Minutes of Meeting

Regularly scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate of Rochester Institute of Technology

Thursday, September 15, 2022   12:15 – 1:50 PM   1720/1720 Global Cybersecurity Institute

Attendance: See Below

<u>Present</u>: M. Abushagur, A. Adrion, S. Aldersley, M. Anselm, G. Babbitt, S. Bamonto, K. Barone, T. Brown, D. Crawford, F. Deese, B. Dell, L. Dibble, N. Eddingsaas, J. Faber, A. Ghazle, A. Gehret, E. Granberg, L. Hall, D. Hazelwood, E. Heyman, B. Jadamba, S. Johnson, P. Kincheloe, L. Kiser, B. Lapizco-Encinas, D. Laury, E. Lawley, C. Lutzer, S. Malachowsky, A. Newman, D. Newman, J. Olabisi, R. Osgood, I. Puchades, M. Reed, Q. Song, B. Thomas, K. Tobin, J. Venkataraman, E. Williams, R. Zanibbi
<u>Absent:</u> S. Boedo, J Butler, E. D'Amanda, C. Fillip, O. Gottlieb, J. Hsieh, D. Johnson, J. Lee, M. Liu, Y. Ma, A. McLaren, A. Perez Sanchez, M. Reisch, A. Ross, M. Shaaban, C. Sheffield, T. Sparkman, O. Tsukernik, J. Van Aardt, L. Villasmil, P. White, T. Worrell, Y. Zlochower
<u>Excused</u>: n/a
<u>Presenters</u>: (In Order of Presentations) J. DeCourcey, M. Fluet, L. Buckley
<u>FS Student Assistants</u>: Paulina
<u>Interpreters</u>: N. Crouse-Dickerson, P. Ynzunza
<u>Tech Crew</u>

Agenda Item No. 1: Call to Order; A. Newman (12:17)
Meeting called to order.

Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; A. Newman (12:18)
Motion (A. Newman): to approve the agenda **Seconded (D Laurie)** Approved by acclamation

Agenda Item No. 3: Communication Officer's Report; L. Hall (12:19)
Update: The 9/1 and 9/8 minutes were sent out on 9/9 and we need to approve them. Receiving no feedback, I'd like to make a motion to approve the minutes from 9/1 and 9/8. **Motion (L. Hall)**: Approve the minutes **Seconded (A. Gehret)** **Comment (A. Newman)**: are there any objections to approving by acclamation? Hearing no objections, the motion is passed. **VOTE**: minutes approved by acclamation Second, we're still tweaking the newsletter formatting and content, so keep the feedback coming. Most has been very positive, though we're aware that the current PDF preview is not ideal. Finally, as always, please identify yourself when you comment for the minutes.

Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; A. Newman (12:20)

Update (A. Newman): We received feedback on renaming the Google Drive folders and we've done that. I've also uploaded previous year reports to the Drive. Last week I attended the Pandemic Update Group meeting and we learned: slightly higher numbers of infections than last year, but the infections have been so mild and the CDC requirements have shifted, so we'll continue with self-reporting and wastewater testing to track rates. It has been four years since the Academic Governance summit was held, and the Executive Committee would like to bring the organizing committee of the Summit back to discuss the outcomes of the charges that were generated in that event. Remember that the Senate Standing Committee mixer is next week, so please RSVP.

Discussion:
Q (L. Lawley): How do we know COVID rates if people aren't reporting?
A (A. Newman): Good question. Wastewater testing is part of that, but the other part is still self-reporting.
Comment (L. Dibble): About half of professors are asking for doctor's notes
Q (A. Newman): Yes, we can ask for Dr's notes, we just can't ask for specific diagnosis/medical information.
Q (B. Thomas): What's the university's stand on updated COVID boosters and vaccinations>
A (E. Granberg): Right now the only requirement is the one that's in place now, so no additional requirements for boosters.

Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; E. Heyman (12:25)

Update (E. Heyman): Committees still getting up and running and One Payroll is still on the minds of staff.

Agenda Item No. 6: Student Government Update; L. Dibble (12:26)

Update (L. Dibble): Retreat last weekend was very productive. Senators are working on separate Career Fair or other options for non-STEM majors. Students are also not happy about tuition increases and increased prices for food. Unfortunately, costs of food and transportation are going up independent of tuition increase. We closed out some petitions from 2020 due to technical issues with PawPrints, including issues relating to COVID. We also dealt with a student who was upset that his RA wouldn't play MineCraft with him and students who want tunnels throughout campus. Both were dismissed.

