

APPROVED as corrected 2/22/07

**ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
ACADEMIC SENATE
FEBRUARY 8, 2007: 12:10 P.M. – 1:50 P.M.
ROOM 1829 OF THE SAU**

Absent: E. Boyd, M-B. Cooper, S. Dianat, C. Jackson, L. Quinsland, T. Schueler, B. Thorn, L. Wild,

1. CALL TO ORDER:

Kristen Waterstram-Rich called the Senate to order at 12:05 pm.

2. COMMUNICATION OFFICER REPORT: The Minutes were approved with 4 abstentions.

3. CHAIR'S REPORT

Kristen Waterstram-Rich reported that the national search for the Ombudsperson is well underway.

Stan McKenzie reported that the Faculty Honorary Degree Committee unanimously voted to give President Bill Clinton an Honorary Degree.

4. REPORTS

Research Oversight Committee

Marjorie Zack, Director of Sponsored Research Services and Tom Cornell, Chair of Oversight Committee for Externally Sponsored Projects reported to Academic Senate on a particular aspect of the Committee's work.

The PowerPoint presentation of Tom Cornell's is posted on the Academic Senate web site under Other Committee Reports.

T. Cornell added these additional points:

- Instead of waiting until the Committee gave the annual report, the Committee wanted to come before Academic Senate to discuss a specific issue
- Under the old policy, the Committee agreed to make a certain amount of information available on all externally supported projects
- Under the new policy certain projects also require prior review by the Committee who then makes recommendations to the Provost
- The Committee discussed the distinction between "no request to keep secret the fact of a project's existence or of its funding source shall be approved" and "request for a limited level of disclosure of Pertinent Details" (including the name of the funding source).
- The title of the project that was brought to their attention was the 'ITT Coatings Project'
- The first issue regarding this project was that ITT was drawing its funding from the Intelligence Community. ITT was asked if it would provide the name of funding agency and they indicated that the project was classified.
- It was determined that these limitations, in this particular case, did not provide risks to RIT. No students were involved and all faculty and staff involved explicitly approved of all of the limitations on the project in terms of publications.

- Sponsored Research Services has developed a “Request for Review” form for use by the Committee. The Committee decided that the reason for acting favorably should be on the form.
- The purpose of this presentation to the Academic Senate is to raise the following questions:
 1. Does this reasoning seem sound?
 2. Does this adequately reflect the expectations of the RIT Community?

M. Zack stated that the Sponsored Research Services Office would try to limit the number of cases that need special consideration. For the Committee reports to the RIT Community, should we report annually, quarterly, or on another timeline? Additionally, she asked what method should the Committee use to report: the Oversight Committee Website, the Academic Senate website, an RIT message to all, or another vehicle?

Tom Policano responded that the appropriate time for feedback is prior to the Committee’s decision so that anyone in the community who has an opinion can share it with the Committee.

Mark Price asked Tom Cornell if the request for classified research came from one of the security agencies listed on the handout.

T. Cornell responded that this was correct.

M. Price then noted that the WWII Manhattan Project involved separate groups around the country all working on a project for which they did not realize the completed and assembled outcome – the making of an atom bomb. M. Price commented that this particular research request is also one in which we do not know how it will be used.

T. Cornell responded that this was correct.

Stan McKenzie stated that the technology being used for this project has all been in the public domain. He raised the question whether the Oversight Committee needs to present this at Senate.

T. Cornell responded that the emphasis in this policy is on any projects that are externally funded. He added that the relatively non-controversial character of this particular project is what makes it a good test. He stated that in future “prior review” cases the Committee may need to move quickly. Feedback from Academic Senate now will help the Committee with future cases, so that they can move ahead to meet deadlines.

Wade Robinson asked how is this information going to be archived so it is available to future Committee members who can review what and why decisions were made?

T. Cornell responded that this document records the procedures. The Committee will create similar documents in future cases. Out of this work patterns will emerge and the Committees may be able to develop guidelines.

W. Robinson commented that if he was still a member of the Committee, he would rather the completed form was up on a website and instantly available from any location. He stated that it strikes him that it would be notice enough if issues were regularly put up on a website. He asked if the Committee wanted input from the community? He asked that he did not know if the Committee has ever asked for input from anyone other than its participants.

T. Cornell responded that it is important for the RIT community to understand the process and that he feels that there ought to be some procedural way to inform people so that there will be no surprises. He stated that there needs to be some method of informing the community to safeguard the community.

Graduate Council Update

Kit Mayberry, Vice President of Academic Affairs gave a brief report on Graduate Council activities up to this time. She reported that the amended revisions of the Ph.D. graduation requirements have been passed by the Academic Senate. She stated that the Graduate Council's main charge is to review programs and that they have approved two of them thus far. She stated that there is an issue regarding the library practice of storing theses and dissertations because the library is running out of space. She reported that the Graduate Council sub-committee charged with reviewing requests for extensions for graduate degree completion has approved five requests, all at the Masters level. She gave an update on the Dean of Graduate Studies and reported that the university is adding an administrative position which Andrew Moore will move into on March 1st. At this time A. Moore will chair the Graduate Council as she had done as the Provost's designee since 1998. She stated that in order for the committee chair to be a standing member of the Academic Senate there must be some small changes to the policy. She added that the Senate will be hearing about these policy revisions soon.

