ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
ACADEMIC SENATE
MAY 21, 2015; 12:00-1:50 p.m.
CIMS/SLAUGHTER HALL/2230/2240

Present:  B. Barry; J. Beck; S. Bower; L. Buckley; J. Capps; A. Carrington; J. Chiavaroli; C. Collison; W. Destler; J. Ettlie; H. Ghoneim; J. Goldowitz; J. Haefner; J. Hertzson (CIAS Alt.); S. Hoi; E. Holden; C. Hull (SCB Alt.); M. Kotlarchyk; M. Laver; S. Maggelakis (Dean); W. McKinzie; K. Mousley; S.M. Ramkumar; V. Serravallo; H. Shahmohamad; C. Sheffield; L. Shields; R. Stevens; B. Trager; L. Villasmil Urdaneta; R. Vullo; F. Walker (Dean); H. Yamashita

Members Absent:  L. Wild

Excused:  H. Ghazle; M. Jones; McDonald; R. Raffaelle

Guests/Presenters:  Margaret Bailey, Ashley Carrington; Nicholas Giordano; Joseph Hornak; Kristen Waterstram-Rich

Interpreters:  Ben Cavaletto, Nicole Crouse-Dickerson

Tech Crew:  George Cavelli, Nick Law

Call To Order:  12:10 p.m.

Communication Officer’s Report - Approved Minutes of 5/14/2015:  https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/17486
[If you experience any difficulty with the DML links, please email the DML department at:  ritscholarworks@rit.edu.]

Executive Committee Report

- List of newly elected senators, some of whom were in attendance but their term begins Fall 2015, was read as follows and welcomed to today’s meeting:

  Jessica Cuculick, NTID
  Irene Evans, COS
  Clyde Hull, SCB
  Shal Khazanchi (SCB)
  Brian Landi (KGCOE Alternate)
  Marcin Lukowiak, KGCOE
  Campbell McDermid, NTID
  Heidi Nickisher, CIAS
  Elena Sommers, CLA
  George Zion, CAST

- Hossein Shahmohamad, vice chair and newly elected chair for AY2015 on behalf of the Executive Committee and Academic Senate thanked Michael Laver for his five years of service on Academic Senate, two of those years AY2013-AY2014 serving as Chair. He also chaired the Academic Affairs Committee for several years, as well as serving on many other committees, and presently serves as co-chair with Anne Wahl on the Middle States 2017 Self-Study.

- “Thank You” went to Vivian Gifford for her work this year with Academic Senate and a gift of appreciation was given.

Student Ratings Access for Students

- Nick Giordano, incoming SG President and Ashley Carrington, SG president for AY2014 reported the following:

  o A petition was signed by 300 students to have this go forward.
  o SG has created its own evaluation system and it is a very polished interface.
  o Students cannot use this site until all evaluations are done in their classes.
  o We would prefer that this not compete with the current evaluation system that is in use.
  o A prototype for this system was created over a decade ago.
This has been discussed in Student Government for a long time.
With the Smart Evals system change there is no student buy-in.
Students have consistently sought to provide input into the evaluations and the ability to access them.
At present there is little incentive for students to participate.

- M. Laver: There have been several meetings recently to discuss this system and its implications. Attending the meetings were the Registrar, Provost, members of the executive committee and Student Government. One concern that has been addressed is qualitative data and how to keep this confidential. The work on this proposed site will take place this summer and this will return to the Academic Senate in the fall.

- Q from M. Fluet: What new information does your system have and why do students want this?
  - A. Carrington: This new system will have more specific information about the instructor’s schedule, the number of sections offered, and more data. Students will be able to see all the professors who teach a class and their ratings, so this will hopefully aid in the registration of classes.

- V. Serravallo: Do you actually think that this information is helpful for a student in determining their courses and schedules?
  - A. Carrington: Students already do this and I do believe that this provides more accuracy in choosing a class.

- C. Hull: Will this eliminate the fact that currently the evaluations are open prior to the end of the semester?
  - A. Carrington: Students doing the evaluation at the end of the semester would not work with this system, as this system is being used for registration purposes.
  - N. Giordano: We will take this into consideration.

- L. Villasmil: Do you actually know why a student refuses to complete an evaluation?
  - N. Giordano: If someone does not have a buy-in to do a survey, then those who are most inclined to do this are the students who have a problem with a faculty member.
  - A. Carrington: If a student recognizes their responsibility to do this, and its potential impact on future students, then hopefully, they will take this seriously.

- E. Saber: With the Smart Evals system, these evaluations were looked at very seriously by the Administration to help determine promotion as well as possible teaching awards. Additionally, any potential issues can be raised concerning a faculty member. These evaluations were never intended to be used for registration purposes and are used far more than a registration mechanism.
  - A. Carrington: Ultimately this new system would still be of use to provide this information about the faculty member. We are looking to enhance the data.

