

Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, November 17, 2022

12:15 – 1:50 PM

1720/30 Global Cybersecurity Institute

Attendance: See Below

Agenda Item No. 1: Call to Order; A. Newman (12:16)
Meeting called to order
Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; A. Newman (12:16)
VOTE: Agenda is approved by acclamation
Agenda Item No. 3: Communication Officer's Report/Approval of Minutes; L. Hall (12:17)
<p>Update: We need to improve two sets of minutes. The September 1, 8, 15, 29 minutes were already approved, but we had some attendance discrepancies that have been corrected. We'll vote on these in two batches.</p> <p>VOTE: Updated minutes approved by acclamation</p> <p>Next we need to approve the October 13, 20, 27, and Nov. 3 minutes, which were delayed by a combination of OnePayroll and the Comms Officer getting COVID. I move to approve these minutes.</p> <p>Seconded (S. Johnson)</p> <p>VOTE: Minutes approved by acclamation</p> <p>October and November minutes</p>
Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; A. Newman (12:19)
<p>Update: First is the Board of Trustees meeting and there's lots that we learned. From the President's report, something I found interesting is that RIT is one of the only schools that does not provide additional funding to female applicants. Staff turnover is currently around 13% when usually it's 8%, so we're seeing a lot of turnover. ITS is being merged with Institutional Research (IR). They currently have 11 employees and a \$1.5M budget. They are developing and using predictive analytics to create smart campus metrics and maintain operational efficiencies.</p> <p>From our Master Plan they're exploring geothermal and solar options for our future power needs. They also thought parking might not be needed when we all have self-driving cars, which seems a little optimistic.</p> <p>The COACHE survey will be worked on this year, with myself, Sam, and possibly Hamad on the steering committee. It will be led by LaVerne.</p> <p>The Ex-Comm is also collecting policies that need to be reviewed, when they've been reviewed, and so we'll have to look at all these given B.02, that was passed in May. We have a lot of outdated paperwork. We may need a taskforce or something to figure out when all these things were reviewed.</p>

The FSEC has been working on a set of proposed changes to the Senate Charter. We are planning to bring them to you in the coming weeks.

Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; B. Strowe (12:22)

Update: Staff Council's executive council had a meeting with President Munson about how to ensure clear communication on issues like OnePayroll, DEI initiatives, etc. We also shared goals for an equitable work-from-home policies and how they're carried out across divisions. We also need more consistent management training policies, because there's a lot of variation.

We have on the agenda this afternoon a meeting with the staff recruitment and outreach folks on how to cover gaps in staff and faculty coverage.

Finally, we're looking at concerns about RIT Confluence Wiki and how to cover the loss of services when that gets phased out in 2024.

Q (A. Newman): Why are they removing the Wiki?

A (B. Strowe): Our understanding is that classroom and technology support no longer wants to cover that because a lot of this is done with myCourses.

Comment (L. Lawley): I think part of the reason is that departments are using it as a runaround for how hard the website is to update and marketing is concerned about things on the website that aren't properly branded, so I suspect that's really what's going on.

Comment (B. Strowe): People also use this for business administration and processes, so we'll need a new system here to replace those spaces.

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

Update: Lots of events, etc. The MarioKart event was a success. The NTID student representative is asking us to consider events that bring students together and are educational. We're also looking at internal changes in terms of BLANK and what they do. There might be uneven workloads. We're also looking at elections and in the case of infractions ensuring that there's a suitable consequence, including impacts on ability to run.

Agenda Item No. 7: 2022 Diversity and Equity Campus Climate Survey; K. Jenkins and D. Wick (12:28)
Presentation files below

Background: This is only an excerpt of some of the outcomes we focused on. This comes straight from the RIT Action Plan on Race and Ethnicity. If there are questions beyond today's presentation, please reach out.