Bob Barbato stated that a couple of meetings prior to today's meeting there was a discussion of the job description for the Dean of Graduate Studies. He stated that one of the issues was that one of the duties on the job description was the selection of Thesis committee members and that this was a concern.

K. Mayberry responded that the Graduate Council would meet with Stan to discuss the job description.

S. McKenzie stated that this was not a job description, but rather an evolving document and that the role of the Dean will be discussed in Academic Senate at a later point.

Proposed Master of Science Program in Innovation Management

Kit Mayberry, Chair of Graduate Council and Victor Perotti, Professor in the College of Business presented the proposal to Academic Senate.

This Program Proposal is posted on the Academic Senate web site under Working Documents.

M. Price stated that it had been mentioned in passing that is to complement the MBA. He asked would this suggest that a person should go for both?

V. Perotti responded that these degrees could be combined and a student could take both, but that it would take substantial amount of time.

Leon Reznik asked if the College of Business currently has any other Master of Science degrees?

V. Perotti responded yes, the College has an MS in Finance degree and an MS in Management degree.

Barbara Birkett asked that as students go into these courses in other schools are they at an equitable level with student who are focusing solely on specific discipline?

V. Perotti responded that he absolutely hoped so because the requirements to get into this program are the same for those students in specific programs.

Jorge Diaz-Herrera asked if students will be prepared to take the business courses required by this degree?

V. Perotti responded that he hoped so as students will begin with core business courses and that these basic courses are the foundation for and overview for specialization.

M. Price asked if these are the same core courses that undergraduates take?

V. Perotti responded no, these are core courses for the MBA. He added that in its initial conception this was a general business management degree. He stated that the idea emerged that it would be more beneficial to have a degree related to innovation. He stated that the idea of entrepreneurship would include new projects/innovations within existing organizations. He added that this allows students to control their education and accomplishments at the end of their education.

Barbara Birkett stated that low level management jobs had been mentioned and could Perotti describe the types of jobs this degree would feed?

V. Perotti responded that for instance individuals doing technical work for a security system might decide that they would like to lead new projects and deal with personnel management.

Latty Goodwin asked what kind of an impact this would have on the current MBA program?

V. Perotti stated that they had thought about this quite a lot and that entry requirements are so different that the current MBA should not be affected. He added that the goal has always been to draw a national audience.

President Simone asked how do you see this competing with neighboring schools? He stated that everyone has plateaued on the MBA level and all are trying an innovative curriculum approach.

Wayne Morse responded that with the exception of part-time programs and the EMBA program we do not compete with other local programs. He stated that the EPSCOP increasingly competes with peer schools on a regional and national level. Our goal is not just to be a good B-school that happens to be at RIT. Our school is to be a great B-school because we are part of RIT.

W. Morse went on to say that by building on the strengths of RIT, the proposed program will enhance the competitiveness of the EPSCOB and partner RIT colleges in this broader market. Our goal is to develop a competitive advantage based on the EPSCOB's unique position as part of RIT.

President Simone stated that this should this be attractive to BOCES.

V. Perotti stated that they had done a lot of benchmarking across the country and that this is very different because of the depth of collaboration and an interdisciplinary approach.

J. Diaz-Herrera stated that its association with the Gaming Program and the Security and Forensics Program makes it unique.

B. Birkett asked if this comes under the accreditation program for the college.

V. Perotti responded yes.

The Academic Senate approved the proposed Master of Science Program with one abstention.

Intellectual Property Annual Report

Varda Main, director of The Technological Licensing Office gave the Annual Report from her office.

This PowerPoint presentation is posted on the Academic Senate web site under Other Committee Reports.

V. Main's report also included the following points:

- We are doing well with licensing revenues.
- We are competing well within the field of schools that have \$50 million or less of annual research expenditures.

President Simone asked why are we doing this work when it is costing us money?

V. Main responded that financial return on investment is not the only metric we should be looking at. These activities enhance the reputation of the Institute and help us to attract and retain quality students and faculty. She stated that we have so many students who want to form businesses that we need to have the infrastructure to support them and create an interface between industry and communities. These activities also fulfill a federal compliance requirement for RIT. She added that the majority of institutions are not in it to make significant money and that at this point we have brought in about \$1M in revenues. She stated that on average only a small percentage of university inventions make it into the commercial marketplace and an even smaller number are blockbusters. She stated that RIT has already brought in more license revenues than cumulative legal and patenting expenses for all inventions. She stated that it takes on average three years from submission of a patent application to the issue of a patent but this can take many more years. She said that some companies are willing to adopt a technology before a patent has been issued but others are not. She added that university technologies tend to be earlier stage and that the licensee must put significant development work into it, thus it is often 7 to 10 years between signing a license and the university seeing any money. She stated that it is therefore premature for RIT to be looking at ROI relative to license. We are so young that the pluses and minuses float off the scale but that relative to peer universities we are performing at or about our peers. Dr. Simone thanked her for her response and said she explained very clearly why RIT is engaged in these activities.

