, do colleges have the right to re-define these and come to senate for approval?
  - It would go as a charge to the FAC and then return to senate again.
E. Saber withdraws his original motion and moves that senate pass these policies (tenure expectations) as they stand. And the Faculty Affairs Committee will re-visit Policy E4.0 and work with colleges for the sake of consistency. **This new motion is seconded.**

- K. Waterstram-Rich: Policy E4.0 is currently under revision with many changes being made and will come to senate in the fall.
- H. Yamashita: If this new motion passes, then with the Faculty Affairs Committee working on E4.0, how would this affect the tenure process for our junior faculty?
  - E. Saber: Mid-term review will lock-in what policy will be followed for tenure.
- H. Ghazle: When a person is hired, it states what the expectations are.
- M. Laver: The new E5.0 will go into effect for the new tenure period.
- F. Walker: We need to stay with the original intent of endorsing the tenure expectations making sure they are consistent with the three categories listed in E5.0 and any other business regarding this can come to senate next year to be discussed more fully.

Motion passes to approve the college tenure expectations and E4.0 will be given to the Faculty Affairs Committee to work with colleges for the sake of consistency.

**Externally Sponsored Projects Disclosure Policy – Proposed Changes**

Proposed Policy and PPT: [https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/17448](https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/17448)

Ryne Raffaelle, VP and Associate Provost for Research presented the Externally Sponsored Projects Disclosure Policy and proposed changes coming to senate today.

- The Oversight Committee was charged with reviewing this policy to have it be updated accordingly.
- This is a Board of Trustees level policy and feedback was requested.
- This policy was originally enacted years ago when RIT’s president was involved with CIA work.
- This policy has to do with “the right to know” in that every student/staff has the right to know who is funding a particular project, the right to know what other research is going on at RIT and who is sponsoring that work.
- Today we have the Rapid system on the web allowing you to see all the awards, who is associated with these awards, what they are doing and who is funding them.
- Rationale of the changes were reviewed. (See link above to full proposal and Ppt). Now the departments and colleges are a part of reviewing the projects.
- The proposed changes have been presented to both Student Government and Staff Council for review and feedback. Based on the feedback the following changes have been made:
  - Student Government will be included in the grievance process.
  - Reports on any policy exemptions will continue to be provided to all governance groups.
- The final proposed changes to this policy will be presented to the Board of Trustees for approval and target date for implementation is July 2015.

Q&A ensued.

- E. Saber: What does it mean that the changes “would place the responsibility for all research compliance activities under one University committee?”
  - R. Raffaelle: Formerly there was a separate committee to administer this policy. Now the Research Compliance Committee will be the responsible unit for exemptions to policy.
  - K. Clark: If the sponsor requested inclusion of classified information or did not want their name mentioned, we would have to get approval from the Research Compliance Committee to obtain the approval to accept this.

Please send any feedback you have on this proposed policy to Ryne Raffaelle.

Adjournment: 1:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Chip Sheffield, Communications Officer
Vivian Gifford, Senior Staff Assistant