

## **FINAL REPORT AS/SA Committee 2018-2019**

### **AS/SA Committee membership (listed alphabetically)**

- Sandra Connelly (COS)
- Rebecca DeRoo (COLA)
- Jacob Ellis (SG rep)
- Matthew Fluet (GCCIS)
- Wendy Gelbrand (Student Affairs Delegate)
- Hany Ghoneim (KGC OE)
- Neil Hair (Provost Appointee)
- Naveida Huggins (SG rep)
- Brian Larson (CAD)
- Stephen Luxmore (SCB)
- Tracy Magin (NTID)
- Corinne Mendieta (SG rep)
- Bobby Moakley (SG President) (co-chair)
- Elizabeth Ruder (CHST) (co-chair)
- Gretchen Wainwright (CET)
- Brian Barry (at large, CLA)
- Irene Evans (at large, COS)
- Jason Listman (at large, NTID)

## **Charges for AY2018 -**

### **Carryover charges:**

1. Investigate the will for RIT to become a "Sanctuary Campus".

### **New charges:**

1. Evaluate RIT's policy on junk email, with particular attention to whether junk email with a link labelled "unsubscribe" should continue to be unfiltered, given that the "unsubscribe" link could take the user anywhere.
2. Consider instituting Student Evaluations of Academic Advisors

**ASSA Carryover Charge:** Investigate the will of RIT to become a Sanctuary Campus.

**ASSA Recommendation:** RIT policies are already largely aligned with guidance for Sanctuary Campuses. The will among RIT community to officially title itself a “Sanctuary Campus” is mixed. There is confusion about what the term means and concern that the title “Sanctuary Campus” may be adversarial. Should the Academic Senate desire to make a symbolic gesture in support of undocumented members of the RIT community, a meaningful course of action would be a Resolution from the Academic Senate to reaffirm University Commitment to protecting the privacy of undocumented students as well as clarification on the University’s financial commitment to undocumented students should DACA be repealed.

**Rationale:**

There is no single accepted definition of a “Sanctuary Campus”, but the term generally refers to a campus that adopts policies to protect members of the campus community who are undocumented immigrants. The term “Sanctuary Campus” bears tremendous symbolic rather than legal guidance.

The ASSA Committee assembled guidance for “Sanctuary Campuses” largely from resources of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). **Table 1** compares guidance for sanctuary campuses with current RIT policies and procedures.

Information on RIT policies and procedures were collected through consultation with Bobby Colón (General Counsel for RIT), Jeff Cox (Director, International Student Services), Gary Moxley (RIT Director of Public Safety), Colleen Peterson (Director of Enrollment Services and Analytics), Marian Nicoletti (RIT Director of Admissions).

**Table 1.** Comparison of guidance for sanctuary campuses with current RIT policies and procedures.

Guidance for Sanctuary Campuses	Current RIT Policy/ Procedure	✓ indicates current RIT policies support Sanctuary Campus Guidance
Administration guarantees the privacy of immigrant students and pledge not to grant access to information that might reveal their immigration status unless so ordered by a court of law	RIT does not identify documentation status to local, state, or federal officers unless otherwise required by applicable federal and/or state law.	✓

<p>Not allow Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) Officers onto campus without a warrant</p>	<p>Immigration Custom Enforcement (ICE) officers are not allowed on campus without a legally issued warrant, court order, or as otherwise required by law.</p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>College and university police should not themselves participate in any efforts to enforce immigration laws, which are under federal jurisdiction.</p>	<p>Neither RIT nor RIT Public Safety Officers enforce immigration laws</p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>Not sharing student immigration status with ICE</p>	<p>RIT does not identify documentation status to local, state, or federal officers unless otherwise required by applicable federal and/or state law.</p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>Not gathering information on immigration or citizenship status</p>	<p>Information on citizenship status is collected as part of the admissions applications. For undergraduate applicants, 90% apply via the third party Common Application with the remainder using the RIT application. Graduate applicants use the RIT application, a form that is maintained by RIT.</p> <p>Residency status and Visa information as it relates to the US is also collected at the time of application for both undergraduate and graduate applicants.</p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>Providing confidential legal support to students with immigration law questions and issues</p>	<p>RIT provides information on legal services in the community to students, including undocumented students. Free legal services available to students offered by Student Government.</p> <p>RIT International Student Services serves as a confidential resource for students with any immigration related questions or concerns, and have sometimes been able to help them identify sources of financial aid and / or connect them with immigration attorneys when necessary. International Student Services does not maintain records of these interactions.</p>	<p>✓</p>