V. Main and C. Lundgren provided an introduction to the Intellectual Property Task Force that they are co-chairing.

This PowerPoint presentation is also posted on the Academic Senate web site under Other Committee reports.

They stated that this policy was put into place in 1997 and given RIT's evolution and increased intellectual property activities the policy now requires modification. The IP Task Force is developing recommendations for these modifications and will be bringing these to RIT governance for review and discussion.

Resource Allocation and Budget Committee Update:

Jeff Lasky, Chair of the committee reported on the committee's first charge: to develop a recommendation for increasing the amount of funding available for faculty travel .

He reported that in one of the executive session meetings that follow budget presentations, he presented the committee's finding that additional travel funds are necessary to support faculty scholarship and professional development, and recommended that additional travel funds be included in the present FEAD grant program. This approach would have the advantage of using an existing process. At that session, the Provost indicated that the FEAD program and structure would

not be an appropriate funding vehicle. After additional discussion, the President indicated that an increased budget for travel would be a high priority in the current budget discussions, and that he wished to offer his thoughts on the matter to the Academic Senate. Jeff Lasky stated that he therefore was yielding the remainder of his presentation time to the President.

President Simone made the following statements:

- Having just finished the strategic plan, the meta goal is to distinguish ourselves from other universities
- We have moved to get scholarship into the classroom and different teaching activities
- Scholarship can be viewed in different ways, including presentations at regional and national meetings, publication in peer-reviewed journals, and competitively awarded grants.
- Travel to conferences to present is critical to our growth
- There are different kinds of conferences: Invitational, those in which papers are refereed, and those in which most are just accepted.
- Often conferences will publish papers in their proceedings helping them to gain status.
- There are also Paper Fairs at which papers are placed on tables to share with colleagues.
- Travel funds are available so faculty can contribute to their profession by presenting their work.
- The second purpose of travel funds is to provide the opportunity for faculty (especially junior faculty) to attend professional meetings to see what the field is like. This involves listening to papers, seeing how the game is played (for junior faculty), or for senior faculty to receive updates in their field and help with their own development.
- We also have faculty who are officers of organizations and need to travel for that purpose.
- We must be able to travel if we are going to be serious about scholarship and movement to a Category 1 classification
- Faculty travel is not fringe benefit; it must be used for faculty development or contribution to the field.
- We need to come up with a system in which faculty can travel as often as justified, including overseas.
- Some faculty will not travel because they will not meet the criteria established for RIT-sponsored travel.
- We need to have guidelines across the university. I am asking the Provost to meet with the Deans to come up with a set of travel guidelines to accommodate professional growth development, professional service and contribution to the discipline.
- Guidelines should come up through Academic Senate, be revised by Stan, and returned to the Deans to have a price tag put on them.
- I would like to have consistency of guidelines across the colleges.
- Consistency does not imply equivalence across Colleges. Colleges will have different needs and the guidelines should provide appropriate flexibility.
- Why is it that we want faculty to travel? For the benefit of the students. The University is for the students and faculty must facilitate the flow of information into the classroom where students are engaged in scholarship.
- Student travel should be available to support scholarship.
- When staff comes up with a good idea that can benefit faculty and students, we need to consider their proposals.
- What about Administrators? Currently they travel as they need to.
- When things are tight, travel is one of the first things cut. Discretionary funds in the Deans' office include travel and provide a buffer.
- This year we should bite the bullet and make a significant increase to the travel budget.

S. McKenzie stated that when he first started as a Faculty member at RIT 40 years ago travel was a perk for faculty who wanted to go to conferences for any reasons. In the late 80s and 90s we were able to meet requests for travel since only 1/3 to 1/2 of faculty went on trips. As enrollment dipped, budgets tightened and the Deans were asked to cut 2% from their budgets, often dipping into travel. In the last decade we have moved from less than 1/2 of the faculty who wanted to travel to many new faculty who need to travel for their scholarship. We have also grown tremendously. Nobody has sufficient travel money at this point. We will work with the Deans first for a set of parameters as a draft. This will happen fairly quickly and the final recommendations will be made at the end of this year's budget process.

Steve Diehl stated that field trips for his Nature Photography class are not funded and it is affecting the curriculum. When he is able to secure funding for trips, he needed to put travel costs on his own credit cards. He stated that he would like to put these costs on a university credit card. Additionally, he stated that he must go through a peer review process to give a peer review paper at PMA. He stated that he would just like to see the process made a little bit easier.

President Simone stated that he would like to reduce bureaucracy but there will be abuse and that we must achieve an acceptable level of accountability.

The meeting was adjourned 1:57p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Feeney Bushnell
Communications Officer
2/12/07