

Charge 1
Campus Master Plan

Charge 2
STARS

Charge 3
Sustainability Green Website

Charge 4
Ombuds Office Support

Campus Master Plan

Charge 1

Provide recommendations to help develop green components /initiatives for the Campus Master Plan.

Randy Vercauteren, Director of Parking, Transportation, and Building Services provided the whole committee with an overview of RIT's overall status of parking, bus services, electric car charging stations on campus. He also answered questions from the committee. Additionally, the Subcommittee reviewed the University of Colorado at Boulder's master plan.

<http://www.colorado.edu/masterplan/plan/>

After reviewing this and other plans, it was clearly evident that no one single committee or entity can or should create a master plan. To have a credible and robust master plan it needs to be overseen by a multidisciplinary committee with representation from all governance groups and have community stakeholder engagement.

After the subcommittee reached this agreement, committee reports related to a master plan charge were reviewed for the past five years (see *History of Master Plan Charges* below). Beginning in 2011 and every year since, a subcommittee of the Academic Senate has identified the need for and clarified the components of an updated master plan.

Recommended Action

Academic Senate should advocate with RIT Administration to develop a new Campus Master Plan based on the best practices outlined by the 2014–2015 LRPE committee:

Establish a multidisciplinary task force to develop a master plan that will align with RIT's new strategic plan.

- The task force will have representation from:
 - Faculty
 - Staff
 - Administration
 - Student populations
 - External communities in which RIT is engaged (e.g. RGH, Town of Henrietta etc.)
- The task force should identify resource needs, including use of external consultants who will work closely with the task force.
- The task force will develop a comprehensive master plan that reflects RIT's strong commitment to leadership in sustainability and resiliency.
- The plan should address needs and expectations related to campus spaces in the broad sense, including academic spaces, natural spaces, residential spaces, and campus life.

History of Master Plan Charges 2011–2012

Recommendation

Form a Team to Update and Detail the Campus Master Plan
With Respect to Current Strategic Plan

- Overall Campus Architecture (look and feel)
- Key Result Area Impacts on:

Current Structures

- Space Inventory vs Expected Needs
- Renovation / Renewal Schedule
- Circulation / Transportation
- Parking / Pedestrian Lanes / Bus Routes and Stops
- Infrastructure

Construction Plan (Justified by Identified Needs)

- Future Sites for Major Initiatives
- Future Sites for Unknown Opportunities
- Forecast Growth / Demand for
Classrooms

Research Space

Performance Hall Space

Academic Support Facilities

Housing

Dining / Support Facilities

Facilities / Maintenance Areas

[https://digitalarchive.rit.edu/
xmlui/bitstream/handle/1850/
14949/LRPCFinalReport_
04-19-2012.pdf?sequence=1](https://digitalarchive.rit.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1850/14949/LRPCFinalReport_04-19-2012.pdf?sequence=1)

2012–2013

Charge

Assess current and long range plans developed by various Institute space committees for the effective use of space on campus.

Findings

- Provost/Academic Affairs and President/Institute each operate space committees
- Academic Affairs committee reviews requests within division
Institute committee looks at requests which cross divisions
- Perception of their role in the process is often incorrect
 - Committees make recommendations
 - Do not assign/re-assign space
 - Do not formulate long range plans
 - Campus Master Plan is out of date and disconnected from this process
- Committees often do not have the data necessary to make decisions and address problems
 - Space available, already promised, backlog requests
 - Current use/utilization/outfitting/etc
- No clear assessment of utilization/contribution
 - Teaching labs and classroom utilization measured
 - using random sampling
 - Research space reported, but actual use is not assessed
 - General space not assessed

Recommendations

- Update the Campus Master Plan
(Recommended by this committee in 2012)
- Invest in system to document existing facilities
(systems being evaluated)
- Develop a general assessment methodology
 - Utilization \neq BIS / ft²
 - Can we assess contribution / ft² ?

([https://digitalarchive.rit.edu/
xmlui/bitstream/handle/
1850/16562/LongRangePlanning
FinalReportAY2012_05-2013.pdf
?sequence=1](https://digitalarchive.rit.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1850/16562/LongRangePlanningFinalReportAY2012_05-2013.pdf?sequence=1))

Charge

(https://digitalarchive.rit.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1850/17309/LRPCFinalReportAY2013_14.pdf?sequence=1)

2013–2014

Recommend a process for RIT to update the master plan in support of the upcoming strategic planning process.

The development of a master plan shall be coincident and integral to the strategic planning process. A set of characteristic features (physical, educational and cultural) strongly associated with the identity of RIT shall be defined within the strategic planning process. The development of a master plan shall build upon these characteristic features of the campus to define a sense of place appropriate to the strategic vision of RIT.