Agenda Item No. 7: RIT Investment Advice and Financial Coaching Benefit Presentation; DeCourcey (12:28) *Document linked below*

Update: New employee benefit, investment advice and financial coaching. We're working with CAPTRUST. Goal is to help employees make informed investment decisions for retirement savings plan account [403(b) plan]. The goal is to provide independent advice, unaffiliated with Fidelity/TIAA, etc. They do not sell products or services and there's no cost to employees. They can help you understand how and how much to invest and which record keeper to use. You'll still work directly with Fidelity and/or TIAA to update investments and beneficiaries.

CAPTRUST can also help with budgeting, financial planning, emergency/college savings, when to collect Social Security, and so on. You can schedule an appointment online or via phone. Appointments are 30 minutes, but you can schedule back-to-back or follow up. For your appointment you'll need your log-in info for Fidelity and TIAA, a recent copy of your statement, current pay stub, and other financial records you'd like to review.

Discussion:
Q (S. Malachowsky): The slide mentioned 403b, but does it include 401k?
A (J. DeCourcey): they can assist with either, but RIT's plan is a 403b.
Comment (A Adrion): This is a great service and I had a really good experience with three separate calls and they helped me set up some contribution plans.
Q (B Thomas): Can we share this presentation with our constituents?
A (J. DeCourcey): Yes.
A (L.Hall): it will be linked in the minutes and saved in the G Drive.

Presentation Attached

Agenda Item No. 8: ASSA Committee Report (12:39) *Document linked below*

Update (M. Fluet): We had three charges last year, one to look at textbooks and bookstore, one to look at the experience of female students and one to assess early alert for graduate students.

Charge #3, Early Alert for grad students was put off due to COVID, but the presentation is currently in the archives. Charge #2, dealing with female student experiences, involved interviews and surveys. Takeaways include that experiences can always be improved, there are lots of existing programs, and it was hard to determine what our specific role might be. Existing programs did mention more assistance collaborating and connecting to each other across campus. Our recommendations were to increase support for existing on-campus resources and include SRATE question on in-class climate. Charge #1 was difficult because the new bookstore was in process when ASSA got this charge. After Akademos was selected as next vendor, we were asked and provided modest feedback. Recommendations include charging ASSA to evaluation Akademos during either 2024/25AY or 2025/2026AY and consolidating concerns about the vendor and voicing those concerns to administration early and often.

Some meta-comments on charging process: getting our charges in mid-October means that we sat around for a month trying to figure out what to do before we got them and then we got a charge we had not previewed ahead of time. Struggled to get clarification from Ex Comm on rationale for charges and it's not always clear how actionable charges are.

Discussion:
Q (B. Thomas): You mentioned an extra question on the SRATE form, but my concern is that these would be evaluations of the professor, correct?
A (M. Fluet): Not necessarily. Some questions simply relate to resources available in the college and climate in the classroom could be part of that conversation.
Q (J Olabisi): I'm wondering if this could open the door to experiences of other populations, including D/HH and so on, which might make the questionnaire very long.
A (M. Fluet): Yes, that's a concern. We'd have to figure out how to think about how to word those and that would be the purview of faculty.
Q (S Malachowsky): we could summarize and quantify the data that already exists.
Q (E. Williams): in terms of the meta comments, are there cases in which the charge rationales aren't included?
A (M. Fluet): we went back to Clyde last year with some charges where the rationale wasn't clear and the proposer didn't recognize
Comment (L. Lawley): These also get discussed in Senate, so we should make sure that representatives of the committee are there and can hear the various rationales.
A (M. Fluet): Sometimes these conversations go very quickly.
Comment (Venkataraman): Going back to that charge too; do we know what problem we were trying to fix? The solution doesn't seem like a good solution if you don't know what problem you're trying to fix.
Comment (NAME?!?!?): Center for Women and Gender has been mixed in with the Q Center, has that been discussed at all? Has that impacted experiences?
A (M. Fluet): We don't know, but I do think that's probably hitting a lot of these groups. We're seeing this across the board, where resources devoted to gender are being split into DEI resources and so on.
Comment (Aldersley): We had the same issue last year with where these charges are coming from and I was looking at B2. There's a selection process on the part of Ex-Comm before it comes to the Senate and then presumably the Senate sends a recommendation?
Comment (M. Fluet): No, after Senate approves it goes straight to the committee.

Comment (L. Lawley): Motion to table this conversation to a separate conversation.