Background on survey:

Administered in Spring 2022

42 questions, 4 indicators (climate, institutional support, negative remarks, discrimination and harassment)

Response rate across benchmark institutions: 17% UG, 12% G, 33% faculty, 42% staff (dropped further during COVID). RIT: 6.2% UG, 5.4% G, 40% faculty, 44% staff (comparable to benchmark institutions)

Respondents by race/ethnicity: comparable to benchmark institutions

Graduate student rates were very low, so it's a very low N. Hard to draw conclusions.

Major findings:

RIT undergraduates are 4x more likely to identify as nonbinary/transgender as 4 year institutions and more than 2x as likely to identify as LGBTQ+ community.

Nearly 3% of our students identify as liberal compared to 39% at four year.

Overall campus climate: ALANA respondents are about 2x as likely to be dissatisfied with the climate as white respondents. Lowest levels of satisfaction were Black students, staff, and faculty.

Sense of belonging: Lower levels of perceived experience for ALANA respondents. Personal experience is more positive than perceived experience. 94% of ALANA and 92% of white students definitely or somewhat agreed to the statement "I belong at RIT."

Experience with negative remarks: More than 50% of African American/Black respondents had heard negative remarks about race and ethnicity on campus. Most remarks come from students and the local community, with faculty coming in third.

Overall, we find medium effect size differences on 3-4 indicators between ALANA respondents and white respondents. Students have pretty small effect size differences. Staff have larger effect size differences.

RIT respondents reported more frequent interactions with diverse populations than 4 year private institutions across all but two identity groups, with faculty having the highest number of interactions. Comfort level when working with diverse groups, however, is lower than comparison institutions. Faculty and staff report the highest levels of comfort in interactions with diverse populations. 13% of respondents have a combination of low interactions and low comfort with diverse populations. High interaction and low comfort level is mostly students and low interaction and low comfort level is mostly students and staff. Respondents in those lower zones are less likely to have participated in discussions, training, and art/events relating to diversity.

Q (L. Hall): Will there be more detail on the questions on political views? The existing questions made it hard to answer accurately.

A (D. Wick): We will be digging into some of the non-race/ethnicity data, but we do have to be sensitive to N, so we don't parse things out so much that we lose meaning.

Q (I. Puchades): My question was related to low participation as well. It does seem like even though it matched other participation rates, it seems low.

A (D. Wick): We were disappointed too, but this survey was also in competition with other surveys and we also offered it in a COVID year, so we need to avoid diving too deep that meaning is removed from results.

Q (B. Thomas): I think we can do better. We had a survey from OnePayroll that got very good return in a short period of time. If this could go through Senate, Staff Council, and SG, we might increase response rates. I also looked at the survey myself and some of the questions could be reworded because they were unclear. And I had a question on the slide on page 3:

Q (E. Williams): Can you speak about how the results of these surveys are being used for interventions?

A (K. Jenkins): We're guided by the RIT Action Plan on Race and Ethnicity, so we're using this survey to determine priority items in the Action Plan as well as data from the Student Success Steering Committee report. One thing that came out of that survey is more MOSAIC spaces where students of color could come together and feel a sense of belonging. So it's those kinds of targeted approaches we're trying to take.

Q (R. Zanibi): is there anything that faculty can do in the short term?

A (D. Wick): The most common places for students to experience negative experiences was the classroom, followed by housing. So that may be a takeaway for faculty to think about.

Comment (K. Jenkins): One thing that came out is that ALANA students did not like being called on in class to represent their specific population. That doesn't make them feel welcome.

Q (A. Adrion): Do we have evidence that these trends affect our ability to attract and retain ALANA students?

A (K. Jenkins): Yes. We find there is a gap between those who are considering RIT and those who are currently experiencing RIT.

[2022 Campus Climate Survey Results](#)

Agenda Item No. 8:DEIC Report; E. D'Amanda and S. Rothenberg (1:00) *Presentation files below*

See presentation for detailed actions and updates.

Update: We suggested the idea of something called "Faculty Equity Advisors," which would be a faculty member in each college who would then make up the DEIC. The reason I'm bringing this up is that some of the charges would be taken care of if we had Faculty Equity Advisors. We tabled that to discuss more with Keith and LaVerne.