<p>Faculty members should join efforts to resist all attempts to intimidate or inappropriately investigate undocumented students or to deny them their full rights to due process and a fair hearing.</p>	<p>Faculty or staff who encounter any individual presenting a warrant or subpoena should be directed to the RIT Office of Legal Affairs. Staff at that office will determine if the warrant or subpoena is validly issued. Assuming that it is, RIT will comply with the applicable provisions of the law, including but not limited to, notification of the particular student or staff member.</p> <p>RIT staff or faculty who provide information without having the Office of Legal Affairs confirm the validity of the warrant / subpoena would be in violation of RIT policy.</p>	<p>✓</p>
---	---	----------

In addition, President Munson made a statement On September 7, 2017 expressing commitment and support for Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) students. It was noted by the ASSA committee that University News Service is no longer maintaining an online archive of statements from the Office of the President, but the ASSA Committee retrieved that communication from email is included in this report (**Appendix 1**). In addition to the September 7, 2017 communication, President Munson was one of over 700 college and university presidents from public and private institutions to sign the Statement in Support of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) Program and our Undocumented Immigrant Students (see: <https://www.pomona.edu/news/2016/11/21-college-university-presidents-call-us-uphold-and-continue-daca>)

These findings indicate that current RIT Policies and Procedures already align with Sanctuary Campus protections, albeit without using the term “Sanctuary Campus”. The one expectation is that information on citizenship, residency and Visa status are collected as part of the application process. This is standard information collected by most universities across the US and is required information for applicants using the Common Application. However, this information would not be shared with any immigration or law enforcement officer unless otherwise required by applicable federal and/or state law.

Given there is no set standard for declaring a campus a “Sanctuary Campus”, the ASSA committee believes that there is little practical benefit in titling itself a “Sanctuary Campus”. In addition, some college constituents and administrators were concerned that titling the campus a “Sanctuary Campus” might be adversarial.

Should the Academic Senate desire to make a symbolic gesture in support of undocumented members of the RIT community, a meaningful course of action would be a Resolution from the Academic Senate to reaffirm University Commitment to protecting the privacy of undocumented students as well as clarification on the University’s financial commitment to

undocumented students should DACA be repealed. This was the approach taken by the Cornell University Faculty Senate ([https://actionnetwork.org/user\\_files/user\\_files/000/011/211/original/Cornell\\_Senate\\_resolution.pdf](https://actionnetwork.org/user_files/user_files/000/011/211/original/Cornell_Senate_resolution.pdf)), which was followed by a response from the University President (<https://statements.cornell.edu/2016/20161222-petition-response.cfm>). It is worth noting that while the Statement from Cornell Interim President Hunter Rawlings III is strong in its support for undocumented members of the Cornell community, it does not use the term “Sanctuary Campus”.

### Appendix 1: Email from President Munson in support of DACA

The screenshot shows an email client interface with a toolbar at the top containing various actions like Ignore, Delete, Reply, Forward, Meeting, etc. The email header indicates it is from RIT Message Center <msgctr@rit.edu> and is titled "A message from President Munson on DACA". The main body of the email contains the following text:

**A message from President Munson on DACA (Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals):**

RIT stands with our colleagues in the higher education community in urging Congress to take bipartisan action to enable DACA students to remain in the United States. DACA students, brought to this country as children, have made this country their home — in many cases the only home they have known. These students are striving to achieve the American dream by pursuing an education so that they can continue to be productive and contributing members of our society. As a university, we are committed to providing DACA students with the education they seek and developing talents that will add measurably to our nation.

Dave Munson  
President, RIT

**ASSA Charge 1 AY 2018:**

Evaluate RIT's policy on junk email, with particular attention to whether junk email with a link labelled "unsubscribe" should continue to be unfiltered, given that the "unsubscribe" link could take the user anywhere.

**ASSA Recommendation:**

No action required.

**Rationale:**

The ASSA Charge 1 sub-committee brought the charge to the attention of ITS and inquired about current practices regarding e-mail processing. In short, ITS does regularly review and update their policies. With respect to the specific concern raised in the charge, the sub-committee is in agreement with ITS that "Blocking email that contains a single word will generate a high amount of false positives and borders on censorship." If "unsubscribe" links were to become high risk, ITS's periodic review would update policy to sideline such e-mails.