[Presentation Attached](#)

Agenda Item No. 9: AAC Report; Buckley (12:55)

Update: Charge #1 looked at program flexibility because there's enormous diversity in program flexibility across RIT. We put forth and the Senate approved a resolution to endorse formation of a joint task force on program flexibility, including SG, housing, etc. Charge #2 involved benchmarking with other institutions for robust online learning classes, programs, etc. We didn't get much traction on that and COVID changed things so rapidly, so it may be a different landscape. We're happy to return to this if needed. Charge #3 was revision of D.08, academic integrity policy and it doesn't keep up with demands of a mixed in-person/online environment. For example, there's a three week notification deadline, but sometimes it takes more than 3 weeks to find out that people are cheating on various websites. We have a lot of academic integrity issues in our college and they've ballooned during COVID and it hasn't come back to normal yet. Once the students know those websites are out there it's very hard to get them to stop. A revision was suggested a few years ago and Senate did not like it. This charge will carryover to this AY. Charge #4 involved D0.5 and coordinated and team taught courses. D0.50 only addresses a single instructor, which creates issues with coordinated courses where the teaching teams need to work in tandem. We updated the policy to plural instructors to create a collective responsibility. This passed in the Senate.

Finally, we had a lot of concerns from students who were given deadlines for assignments over official RIT breaks. Forces students to use break time to complete work during a break. Proposed change prohibits deadlines for work that contributes to any course grades set during breaks including reading days for courses without regularly scheduled weekend times.

Discussion:
Q (J. Vankataram): If due date can't be on break but can be on Monday after break, this defeats the objective to get them to not do work on breaks.
A (L. Buckley): True, but students make the choice about when to do the work. All we're saying is that if they wait to do the work during the break the deadline won't be during break. I can't solve problem of student procrastination.
Q (L. Dibble): My concern is being assigned an assignment the Friday before break and then due Monday after break. So sometimes it's not about student procrastination.
A (L. Buckley): There are other policies we work with on that.
Q (I. Puchades): So a break means they can't do any work for us?
A (L. Buckley): No, all it means is that that deadline can't be during that break.

Document attached
Proposed charges

Agenda Item No. 10: Standing Committee Charges; A. Newman (1:08pm)

A (A. Newman): We're going to move on. We'd like feedback on the AAC charges. They're all related to what you've spoken about.
Q (L. Buckley): One that we'll need to decide about rec-charging is the online course one.
A (A. Newman): Charges include instructors needing more time to finalize grades; 5 days after last final to get grades in.
A (L. Buckley): This will affect calendar changes, so it's more complicated. We need to know what the limits are and we can bring that to the body.
Comment (N. Eddingsaas): I'd like charges written as charges instead of statements.
A (A. Newman): We haven't been rewriting the charges for the people submitting them, so please suggest or comment in the document itself how you'd like us to edit the charges and make them actionable. We also have a calendar committee, so perhaps AAC would like to interface with that committee. We can come back to this. Charge 2 relates to thinking about reasonable expectations for outside-of-classroom time when teaching, relating to providing test accommodations.
Comment (Buckley): DSO is administering 4000 tests per week so they can't handle additional requests and they're just asking that additional exam requests be handled by faculty.
Comment (J. Faber): The fact that Larry is talking about the capacity of the testing center indicates that there might be a larger problem that needs more investigation.
Comment (M. Reed): It wasn't just capacity, but it's also a timing issue, which is that students have to request

exam accommodations by a certain date and if they don't do that it falls on the faculty member because we still have to offer the accommodation by law.

Comment (A Gehret): I'm at large for AASA and this charge is also a possible charge for that committee.

Comment (A. Newman): I think it was double listed and we're asking the Senate to clarify which committee.

Comment (Q Song): I had the same experience where I had to proctor a student for five hours. The capacity question seems concerning, since it .

Comment (L. Lawley): accuracy isn't an issue for charges; the question is whether we want the committee to address the part in bold.

Q (M. Anselm): could the charge include the potential for other accommodations; does the department have a responsibility to provide some accommodations for things the DSO can't cover?

A (A. Newman): I'm assuming that's something the committee can propose. Do we want to charge AAC with this?

Motion (L Lawley): we can modify the language of the charge. I'm going to move that we modify this to: "Investigate and make recommendations related to reasonable expectations for provision of academic accommodations."

Seconded (L Hall)

Comment: (I. Puchades): I'd also like to amend the charge to assess what the DSO's job is and what their resources are. So maybe the issue is better solved by increasing that capacity.