The master plan shall address current and future structures and arrangement of buildings, including facility upgrades and plans for incorporation of next generation technologies.

Development shall involve an architectural firm (or competing firms) to develop various scenarios for comparison. The architectural firm shall be an integral part of the strategic planning process. Examples of master plans associated with spine-oriented campus layouts similar to RIT should be evaluated for their historical and future development.

The master plan shall be disseminated in a clearly identifiable location on the RIT website, preferably the home page.

2014–2015

Charge

https://digitalarchive.rit.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1850/17493/LRPECommitteeFinalReportAY2014_15_05-20-2015.pdf?sequence=1

Suggest inclusion of all governance groups in the formation of the Master Plan? Recommend process and membership of a task force that would begin the creation of a Campus Master Plan that addresses the various kinds of space across campus, academic and otherwise. The master plan should include our natural resources, taking into account a data-driven assessment and adaptive management of our natural areas

Recommendation

Establish a multidisciplinary task force to develop a master plan that will align with RIT's new strategic plan.

- The task force will have representation from:
 - Faculty
 - Staff
 - Administration
 - Student populations,
- External communities in which RIT is engaged (e.g. RGH, Town of Henrietta etc.)
- The task force should identify resource needs, including use of external consultants who will work closely with the task force.
- The task force will develop a comprehensive master plan that reflects RIT's strong commitment to leadership in sustainability and resiliency.
- The plan should address needs and expectations related to campus spaces in the broad sense, including academic spaces, natural spaces, residential spaces, and campus life.

2015–2016

Charge

Provide recommendations to help develop green components/initiatives for the Campus Master Plan.

STARS

Charge 2

In addition to the charges assigned to the committee by the Academic Senate, the committee was asked to assist with the provision of academic program-related data for RIT's updated submission to the Sustainability Tracking Assessment and Rating System (STARS).

The two STARS credits the committee was asked to assist with:

- 1 The percentage of courses offered at RIT that include sustainability as part of the content.
- 2 The number of students who graduated from a program that has adopted at least one sustainability learning outcome (definition provided by STARS).

The committee started with the second credit because data from the second credit could inform the first. The eventual plan is to survey program directors/chairpersons or faculty directly, such as with a Clipboard survey, to identify specific courses with sustainability content.

As a starting point for the second credit, the committee requested program assessment data from the Assistant Provost for Assessment and Accreditation (Ann Wahl).

She provided a list of all RIT academic degree program goals and student learning outcomes in an Excel spreadsheet. Because the university does not have essential, overarching, or threaded outcomes for sustainability, the committee then developed a list of search terms to help identify sustainability goals/outcomes contained in the spreadsheet.

The following terms were used:

sustain

environment

equity

social responsibility

global

ethical

systems thinking

The filtered results were then reviewed by the committee to identify which programs included all three dimensions of sustainability (economic, social and environmental) in the learning outcome.

Based on that process, the following degree programs were determined to have a learning outcome or outcomes related to sustainability:

1 Environmental Sustainability, Health, and Safety	BS
2 Environmental Management and Safety	MS
3 Sustainability	MS
4 Architecture	MArch
5 Sustainability	PhD
6 Industrial Design	BFA
7 Industrial Design	MFA
8 Interior Design	BFA
9 Sustainable Engineering	MS
10 Packaging Science	MS
11 Packaging Science	BS
12 Science, Technology, and Public Policy	MS
13 Computer Aided Drafting Technology	AAS/AOS
14 Chemistry	MS
15 Environmental Science	BS
16 Environmental Science	MS
17 Conservation Biology	BS
18 Engineering Management	ME
19 Mechanical Engineering	BS
20 Business Administration Accounting	BS

21 Business Administration International business	BS
22 Business Administration Management	BS
23 Business Administration Marketing	BS
24 Management Information Systems	BS
25 New Media Marketing	BS
26 Media Arts and Technology	BS
27 Print Media	MS
28 Software Engineering	BS
29 Hospitality and Tourism Management	MS
30 Political Science	BS
31 International and Global Studies	BS
32 Engineering	PhD

Now, simply obtaining graduating student numbers for these programs will give the number of students graduating from programs meeting the criteria, and complete the second credit.

This also identifies the schools and programs which need to be approached to complete the first credit, providing a good foundation on which to continue the effort.

Recommendation

Given that STARS needs to be updated every three years, the sub-committee additionally recommends that a standardized process be developed that enables departments to identify courses containing sustainability and programs with sustainability-related learning outcomes.

Sustainability Green Website

Charge 3

Introduction

An evaluation of the RIT Sustainability Website (<https://www.rit.edu/sustainability/>) was undertaken.

