

APPROVED 11/15/2007

**ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
ACADEMIC SENATE
NOVEMBER 1, 2007: 12:05 – 1:50 P.M.
1829 ROOM OF THE SAU**

Absent: B. Barbato, E. Boyd, W. Destler, J. Diaz-Herrera, E. Mineck, S. Perez-Hardy, C. McKenzie, T. Schueler, L. Wild

1. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 12:10 p.m.
2. COMMUNICATION OFFICER'S REPORT – Minutes of October 18, 2007 were approved as corrected with one abstention.

3. CHAIR'S REPORT:

Kristen Waterstram-Rich gave a brief summary of the Institute Council meeting of October 31, 2007:

- President Destler reported that he has been traveling extensively outside of the area [Philadelphia, Albany, Saratoga, Schenectady, Boston & Washington D.C.] and is beginning to re-engage alumni. Next week he will be traveling to New York City and then out west. Most of his travels have been on a Friday and over the weekend so that he is on campus during the week.
- Fundraising is ahead of schedule and \$11M of the \$25M goal has been raised.
- Student applications are up 18% from last year and the number of out-of-state applications has increased.
- This year's retention of second year students has increased to 89%, up from 87% last year.
- The Educational Records Policy revision was approved.
- The presentations made at IC were ones that have been or will be presented to Senate at this meeting or the next.

Tom Policano, Vice Chair, reported the following:

- A forum is now available on the AAUP site in response to the Human Resources presentation to Senate on the RMA's (Retired Medical Accounts)
<http://ritaaup.org/forum/viewtopic.php?id=196>
- In conversations with Stan McKenzie, it was agreed that in the future, it would be beneficial to have dialogue previous to any final decisions regarding changes to benefits.
- The 18 talking points regarding hiring contingent faculty have been shared with the Provost and HR. Both parties have been receptive to these ideas and they will be reviewed.
- Jeffrey Baker suggested the possibility of ITS putting together a daily digest to collate RIT community announcements as an option to reduce mailbox clutter. Jim Waters indicated an interest in pursuing such a solution.
- The DHCC (Dishonorable Conduct Committee) has been meeting regularly to address harassment on campus. The Executive Committee suggested the expansion of Student Conduct & Conflict Management Office model to a Campus Conduct & Conflict Management Office. Student Affairs pointed out that it would not be an appropriate place for such an office. The issue has not been resolved.

Provost McKenzie reported that the Calendar Committee met to respond to a students desire to have Commencement on Saturday and Sunday. Planning Commencement on a weekend other than Memorial Day weekend would result in an arduous week. A Memorial Day weekend event would

allow staff to additional overtime for the holiday weekend. Joe Loffredo has assured us that exams could take place on Friday no later than 2 p.m. allowing for a 4 p.m. Convocation. The issue still needs to be discussed with Ed Wolf, Student Government President.

4. REPORTS:

CAPITAL PROJECTS UPDATE:

Before Dr. Watters began his report he responded to the request transmitted to Tom Policano to establish a daily digest to collate and therein reduce spam mail. He said that he would be happy to have someone work on this possibility.

Dr. Watters reported on the following RIT Capital Projects:

HVAC: Much of the infrastructure here at RIT is original and some systems are starting to fail. The goal is to decommission 44 boilers down to 5 boilers. The cost of installing two centralized plants to service the East and West sides of campus is estimated to be \$38M. It will take 18 months to get this project completed.

Park Point (College Town): This privately owned project is ahead of schedule and will become the home of the academic bookstore (Barnes & Nobles). Park Point retail in total will cover 80,000 square feet and is scheduled to open July 2008. There will be housing adding 922 new beds for students.

Craft Village and Gallery: This \$5.5 project will include new gallery space on the west side of the Booth Building. Because of gracious donations totaling \$2.5M, this project will also create new space for students and a gathering place. RIT has given \$3M for this project.