- J. Capps: I speak in favor of opening up this system to students. I believe that the qualitative data is also important, and this information could be very useful to the student to know about this information. At a former institution where I taught, the students had to very briefly summarize the importance of the course and instructor in 50 words or less.

- J. Haefner: I believe that the key issues have been nicely addressed and this is an important process. This is a great example of shared governance. We have established a process where two committees (a Policy Committee and a Technology Committee) will work together on this project. Michael Laver and Nick Giordano will co-chair the Policy Committee and research other schools over the summer months. Many of our peers are already ahead of us in this regard. The Technology Committee will look at the amazing features which our students have created and what can be done to improve the interface. We should take great pride in what the students have already accomplished with this site. Dialogue with the Academic Senate will continue. We are looking forward to this and to meeting the needs of the students. Hossein Shahmohamad has helped to identify others to serve on these committees.

Margaret’s House Cost Model (Ruben Proano, Presenter, Michael Laver, Patrick Saeva)
PPt Presentation: [https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/17496](https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/17496)

- See link above to view the presentation in its entirety.
- A few faculty have been discussing making Margaret’s House more affordable.
- Affordable daycare is key to support the RIT strategic plan objectives.
- This proposal is being presented today and hopefully will be given to the Administration for review.
For many junior faculty, having access to a daycare on campus is an absolute lifeline. Presently for many families, especially those with multiple children, Margaret’s House is not affordable as it presently costs $1000/child.

Ways to make daycare more affordable was suggested (e.g. reducing daycare costs, deferred payments, financial assistance programs, payments based on income, a revolving credit line, RIT helping with the risk sharing and thereby reducing the interest rates paid on loans).

Could we consider Margaret’s House as an institutional unit?

Provost Haefner: Could we welcome a motion?

Motion: The Academic Senate moves that the Administration consider ways for Margaret’s House to be more affordable, without eliminating or reducing any services.

Motion carries unanimously.

Proposed Master’s Degree Program in Health Care Interpretation

PPt Presentation, Executive Summary and Full Proposal: https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/17482

Graduate Council voted unanimously to approve this degree program.

Kim Kurz shared her own personal story of a situation she and her husband had many years ago in the hospital, as he was diagnosed with cancer, and how daunting the process was in getting the help they needed, as they had an incompetent interpreter at the time.

Presently there is no advanced degree program in the U.S. for Health Care Interpreting Services, and this is a terrible oversight.

There is a genuine need for specialized health care interpreters, which will ensure language access to patients in hospital settings.

This degree program is a blended online program.

Program goals and student learning outcomes were shared in the power point.

It is a collaborative Master’s degree program between NTID and CHST.

The first-year goal is to have 5 full-time students and 6 part-time students.

See link above to view the entire power point presentation, executive summary and full proposal.

Discussion/Q&A ensued.

S. Ramkumar: You do require that the candidates already have some level of competence in sign language. What does it mean that the practical courses are on-line?

K. Miraglia: We will take their current work and apply theory, which is the practical courses online. All candidates for admission to the program must hold national certification as a sign language interpreter through the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID).

C. Collison: What is the demand for graduates who will graduate from this program? Additionally, are there interpreters in hospitals now, and are there any competitive programs to this one?

K. Miraglia: There are no competitors. Hospitals (7,000) are mandated to comply with having interpreters in hospitals, by Federal Law, but it is very challenging for them to find someone to meet this need. This includes not just the deaf and hard-of-hearing, but also any foreign language.

K. Kurz: A recent report by the U.S. Department of Labor states that almost 70% of the adult deaf population is unemployed.

J. Ettlie: If there is no precedent for this program, then how do we know that the courses proposed are sufficient in order to award a Master’s degree in this area?

K. Miraglia: In terms of the courses being taught, some will be taught by a deaf MD, and there will be 8 courses from NTID and 3 from CHST.

J. Ettlie: How will the program be marketed and what is the roll-out timeframe?

K. Miraglia: We want to pursue this very aggressively. The deaf are going into the healthcare fields in greater numbers and interpreters need this training. We will have a large applicant pool and NTID will be doing the marketing.

B. Walence: This will be on the online learning website.
• D. Ornt (CHST Dean): We are incredibly supportive of this, and we see a tremendous cross-registration between NTID and CHST. There is a great need for this and we feel confident that we will have a very positive response. We believe that Online Learning will be marketing this aggressively as well.
• E. Saber: What is the projected student numbers in this program?
  o K. Miraglia: In the first year, we look to have 11 or 12 students. In the third year this will increase by two and finally the total enrollment will be 16 students.
• K. Kurz: We are exploring possibilities for a national certification for health care interpreters.
• J. Chiavaroli: The courses seem a bit heavy with respect to sign language, and perhaps more courses in psychology could be added.
• C. Hull: I am strongly supportive of this program and believe that it shows a strong entrepreneurial aspect, which I especially find appealing.
• H. Yamashita: This is a blended program, combining online and residency. Would students have housing and are there any plans to make this solely an on-line program?
  o K. Miraglia: There is a one-week residency and then the rest of the program is online. We have live webinars. Interpreters are used to travel and we think this model will be successful.
• J. Ettlie: If our online MBA program is any precedent, then a blended model will become more desired, I suspect.

