

APPROVED 11/02/06

**ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
ACADEMIC SENATE
OCTOBER 19, 2006: 12:00 P.M. – 1:50 P.M.
SKALNY ROOM/SCHMITT INTERFAITH CENTER**

Absent: E. Boyd, J. Diaz-Herrera, C. Jackson, W. Osterman, L. Quinsland, A. Simone, L. Wild

1. CALL TO ORDER: Kristen Waterstram-Rich called the meeting to order at 12:10 P.M.

2. COMMUNICATIONS OFFICER REPORT

The minutes were approved with 1 abstention.

3. CHAIR'S REPORT

Kristen Waterstram-Rich asked the Senate for a change of order on agenda, making the IACA update first. There were no objections from the floor. She stated that there were 2 items of interest this week. First was that last year Dr. Robert Clark, Special Assistant to the Provost and Dean Emeritus, reported to the Senate about the White Paper that he was working on that would discuss General Education Requirements. These requirements would outline the knowledge base that graduates of RIT could be assumed to have. This paper will be online tomorrow. It is being sent to members of the Senate and the faculty of the three colleges which offer most of the General Education courses: Liberal Arts, NTID and the College of Science. She reported that Dr. Clark would also come to Senate to talk about the paper. She asked that all comments regarding this paper be sent to the Executive Committee before the first week in December so that they can be addressed during the meeting of December 14.

Wade Robison asked what is to be done with this document.

K. Waterstram-Rich responded that it would identify what is needed with respect to general education for all students; the paper identifies 12 areas of general education. Eventually, it may be that each program would have to identify in their curriculum how these requirements will be met.

W. Robison stated that this should have been done before the General Education requirements were cut from Liberal Arts. Asking what General Education credits graduates should take precludes the inclusion of those who are teaching General Education.

K. Waterstram-Rich stated that this may have occurred because when the Institute was undergoing review for Middle States, it came to light that a complete review of the general education requirements including assessment was needed.

W. Robison stated that this paper needs to be explained properly. He stated that his colleagues would not be excited, as they feel cut out of the process. The committee working on this paper came to the COLA faculty and they received an email that said that they would indeed be cut out of the process. He stated that he hated to be pessimistic but felt that what will happen, will happen.

K. Waterstram-Rich expressed surprise at this statement.

W. Robison stated that this was his interpretation of the events.

Mark Price stated that there was to be a COLA meeting tomorrow at noon and would the paper be out in paper form?

K. Waterstram-Rich stated that the White Paper would probably be out in digital form by that time tomorrow.

S. McKenzie said that the paper is going out in white paper form to COLA, NTID and COS. If those colleges reject the paper, then he said that is the end of it as far as he is concerned.

Tom Cornell stated that it seems natural that COLA could have participated in the preparation of this paper. There are some members of the college on the committee, but the college was not asked as a whole to participate and it seems late to be coming to the college with a White Paper. He said that the process was not one designed to elicit maximum creative input for such a paper.

K. Waterstram-Rich stated that meetings were also not held in COS or NTID. She stated that now there will be discussion in the colleges; this is a draft paper and a place to start. When faculty read the paper they may decide that they are already doing what the paper states.

S. McKenzie said that it would have been difficult to get a committee of 150 Liberal Arts faculty to write a White Paper.

T. Cornell responded that it would have been a challenge that he would gladly have taken on. He stated that COLA had just finished a review of programs and then they were hit with changes. He said it has been very hard for them to adjust and the White Paper adds to the frustration. He felt that it is hard to want to participate at this point.

K. Waterstram-Rich stated that the committee might not have had participation in the way desired by COLA, but that there were Liberal Arts faculty on the committee.

T. Cornell responded that they had not been informed of the process.

Barbara Birkett stated that hopefully this would be a step in the right direction in terms of scheduling.

Warren Koontz said that he had been confused by the comment that there were COLA faculty on the White Paper team.

T. Cornell responded that the college did not receive an invitation. Individuals were chosen to serve, but no feedback was given to the college as a whole during the process.

K. Waterstram-Rich stated that we will have a great discussion at the Dec 14th meeting.

Katie Schmitz stated that this paper is an opportunity, but asked T. Cornell if he does not consider this opportunity to be valid.

T. Cornell responded No. He said there has been no invitation for us to be to be involved as a group or even allowed to participate.

W. Koontz stated that the COLA members of the committee were not even charged to communicate with other faculty.

K. Waterstram-Rich stated that the discussion of the White Paper on General Education will take place during the December 14th Senate meeting.