Specific charges:

Charge 1 (Juneteenth) was completed.

Charge 2 (retention of diverse faculty) is still ongoing. Motion to pause plan to require NTT to have terminal degree because of its impact on diverse faculty. We decided to hold this and discuss more with LaVerne and Keith.

Charge 3 (recommend evaluation of service loads) is completed.

Charge 4 (evaluate tokenism in committees/service) is completed (they also suggested faculty activity system)

Charge 6 (gather information on DEI related activities in annual evaluations) not completed, consulting with the Senate on next steps. Some colleges and schools already do this.

Charge 7 (curriculum assessment) is not completed, but a potential consultant has been identified. Please reserve December 9, 1-2:30pm on Zoom (pencil this in, since it's not final).

Charge 8 (coordinate the efforts of DEI actors on campus): Completed.

Comment (L. Lawley): We just passed abbreviated plans of work, so adding additional categories might be an issue and it may not be a reflection on the importance of DEI work.

Q (J. Venkataraman): Charge 6 was not that DEI activity isn't being reported, but the way it's valued by supervisors. So your motion doesn't really address the charge. So the next meeting, May 4, Hamad made the presentation and he withdrew the motion because of all the questions and discussions; we needed to gather more data.

A (S. Rothenberg): We'll need to look at the minutes because we couldn't figure out exactly what happened.

Q (B. Thomas): My question is on charge 3. My assumption is that the activity you're referring to is on campus activity, but a lot of DEI activity and service occurs off campus, so how do you get credit for these activities?

A (B. Dell): The charge itself does specify on-campus activities.

A (L. Williams): We're working on this along with RABC on what an appropriate faculty activity reporting system might work. We're trying to find funding for what a system like this might look like (including replacing the scholarship report) to support tenure, promotion, and merit. We're in very early stages.

Comment (L. Hall): CLA has a new initiative for a DEIA Faculty Fellow, whose job it would be to coordinate a lot of these activities and also be the point person for DEIC, the Office of Diversity, and the Action Plan. So that might be a model for other colleges. I can share that call, if people are interested.

Q (A. Adrian): We're trying to diversify our faculty and in our field in film and animation we're losing really high quality candidates because they have excellent professional experience but not a terminal degree. What's the sticking point?

A (E. Granberg): It's a complicated topic. The percentage of people with a terminal degree is less important than keeping pace with what we're trying to do as an institution. It was ok to have a lot of people without terminal degrees when we were a professional university. But in higher ed broadly, the standard of excellence is a terminal degree. I think it's important that we move toward that, but we can have some flexibility. I'm also very leery of creating a two-tier system where faculty have different qualifications. What we have now is that the Dean has to approve a person without a terminal degree, so there is a process where we could make exceptions, it just means the conversation needs to happen. Tenure-track we're already requiring the check for a terminal degree, so it's mostly in NTT that we're doing this additional step.

Q (E. Williams): In charge 2 you discuss bias in SRATE and I'm wondering if students should undergo unconscious bias training or something similar, the way faculty does.

A (K. Jenkins): RIT365 does some of this, so every student gets exposed to some of that training. We also have diversity theater, etc. I'll yield to students on this.

A (L. Dibble): As far as unconscious bias training, there's concern about engagement in RIT365 that's been brought to SG, so there's concern that students aren't retaining the information that's being presented.

Comment (B. Dell): We did argue that we need to move away from SRATE surveys because of the known bias, so that's part of the conversation too.

(J. Venkataraman): Can you explain why terminal degrees are linked to DEI concerns?

(B. Dell): If you want, for example, a Black applicant in software engineering, you have a lot of options with an MS and very few with a PhD and it's that way across a lot of fields.

[DEIC Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 9: AAC Charge; L. Buckley (1:25) *Link to presentation below*

Background: one of our charges was to find representatives for the taskforce on program flexibility. We've made some recommendations to do that.