Motion to approve the Master’s degree program in Health Care Interpretation passes with one abstention.

Proposed Policy E6.1 (Faculty Honorary Titles – A New Policy) (Kristen Waterstram-Rich and Margaret Bailey, presenters)
PPT Presentation and Proposed Policy: https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/17488

• This new policy looks at three faculty honorary titles: Emeritus Faculty, Distinguished Professor and Endowed Chair.
• Policy E6.1 was presented and discussed at the 5/14/2015 AS meeting, with more revisions coming from the floor.
• See link above to view all proposed revisions in their entirety (power point) and the full policy as revised.

Discussion/Q&A ensued.
• C. Collison: Last week there was some discussion about the strength of a faculty member going up for the Emeritus award and concerns regarding this. Have you had any more deliberations?
  o M. Bailey: This has been heavily discussed by all members of our group, which represents all the colleges.
• C. Collison: Last week, it seemed there was a lot of inconsistency and discrepancy among the colleges. Has the new wording helped eliminate this?
  o K. Waterstram-Rich: Yes, we hope so. Our goal has been to achieve more parity across the colleges with respect to this.
• H. Ghoneim: Is there a higher honorary title than what is presented coming forth? If not, then I would like to see the Distinguished Title in this policy even stronger. In Line 74 can “2” criteria be requested instead of “1”?
  o K. Waterstram-Rich: We stand by the criteria we have presently in this policy. It varies across the U.S.
  o We suggested for next year that the Faculty Affairs Committee work on the University Professor honorary title and expand the current proposed language for the Endowed Chair.
• L. Villasmil: In regards to the guidelines for the Endowed Chair, is the Provost’s Office responsible for housing these guidelines and suggested that this be clarified.
  o T. Policano: I put this suggestion in the Suggestion Box that we have a similar system for the Endowed chair. I think that total transparency is a very good idea and that this should be listed and the criteria spelled out in detail. This would be not only for record keeping but giving people credit.

Motion to approved the proposed Policy E6.1 passes with one abstention.

Academic Affairs Committee - Final Report
PPT Presentation: https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/17485

• Joyce Hertzson, Chair of the AAC, gave an informational report, which included all the charges they completed this year and some recommendations pertaining to some of the charges.
• The AAC was divided into sub-committees to complete the work on their charges for this year.
• A recommendation was made to the AAC to change the name of the “Study Abroad Program” to now be called “Learning Abroad Program” and added Jim Myers (Office of International Education Programs and Learning Abroad) to the routing process.
  o S. Ramkumar: Is it being proposed to call “Study Abroad” now “Learning Abroad”?  
    ▪ J. Hertzson: This is what is being proposed.
    ▪ M. Laver: I would request that these changes to Policy D.7 be brought to senate in the future as all policy changes need to come to senate for discussion and vote.
    ▪ Provost: These recommendations will return to the Academic Senate in the Fall 2015.
• J. Hertzson: For the Honors Program charge it was noted that the AAC would like for each college to have a similar percentage of Honors students.
  o T. Policano: Equal share or proportionate?
    ▪ J. Goldowitz: The committee advocated that each college would get an equal percentage.
    ▪ J. Hertzson: This issue is still being raised.
• J. Ettlie: There has been a tussle historically about what an honors program can be here at RIT, and I recall that President Simone certainly saw this as a development issue. Others have described the Honors Program as a recruitment issue. Was this taken into consideration?
  o J. Hertzson: This was not a charge but was raised with Ed Lincoln when he came to the AAC meeting. He spoke of addressing recruitment through an Honors Program. In regards to admissions, Honors students in the program have a significant drop out rate and why is this happening?
  o C. Licata: Danielle Smith, Director of the Honors Program is prepared to review the Honors admissions process, as well as the question of students persisting in the program, and is willing to try to assess the overall impact that we make on the university at large. J. Ettlie’s point is very well taken.
• J. Ettlie: I tried to underscore the societal benefit of our Honors Program, when I first arrived here at RIT, and that it could have a tremendous benefit for the world beyond RIT. These students were more likely to go on and make a positive contribution to society at large. I simply wasn’t concerned with the front-end and back-end side of the equation.
  o J. Hertzson: Point well taken.
• M. Laver said he appreciated all the work this committee has done.
• See link above to view the report in its entirety.

At the closing of this final senate meeting of the year, Michael Laver, out-going Academic Senate Chair handed the gavel to the new in-coming Academic Senate Chair, Hossein Shahmohamad and wished everyone a wonderful summer.

Adjournment: 1:53 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Chip Sheffield, Communications Officer
Vivian Gifford, Senior Staff Assistant