K. Waterstram-Rich stated that the other issue that she wanted to talk about was the wording of the Retirement Eligibility Clause. The word 'detrimental' is still hanging and needs to be addressed. Tom Policano and Ed Holden have agreed to work on this. She reported that the Senate has been told that this is the wording that Legal will accept. She stated that one approach is to have another lawyer take a look at the 'detrimental' clause to see if there might be acceptable alternative wording. She asked that if AAUP cannot get us a lawyer for free, and would the Senate agree to approach the three oldest faculty members to release some of the funds left over from Faculty Council to hire a lawyer for this purpose.

The Senate unanimously approved this proposal.

T. Policano and E. Holden will bring back some possible wording options and the Executive Committee will look into having a lawyer assess the document. She reiterated that the word 'felony' couldn't be used in the wording.

Abi Aghayere asked what happens if the outside lawyer says "yes" and the inside lawyer says "no"?

K. Waterstram-Rich replied that we would cross that bridge when we come to it. She reiterated that this is not a policy issue, it is a benefits issue.

She asked the Senators to please be aware that the minutes are available before each meeting and to please let us know about any edits that are necessary before they come before the Senate for approval.

Stan McKenzie stated that at the last meeting he did misspeak, and that since we accept federal funding we must adhere to first amendment rights. Therefore, Abi Aghayere's example of standing in front of the library with a megaphone making disparaging remarks about RIT would be protected speech.

4. REPORTS

IACA UPDATE

Steve Morse, Executive Director of Institute Audit, Compliance and Advisement reported to the Senate about the IACA Annual Update.

This Power Point presentation is posted on the Academic Senate web site under Senate Documents (Other).

S. Morse included these additional points related to the PowerPoint presentation:

- There is a new mission statement for IACA.
- The division includes five professionals, all CPAs, who look at how departments are following internal guidelines.
- IACA audits specify business processes and distribute questionnaire reviews to low risk divisions to make sure that they understand these processes.
- There is continuous auditing involving specific issues like procurement cards with the goal of revealing any fraud that may exist. They do not know the cost of fraud to the institution. They may find fraud, but cannot actually estimate its cost.
- Supervisory review and oversight is a critical control in the fight against fraud.
- The Ethics Hotline that was identified by President Simone in a campus wide email contained the expectation that RIT employees will do things right. It is not however meant to circumvent the normal chain of command. At this time the important issues related to ethics and covered by this hotline through Jim Watters, deal with compliance and finances. Other issues related to ethics may be included in the future, but he is not certain of that at this time.
- The CARES Internal Controls program deals with these issues and is mandatory for all managers at this time. The next session runs on November 16th.
- S. Morse handed out an updated IACA brochure and indicated that all of this information is also available on the website.

M. Price stated that S. Morse had mentioned that a supervisor needs to be careful about signing anything that comes across his or her desk. He asked if there is a danger of a supervisor being charged with fraud if the document is later problematic?

S. Morse replied that it is important that as a supervisor you carefully read all documents because you need to be aware of what you are signing off on. Supervisors need to ask questions if documents do not appear correct.

M. Price asked that if Supervisors may not then be liable, may they be castigated for not doing their job well?

S. Morse responded that he did not want to stand here and say what will be in a hypothetical situation.

M. Price restated that you (S. Morse) said that we could not know cost of fraud or the degree to which we are now being defrauded.

S. Morse replied that yes, we cannot know.

A. Aghayere asked if fraud has increased during the time that you have been doing this.

S. Morse responded that it is hard to tell, and that he is not at point where we can really assess this. He stated that through Dr. Watters' letters and grapevine scuttle about events, he felt that there was an increased awareness of the issue.

A. Aghayere asked what is an average amount of fraudulent activity?

S. Morse replied that over the last year the institute has been involved in about 4 cases. The money involved has been between the \$1,000 to \$30,000 range and that it will often involve very different circumstances.

S. McKenzie stated that there are control mechanisms in place; for instance, any RIT check for over \$50,000 must have 2 signatures.

One of the Senators asked what good is a printed signature?

S. Morse responded that a printed signature is not as good as written signature. He stated that they have put new processes in place in regards to procurement cards including printed cover sheets and reducing the number of procurement cards available in general. He added that he would be happy to expand on procurement card issues.

K. Waterstram-Rich thanked S. Morse for presenting today.

RESEARCH OVERSIGHT PROPOSED POLICY CHANGES

Tom Cornell, Chair of the Research Oversight Committee and Marjorie Zack, Director of Sponsored Research Services, reported to the Senate on proposed policy changes.

This Power Point presentation is posted on the Academic Senate web site under Senate Documents (General Institute Policies).