Comment (E. Williams): the outcome of the charge should be actionable.

Comment (L. Lawley): The modification addresses this by changing the language to "investigate and make recommendations."

VOTE: Motion to change the wording on the charge to "Investigate and make recommendations related to reasonable expectations for provision of academic accommodations" is **approved, 30 yes, 0 no, 5 abstentions**

Motion (L. Lawley): I'd like to move to vote on the charge
Seconded (L. Hall)

VOTE: Charge #2 "Investigate and make recommendations related to reasonable expectations for provision of academic accommodations" is **approved, 25 yes, 6 no, 1 abstention**

Discussion:
Comment (Buckley: Charge #3: Work with the task force proposed by AA last year on curricular flexibility and advance proposals as appropriate.

Comment (L Lawley): This is the task force's job, so I don't see any point in this.

Comment (Buckley): I agree, but someone in the Senate has to be the touchpoint, so the AAC would be that person to create the actual task force.

Comment (S. Aldersley): It's the same point about charges. It seems that B2 asks the Ex Comm to select the charges that arrive on your desk and presumably it should have been discussed at Ex Comm before it comes to Senate.

Comment (L. Lawley): You are seeing a tiny tiny fraction of the charges that came to us. We have to sort through hundreds of charges.

Q (Venkataram): I thought we set up the membership of the taskforce?

A (Buckley): We don't have actual names, so we need to get it populated.

Q (E Williams): This charge isn't about populating the task force; it's about working with the committee. Is the purpose of this to have them work with the committee?

A (A Newman): Since it was their recommendation it makes sense to keep them involved.

Comment (S Malachowsky): the nature of committees have some discretion given their original charge. So if someone wants to interface with them and ask them questions that would fall under that discretion.

Q (E. Williams): Who is appointing this taskforce?

A (E. Granberg): It's a combination of AA and Senate because it's joint.

Q (E.Williams): I move to reword the charge to "committee shall appoint a taskforce in conjunction with the Provost. "
Seconded (Puchades)
Comment (L. Lawley): My friendly amendment is just "make recommendations to Senate Ex Comm for faculty membership on this taskforce." The committee could do the groundwork and then the Senate would just have to approve.
Comment (A Newman): Martin accepts that friendly amendment.

VOTE: Motion to change language to charge to "provide recommendations to FS for a Curricular Flexibility Taskforce with the Provost" is approved, 33 yes, 0 no, 2 abstentions.

Motion (A. Newman): move to approve charge.
Seconded (L. Lawley)

VOTE: Charge #3 "to provide recommendations to FS for a Curricular Flexibility Taskforce with the Provost" is approved, 36 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.

Discussion
Comment: (A Newman): We're now looking at Charge #4.
Comment (S. Malachowsky): I would like to recommend an edit that instead of saying "text generators" we add "image" and other..
Comment (C. Lutzer): Current policy already says "thou shalt not cheat" so I'm going to recommend that we not charge the committee with this since we have an existing policy.
Comment (L Lawley): this is a contested area in, for example, media. If I go to a website and give it prompts and use a program to write this doesn't clearly violate our cheating policies. Things have become much harder when it comes to authorship and ownership.
Comment (S. Johnson):I think the policy discusses outside sources and tools, so the policy should cover it.
A(L. Lawley): but professors don't always know what counts as an acceptable resource. Does Google count?
Sam: we either need to broaden the scope to include all AI tools or eliminate it.
(R. Zanibbi): I want to second what Carl said. There are tools that can generate content, but I think when assignments are given out the assumption is that the person tasked with the assignment is generating the content so I don't know if this helps us much.
(I.Puchades): I don't see any harm because I don't know enough about this area so it would be helpful to know more. We don't have to change the policy.
(R. Zanibbi): If the requirement is clear, why have the conversation?
Q(A.Newman): would someone like to make a motion to edit or strike?

Motion (C. Lutzer): I'd like to make a motion to remove "text."
Seconded (D. Laurie)

VOTE: Change in wording to "Request AAC investigate, report on, and recommend policy on AI generators as cheating tools" is **approved, 29 yes, 1 no, 2 abstentions**.

MOTION (L. Lawley): motion to approve charge
Seconded (L. Hall)

VOTE: Charge #4 "Request AAC investigate, report on, and recommend policy on AI generators as cheating tools" is **approved, 28 yes, 1 no, 3 abstentions.**

Agenda Item No. 11: New Business; A. Newman
Postponed until next meeting.
Agenda Item No. 12: Adjournment; A. Newman (1:49)