Administrative/Student Service Center Building: This project is south of GCCIS and will be 33,000 square feet. Its purpose is to co-locate functional activities. Jim Miller, VP of Enrollment Management has been charged with raising undergraduate applications by an additional 1000 this year and graduate applications by an additional 500 this year. This charge has necessitated additional new staff in the Bausch & Lomb Building. Shifts will be made in other buildings where space is needed. The Development Office in the Eastman will be moved and Liberal Arts will occupy their space. The Sponsored Research Offices need to be moved so that the Sustainability Institute can be moved to that area in CIMS. This project will have an Innovation Center with 10,000 square feet of devoted space. \$15M has been allocated to this project.

Global Village: Dr. Watters reported that Colony Manor and Riverknoll are very old units that presently house 1,250 beds. These complexes need to be replaced and the committee is working on a plan. There are plans to have an Entrepreneurship Dorm within this complex. Riverknoll will start coming down next spring.

SAU Woodward Pool Renovation: Renovation costs are estimated at \$10M. A Trustee has already given a gift of \$2M and \$8M is coming from RIT. This will provide 39,000 square feet of new space for Student Affairs.

Parking & Transportation: Studies are underway to plan for new parking facilities to accommodate growth and building development projects. Discussion ensued.

Discussion has revolved around having people mover technology on our campus. Is it possible to provide atmospheric space during inclement weather? There is already a tunnel but we need more tunnels. A cost of \$130M is estimated for this project.

Discussion ensued.

Q: Steve Diehl gave his congratulations for the Park Point project but asked if all the buildings will meet the standards for green tech. Also he asked about the carbon balance from an environmental standpoint with so much of the land now being used for buildings.

A: Dr. Watters said the CAST building is now LEED certified and the SAU will be certified. There is an alumnus on the west coast who is gifted in this technology and will be assisting us. In the Physical Plant department a position will be coming forth regarding Green technology. There will be geo-thermal cooling and heating systems. In days past there was little sensitivity to land use but at this point in time we are trying to use less land by building up instead of out.

Q: Warren Koontz said one of his colleagues sent Dr. Destler a lengthy letter regarding the need for more classroom space, a commodity that is not growing in proportion to the number of buildings currently under construction.

A: J. Watters said they are working on the need to create new classrooms.

Q: Abi Aghayere asked how the \$130M for all the capital projects is being funded.

A: J. Watters said it is through gift money, cash set aside from RIT to fund different projects, and we can still borrow at extremely low rates.

Q: Sophia Maggelakis asked about a Faculty Club being built.

A: J. Watters said no, there is no plan to build a Faculty Club at this time.

Q: What was the rationale behind the change of name from Collegetown to Park Point.

A: J. Watters said that a marketing firm came up with this name.

Q: Christine Kray asked about the possibility of student involvement (student projects) as an aspect of Global Village.

A: J. Watters said would welcome this type of interaction and was willing to engage in further discussion.

Q: Willie Osterman said that most universities have a Faculty Center on campus.

A: J. Watters said that Dr. Simone talked about a Faculty Club but this was a no go.

Q: Tom Policano said about ¼ of the faculty are adjuncts and need to have offices to meet with students. Can we think of having flexible space for this?

A: J. Watters said that we have rehabbed buildings and have recognized the limitations of having enough office space. We are trying to create space where adjuncts are actually located.

Tom's response was that adjuncts need to have space reserved for them and to have living space. The library has a few rooms they can schedule but this need needs to be discussed and to be promoted so that students and adjunct faculty can have a place to meet.

A suggestion by Eli Saber was made to have ramp parking or underground parking to create more parking spaces. He said upon leaving the campus during the day and then returning there are never any parking spaces.

Dr. Watters said they are looking at underground parking. He said it takes \$1800 to create one space, which is very costly. Yes, the structured parking issue has to be addressed.

Q: Brian Thorn asked what implications the building project has on the operating budget.

A: J. Watters said \$80,000 per year.