T. Cornell included these additional points related to the PowerPoint presentation:

- The ROC received its biennial report last Friday and it was helpful to see how well they were following their own policies and procedures.
- The structure of the new policy follows the structure of the old policy
- Both versions open with a preamble and a statement of principles, to serve as points of reference in the committee's deliberations.
- The new policy is also like the old in that the heart of policy involves guidelines for how the committee is set up and what its responsibilities are. The final section of the new policy lists definitions of key terms.
- The major changes include a new name: Oversight Policy for Externally Sponsored Projects. This addresses the reality that the committee reviews a wide range of projects, not just research based projects. The committee has one responsibility: to review all projects that are externally funded.
- Implicit in the committee's work is the embracing of the culture of openness. The new policy states this explicitly (principle #1). Projects should be public and available to the community.
- One of main reasons for working on this policy now is to accommodate the shifting from paper postings of awards to online postings on the web.
- The ROC could not function without the formalized relationship between Sponsored Research Services and the Committee itself.
- The language is more clear and briefer, following the wording of other RIT Policies.
- This policy is not seen as a replacement of the original policy. The existing policy has been incredibly successful in entering territory that was completely foreign and

these changes have just refined it.

K. Waterstram-Rich stated that all Senators received a copy of this policy and that it is also online. She offered that there were a few copies available if individuals did not bring their own.

T. Policano asked that although not specific to this policy, is the new math for divvying up money for research under your purview?

T. Cornell responded no, Deans look at that issue. He stated that for every externally funded project all information is available to students and members of community. They do not oversee funding or the use of funds. Their goal is to make sure that no one is caught by surprise by any of the information involved.

K. Waterstram-Rich asked what percentage of overhead is given to RIT and who sets the percentage?

S. McKenzie responded that this is a figure that is established by RIT's negotiation with the Federal Government that takes place every three years.

W. Robison stated that the ROC had done a great job. He offered a little history stating that he was chair of the first committee. When he asked the Provost, who was a younger version of the current Provost, for help doing this, he was told that there was no secretarial help available and that his own staff assistant needed to do this. The committee then divvied up all of the materials and went through every single charge. He stated that it seemed to him that this committee had captured the original spirit of the policy with clearer language and headings.

W. Robison moved that the Senate accept this document.

A. Aghayere seconded the motion.

K. Waterstram-Rich moved that we accept the revisions to the Research Oversight Committee Policy.

The revisions were **approved** with one abstention.

K. Waterstram-Rich moved that we approve the revisions to the Procedures to the ROC.

The revisions were **approved** with one abstention.

PROPOSED DOCTORAL POLICY

Kit Mayberry, Vice President of Academic Affairs and Chair of the Graduate Council, reported to the Senate on the Proposed Doctoral Policy. She gave a brief history, stating that last year Graduate Council proposed to the Senate revisions of the credit requirement part of the Doctoral Policy. Now with multiple Ph.D. Programs, we need greater flexibility regarding graduation requirements. K. Mayberry reported that she has stated repeatedly that the revisions proposed last year by Graduate Council and approved by the Senate were not comprehensive; a comprehensive review of the entire Ph.D. Policy will be forthcoming. The Deans did not have a chance to review the changes until after Senate approval and made some minor changes. K. Mayberry was asking the Senate to

approve these changes from the Deans. The first change is the replacement of the phrase “one to two outside examiners” with “one **or** two outside examiners.” Second, the Deans would like the phrase “fail to pass” to be replaced by “are failed on.” Third, the word “department” will be replaced in every instance by “program.”

W. Koontz asked about “not pass” vs. fail stating that students who fail to pass the defense cannot take the exam again.

S. McKenzie responded that this is a substantive change. If a student is “not passing” the dissertation defense, the committee can choose to suspend the examinations for a few months and then resume the defense; however, if the committee “fails” the student on the defense, then there is not a second chance.

M. Price referred to the passage on page 2 that states that the Library will assume responsibility for cataloguing the dissertation. He asked if dissertation abstracts be made available to the academic community.

Chandra McKenzie responded that we now have online access to the UMI dissertation abstracts database. However, at present RIT Thesis and dissertations are not included there. Additionally, there is not a mandatory requirement for RIT graduates to submit thesis and dissertations for online access (either in UMI or RIT Digital Media Library) and no oversight to assure that students are submitting copies of their thesis and dissertations (paper or otherwise) to the library. All of this is voluntary on the student’s part. She is on the agenda of the October 27th Graduate Council meeting with Marianne Buehler, to present these issues and propose solutions.

M. Price asked if the Qualifying Exam is the same thing as a comprehensive entrance exam. He noted that “Continuation of Thesis Dissertation Course” is on the books, but asked if it is a real course that is actually taught.