ITS provided the following information:

- "Anti-spam works by using a combination of techniques to stop unsolicited email while creating a balance between stopping unwanted email and minimizing false positives."
- "RIT's goal is to stop unsolicited email that does not adhere to best practices for marketing or is abusive in nature."
- "Email is processed centrally by RIT for spam, scams, viruses, phishes, and other compliance threats. Some email clients may take their own actions like moving items to a Junk Mail folder, warning about deceptive links, or blocking access to executable content. Desktop anti-virus software may add additional functionality."
- "Messages for employees may be sidelined to a central policy quarantine or stored in the end user spam quarantine at <https://spam.rit.edu>. Messages for students and alumni may be sidelined to a central policy quarantine or tagged so that Gmail puts them to the end user's spam folder. They may also be determined to be spam by Gmail's processing."
- Messages that are sidelined to a central policy quarantine include messages that may contain higher risk content such as viruses, phishes, scams, and spam from abusive sites. These policy quarantines are reviewed periodically. False positives are released and rules are updated routinely. The email sent here also includes messages that may violate published policies, laws, or may contain a threat to the RIT community (e.g. bomb or other like threats, payroll/W4 phishing, ransomware, message purporting to be from RIT executives, etc.)."

- "The above is a general list of the types of things that may occur. There is no definitive documented list as a) both the techniques and actions change based on current threats and b) disclosing the current techniques could be used to exploit the protections in place."
- "Most messages that are perceived to be spam that are not caught or marked as spam fit into the category of general marketing that an individual either directly or indirectly signed up for whether they realized it or not through the company doing the marketing or one of their affiliates and should unsubscribe from those messages."

Additional information may be found on the ITS website at the following links:

<https://www.rit.edu/its/servicing/secure-computing/spam-filtering>

<https://www.rit.edu/its/servicing/secure-computing/reporting-spam>

The ASSA Committee voted on January 23, 2019 in support of this recommendation 9-0. Committee members present and voting in favor of the recommendation were: Steve Luxmore, Gretchen Wainwright, Tracy Magin, Matthew Fluet, Irene Evans, Brian Barry, Navieda Huggins, Bobby Moakley, and Liz Ruder. Sandra Connelly and Rebecca DeRoo were not in attendance (and not included in the official vote), but provided support of the "No action needed" recommendation by email.



**ASSA Charge 2 AY 2018:** *Consider instituting Student Evaluations of Academic Advisors*

**ASSA Recommendation:** No action of Academic Senate is recommended.

**Rationale:**

Students (SG) wants:

- feedback to each advising meeting (like a ITS feedback ticket) [note that there are concerns with this - load of evals being generated, but more so the confidentiality of the students]

Students have concerns about:

- continuity between meetings
- not getting what they need as far as how to follow a path to their career choice [note from Sandi and Lynne - this is really the role of a faculty advisor in many departments]
- role of faculty advisor vs. professional advisors is not clear [note that some of this may be corrected in orientation / intro to departments / etc.]
- if students have concerns about an advising session / advisor, who do they see? [assistant dean or department chair]

This Committee met with Lynne Mazadoorian (Director, University Advising Office, RIT) and determined the following:

- students can give feedback any time that they want to the Assistant Dean or Department Chair/Head
- advisors are enforcing what is decided by faculty - not making programmatic decisions, etc.
- professional advisors are reviewed annually
  - reviews include any information from the student surveys that are conducted annually (to a subset of 3,000 students)

Action Plan for Student Government as outlined by the President of Student Government:

- SG will create an infographic for students outlining the roles of faculty and academic advisors as well as who to contact if they have concerns
- [The SG President] will be working with Lynne and the Advisor Delegates Committee to work on making sure each college's website very clearly outlines who to contact if students have complaints

The ASSA Committee voted on January 23, 2019 in support of this recommendation 9-0. Committee members present and voting in favor of the recommendation were: Steve Luxmore, Gretchen Wainwright, Tracy Magin, Matthew Fluet, Irene Evans, Brian Barry, Navieda Huggins, Bobby Moakley, and Liz Ruder. Sandra Connelly and Rebecca DeRoo were not in attendance (and not included in the official vote), but provided support of the “No action needed” recommendation by email.