The purpose of the website is to serve as a conduit for individuals and organizations interested in sustainability at RIT to have access to all the sustainability resources at RIT. These include students, faculty, other campus members and the general public.

The website was evaluated from two perspectives:

- 1 A thorough check of the current website in terms of:
 - a Logic/flow of the links and email addresses
 - b Information content in terms of currency and relevance
- 2 A comparison of the RIT sustainability websites to 22 benchmark schools listed at (<https://www.rit.edu/fa/humanresources/content/benchmark-schools>).

Based on the evaluation, we propose the potential suggestions for future content on the RIT sustainability website.

Evaluation Item 1

A review of the current RIT sustainability website yielded the following problems:

- 1 The website appears dynamic, but was indeed out-of-date. Some of the personnel listed were no longer part of RIT.
- 2 The RIT link does not go to the RIT main website, but back to the RIT Sustainability website
- 3 The menu buttons at the top *About*, *Academic Research* etc. are not easy to use to get to sub-links.
- 4 Some key sustainability metrics from campus were missing
- 5 There is no link from the RIT's main website to the RIT sustainability website.
- 6 Some events listed on the RIT sustainability website are out-of-date.
- 7 Some links on the RIT sustainability website are invalid, showing error message *Page Not Found*.

Evaluation Item 2

*Please see
attached spreadsheet*

Sustainability websites from 22 benchmark schools and RIT were investigated and compared in terms of 11 categories:

- 1 Website address
- 2 STARS rating on website
- 3 Consumption metrics
- 4 Broader community engagement
- 5 Campus community opportunities for engagement
- 6 Student organizations
- 7 Course opportunities
- 8 Degree opportunities
- 9 Research
- 10 Sustainability commitment with infrastructure (LEED Rating)
- 11 Additional notes

Conclusions

1 RIT's sustainability website ranks somewhat in the middle among benchmark schools. This evaluation was based on our own judgement and not necessarily on any quantitative metric.

2 Worcester Polytechnic Institute:

<http://www.wpi.edu/about/sustainability.html>

Cornell University: <http://sustainability.cornell.edu/>

Clarkson University: <http://www.clarkson.edu/green/>

These three schools' sustainability websites can be used as good models for updating RIT's sustainability website.

Ombuds Office Support

Charge 4

Explore whether the Ombuds office is adequately staffed, especially since Ombuds Office Director Lee Twyman noted that we no longer have a mediator on campus. Should additional resources be considered, given the increased demands and importance of this position?

Background

In academic year 2014–2015, the LRPE found no evidence that the Ombuds Office needed additional staffing to complete its core mission and did not find a compelling need to expand the core mission. We suggested a survey might provide more evidence. The Academic Senate requested we conduct such a survey during academic year 2015–2016.

An LRPE subcommittee devised an online evaluation survey with two primary inquiries:

- 1 Gauge RIT community (students, faculty and staff) awareness of the Ombuds Office.
- 2 Gauge the ability of the Ombuds Office to meet campus demands with current resources.

The survey set out to ask those who had experience using the Ombuds Office to indicate level of satisfaction, amount of wait time to have cases commence, the degree and quality of follow-through, and how often cases return to the office due to a lack of follow-through (if any).

The subcommittee developed the online survey through the Fall semester and much of the Spring. The survey was comprehensively reviewed by the full committee to ensure it adequately addressed both of the primary inquiries identified the previous academic year. A draft was also sent to Ombuds Office Director Lee Twyman.

A final draft of the survey was completed late Spring semester and the committee sought an expedited review from Lee Twyman ahead of its release to allow enough time for a response window before the end of the semester.

Though Lee Twyman was unable to critically review the survey prior to its launch, she cited several concerns about the survey following its release:

- Community awareness of the survey was a minor component.
- The survey could be misconstrued as an instrument for assessing the office's services, a function that the office currently handles through other means.
- Rater bias could skew survey responses despite the committee's efforts to protect against this possibility.

At the request of the Ombuds office, the survey was taken offline prematurely with a relatively small sampling of 379 responses.

The committee met to discuss the concerns of the Ombuds Office and critically review the survey.

Conclusion

The committee came to a unanimous decision that **any survey instrument will fall short in addressing whether the Ombuds office has sufficient resources.**

- Survey responses can report on community awareness of the Ombuds Office but cannot ascertain if any potential deficiencies are based on a lack of staffing or the communications clutter that makes it difficult for the delivery of any campuswide message.
- Survey responses can report on user-satisfaction with the Ombuds Office, but cannot provide insight about office resources and their impact on those experiences.

Recommendations

The committee thus is unable to provide any additional evidence that would allow it to change its recommendation from the previous academic year:

“The LRPE committee recommends no additional resources to the Ombuds Office without evidence.”