Q: Katie Schmitz was concerned about a ramp garage collapsing as one did on South Avenue and asked how RIT can protect itself in regards to this.

A: J. Watters said that parking garages that collapse are affected by salt and the prevention of such incidents are all about maintenance.

K. Waterstram-Rich thanked Dr. Watters for his update at today's meeting.

PROTOCOLS FOR ACADEMIC CENTERS: [This document is posted on the Senate DML site and was sent to Senators prior to the meeting today.]

Provost McKenzie reported that the issue of protocols for Academic Centers was brought up at a Research sub-committee meeting of the Board of Trustees, where a Trustee asked about the criteria for opening a center. There were no criteria or protocols in place, so the Provost said he crafted something and took it to the Deans for approval. The Deans wanted a more specific document, so the Provost prepared a second version, which has been distributed to the Senate today and will go before the Education Committee of the Board of Trustees next week. Provost McKenzie read through the Protocols for Academic Centers and discussion ensued. The Provost said the reason it is called a center is because a center is a locus in the middle of everything. It does not have to be more than one department to be a center, but must be more than one discipline.

Q: Barbara Birkett asked if all our present centers meet the criteria?

A: Yes, all the existing Academic Centers meet the criteria.

Q: Sophia Maggelakis asked if the Centers would have academic programs and degrees?

A: The Provost said that a Center could have an academic program.

Q: Brian Thorn asked why the Protocols document states that the V.P. of Research would review Centers.

A: There are costs covered through external grant and contract funding including research funding; the V.P. of Research is most closely familiar with such funding. Monies supporting a Center can also be from gifts and endowments.

Q: Eli Saber said he is familiar with two centers and they are used to attract research monies. He asked why then do we have a process that the VP's have to review when the Centers can just report to Granting Agencies.

A: The Provost said a Center can be stagnating, absorbing space, and that an internal mechanism needs to be in place to get it reviewed periodically.

Q: Abi Aghayere asked how many academic centers are at RIT presently – academic and non-academic?

A: The Provost did not know how many non-academic centers there are and asked Mary-Beth Cooper about this as well. M-B. Cooper said prior to her arrival Linda Kuk had nine centers and all their departments were centers. Many departments now have gone away from the name "Center." There are four or five right now in her department and they don't involve grants and research. She said she would leave Student Affairs out of the equation.

Q: Tom Cornell asked if each center would have a director who would then be responsible to a specific dean. He added that there are so many complexities with these protocols and if some of these things are in transition, are there some general guidelines.

A: Each Center would be responsible to the Provost and at least one dean. Most centers would report in a college structure. He said he would not want to rule out where Astrophysics would be housed (faculty are from three units). Right now it exists within a college. The Provost said he is trying to get this into policy form, giving guidelines and accountability. He added that the policy would need to be reviewed in future years to assess how it is working.

Q: Abi Aghayere asked why there is an institute within an institute and stressed the need to develop criteria for establishing institutes.

A: The Provost said we already have NTID within RIT.

A motion to send this document (Protocols for Academic Centers) to the Academic Affairs Committee for review was approved by the Senate with a vote of 24 In Favor and 4 Abstentions.

IMAGINE RIT: INNOVATION & CREATIVITY FESTIVAL:

Dr. Barry Culhane, Executive Assistant to the President, presented the *Imagine RIT: Innovation & Creativity Festival* project which will be held on May 3, 2008. Dr. Culhane announced that the event is 184 days away. A planning committee of 20 people is in place [see Senate DML site for complete listing of this.] This has never been done before at RIT and the goal is to show what an incredibly wonderful place RIT is! This event will occur on the same weekend as the Spring Fest at RIT. A call has gone forth for proposals for this event and the deadline to submit proposals is November 16th or if that is too soon, December 17th. Dr. Culhane said on May 3rd from 10:00-4:00 p.m. the campus will be open for all to come and have a “wow” experience. Each college has been asked to participate and show off their departments with exhibits and works in whatever way they choose. Already COE has a committee of six willing to serve to plan their interaction. From the residence halls to CIMS and throughout the entire campus, there will be a continuous line of activities and exhibits. This event will be family friendly and all are welcome. This is a wonderful opportunity, especially for the younger K-12 students. Alumni will be involved as well. The committee is in contact with Steve Wozniak with regard to having a national innovation award system. Dr. Culhane said we can be as innovative and creative as we like. He reported that Maryland has a 55-person committee working on a festival there. A website will be up regarding this event by November 12th. There is an estimated budget of \$200,000 and \$100,000 is coming from RIT. Logistically busing will have to be worked on so that this will not be a problem. There will be a Welcome Center to greet all visitors. All ideas thus far will be presented to the Board of Trustees next week and more details will be emerging in the near future. All suggestions and ideas are welcome.

EXAM SCHEDULING: [The Power Point is found under Working Documents on the DML Senate site.] Joe Loffredo, Registrar and George Thurston, Co-Chair of the Academic Support Committee gave an overview of a proposed exam scheduling system for RIT. The proposed approach given for a new exam schedule is a standard meeting time approach. Simulations of this approach at RIT are now being tested.

The current timing of exam scheduling is inconvenient and special requests are generating weeks of manual labor. A simpler system would be more convenient, transparent and adaptable. At many other quarter schools, exam schedules are based on class meeting times and are typically published in advance. Accommodation is built-in for common exams, laboratory exams and make-up exams. The goal of this work is to devise and quantitatively test a similar method for RIT. Independent tests are

being conducted by Joe Loffredo (SAS), George Thurston (Mathematics), with support from Ann Gottorff and the Academic Support Committee.

Joe Loffredo reviewed how quarter schools use a “meeting time” approach to exam scheduling (i.e. Cincinnati, DePaul, Ohio State, Northwestern, Stanford, University of Chicago and University of Washington). The new approach would be based on the first weekly meeting times for courses scheduled in the standard manner.

For example, he said, all courses that first meet on Monday at 8 a.m. would be assigned the same exam time period. Specifically, courses that meet M or MF, or MR or MRF, or MT or MTRF, or MTW, or MTWR or MTWRF, or MW, or MWF, or MWR, or MWRF at 8:00 a.m. would have the same exam period. This method automatically creates no conflicts for those courses in the 20 standard day and time blocks.

The results of simulations of methods to accommodate conflicts and Common/Make-Up exam periods were presented. The current simulations assign the class time categories to 20 exam blocks so as to minimize conflicts and assigns exam blocks to exam days and times to minimize instances of more than two exams per day for students.

The plan calls for exams to be limited to two hours, as they are currently. Joe Loffredo reviewed the exam blocks showing how exams would be scheduled. Eli Saber said he prefers 3-hour block exam times. Joe and George responded that they would consider how this might be accommodated. The issue of crowded classrooms was also raised and George Thurston said that simulations still need to be carried out to see how this would be dealt with.

There are several advantages to this new approach. First, there will be early notification of the exam schedule, as early as the time of registration. Second, the exam schedule will be more understandable and explainable. Third, the exam classroom scheduling is simplified, but will need further simulations. The new schedule also creates common exam/make-up blocks. Disadvantages are that many multi-section courses will not be given a common exam block and the simulations are based on historical data.

Christine Kray said this proposed exam schedule may solve interpreter and C-Print problems.

The committee’s next steps are to conduct additional simulations on more historical data; to more fully evaluate the needs for common exam blocks; to simulate actual room scheduling and to consider other scheduling models. Joe Loffredo and George Thurston will return to the Senate with the newly updated proposal to be discussed.

Kristen thanked Joe Loffredo and George Thurston and the committee for all their hard work. They agreed to return to Senate on November 15th, to present again.

ADJOURNMENT: 1:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Feeney Bushnell
Vivian Gifford