Harvey Palmer made a Friendly Amendment involving the first sentence. He stated that this sentence does not explicitly say that a person needs to submit an approved final version of a thesis and that usually during a defense the committee identifies corrections that need to be made at a later date.

Kit replied that this would all be revisited in tremendous detail in a short period of time. She stated that there are many things here that could be changed. She said that if you have faith that the whole policy will be reviewed in the next 2 years, there is no need to go back at this hammer and tong.

Palmer responded that he was just making a suggestion because there was a need for the submission of a final version.

W. Robison seconded this amendment.

H. Palmer referred to the statement “submission of the final accepted copy of the thesis”, suggesting the removal of ‘dissertation’ to make it consistent.

K. Mayberry asked if we were friendly about the substitution of 'dissertation' for 'thesis'?

Jayanti Venkataraman asked for a clarification regarding the composition of the Committee for the Candidacy Exam and also suggested that there should be a member external to the program in order to ensure quality control.

K. Mayberry responded that they have a committee to deal with substantive issues and this is one of them, and that there is not a need to have full blown review at this point.

J. Venkataraman stated that under section 5.3, the sentence should include the word "accepted" to read "...thesis finished and accepted...".

K. Mayberry responded that she would take it as a friendly amendment.

A. Aghayere asked if the qualifying exam was oral, written or a combination of both.

Kit answered that each Ph.D. program decides that.

The question was asked, is Point 3 referring to 9 academic credits acceptable for international students?

K. Mayberry stated that 9 would not be acceptable but that program chairs can up the number through work-study or assistantships.

C. McKenzie asked if saying that a dissertation is housed in the library means in electronic form.

K. Mayberry responded no, it means paper form. She also stated that Items G and H refer to Masters and Ph.D. Degrees.

S. Dianat pointed out that item 4 (page 3) contradicts the practice in MS programs where the student gets one free quarter hour of continuation of thesis tuition following completion of thesis credit required.

K. Mayberry responded that this is current policy and not under review.

Katie Schmitz commented that a student must register for a minimum of 9 academic credits each quarter for 3 consecutive quarters to establish residency.

Barbara Birkett suggested that dissertations be made available online.

K. Mayberry responded that this is the plan.

C. McKenzie stated that we are not registering with UMI right now.

S. McKenzie made a Friendly Amendment regarding the statement "one or two outside examiners" found on page 1. He stated that "one of the outside examiners appointed by the Provost will also

chair the dissertation defense.” He said that as other programs have this stipulation, he wanted to make this unanimous.

M. Price seconded the proposal.

Tom Cornell said that on page 1 it states that students need to be ready to develop a plan of study in 1st quarter and that a quarter is a very short amount of time.

S. McKenzie responded that the plan of study already is in place for the first year.

T. Policano asked that in regards to the posting of the dissertation proposal in the library, is there any risk that the level of work may be proprietary or of significance in their field that it would be in danger?

Kit responded that she was talking about proposal abstracts in UMI.

Irene Evans asked if Ph.D. students have an advisor.

K. Mayberry responded yes.

K. Waterstram-Rich asked the Senate if they wanted to vote or wait until they have the friendly amendments added.

In response to comments, she asked K. Mayberry to please bring this back next meeting with the amendments.

M. Price asked if a Ph.D. could be based on Classified Research?

S. McKenzie responded yes, up until the public defense of the dissertation.

NEW BUSINESS

Lisa Cauda and Cindee Gray reported to the Senate on the activities of the Tribute Committee for the Simones. L. Cauda stated that they would be looking at all forms of recognition for the Simones over the course of their last year. She stated that they have been charged with keeping an eye on activities and offering guidance to those interested in organizing any activities. She said that as a committee, they are taking suggestions and keeping an eye on the volume of activities. She indicated that they would be encouraging which ideas could be undertaken this year and which activities could be held in the future.

C. Gray stated that they are compiling a list of tributes, including the video that was shown at the Opening Day Address. She reported that Dr. Simone was awarded an honorary Dancy Duffy Award for Outstanding Citizenship at the Staff Awards Event. She stated that community organizations may also be recognizing the president throughout the year. C. Gray also reported that the trustees will be hosting Diversity Day in April and are planning a special dinner. She asked the Senators to please let us know if anything will be planned so that they can keep the list current. She stated that they did not want to dilute the amount of recognition.

L. Cauda stated that people have been asking how they could make gifts in the Simones name and that they have decided that they will be raising funds for Center of Entrepreneurship. She said to please let the committee know about any questions and comments.

K. Waterstram-Rich reminded the Senate that the next 2 meetings would be back to the 1829 Room in the SAU.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Feeney Bushnell
Communications Officer
10/23/06