Suggestions:

3 Provost Office Representatives (advising, ICC, GEC with REG and EEA as technical advice, not on committee)

2-4 Faculty Senate Representatives (AAC and other Senate bodies that might want to be represented)

Student Affairs Representative (1 College Restoration Program)

2 SG Representatives (At least 2 reps, with more as desired by SG)

Unknown number of college reps including program leadership (SOIS/KGCOE/CET/CHST/COS, others? As well as UG program coordinators?)

We'd like to discuss the process to get actual names on paper.

Q (A. Newman): Does the AAC move to make this the committee makeup?

A (L. Buckley): Yes.

Discussion:

Comment (E. Granberg): In past task forces, it's a joint agreement between the Provost and the Senate; is that what you're thinking? The way we've done it in the past, we've done that I get three who are anyone I want and Senate gets three that are anyone you want, and then we agree on the rest.

Q (J. Faber): How long is the taskforce expected to work? Since a lot of the reps aren't from the Senate, we should be specific about the Senate appointees and vague about the other ones.

A (L. Buckley): I think the goal was to make recommendations at the end of the academic year, if possible.

Q (L. Lawley): Do we need academic advising representation instead of program heads and directors? I would also be more comfortable with this not coming to the Senate without more clarity from the Provost's office. More broadly, I think we need to specify a period of time for task forces. We can always extend the period, but

we have a history of creating ongoing task forces that make it difficult to attract faculty.

Q (L. Hall): Should these people just be Associate Deans from each of the colleges? They report to the Chairs and vice versa.

A (L. Buckley): I would hope they would at least be involved.

Motion (L. Lawley): I would like to move that this be tabled to the next meeting to give people a change to think about their questions, email Larry, etc.

Seconded (L. Hall)

VOTE: Motion is tabled until next meeting by acclamation

[AAC Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 10: At-Large Nomination ASSA; H. Ghazle (1:42)

Background: We're looking for an at-large member for ASSA.

Comment (L. Lawley): As a reminder, part of your Senate duties is to serve on one of our At Large Committees, so Hamad could just look at the list of Senators who are not serving on committees right now and choose someone randomly.

Comment (H. Ghazle): I don't want to keep harassing people, but this year has been very difficult to get nominations and people willing to serve.

Agenda Item No. 11: New Business; A. Newman (1:44)

Comment (J. Venkataraman): To go back to the DEIC charges, I'm concerned because it seems like we're saying that those without terminal degrees are diversity candidates, which is a little offensive.

Comment (A. Newman): So perhaps we need to add more nuance?

Q (J. Venkataraman): I don't see why terminal degrees need to be linked to diversity at all.

A (H. Ghazle): There's much more data in the report, so once that gets sent out I know the DEIC would be happy to look at that. There's more evidence in there than that's being represented on the slide.

Comment (B. Dell): it's just a reality that if you require terminal degrees you dramatically reduce the pool of diverse candidates. It's just a function of the numbers and who has access to advanced degrees..

Comment (M. Anselm): I had a conversation about scheduling students for final exams and I know this came up a few weeks ago, but I have colleagues who are absolutely flustered because they don't have enough time to do what they need to do, so I'm wondering if there might be flexibility.

Comment (H. Ghazle): In our school we arranged with the DSO to have the students go to the office and the DSO will make some recommendations. Talk to the DSO. They've been working with us so far.

Agenda Item No. 12: Adjournment; A. Newman (1:50)

Adjourned

Attendance November 17, 2022

Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended		Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended
Abushagur, Mustafa	KGCOE Senator	x		Malachowsky, Sam	Treasurer, GCCIS Senator	x
Adrion, Amy	ALT CAD Senator (Fall 2022)	x		McLaren, Amy	CAD Senator	X
Aldersley, Stephen	SOIS Senator	x		Newman, Atia	Chair, CAD Senator	x
Anselm, Martin	CET Senator	x		Newman, Dina	COS Senator	x
Babbitt, Gregory	COS Senator	x		Olabisi, Joy	SCB Senator	
Bamonto, Suzanne	CLA Senator			Osgood, Robert	ALT CHST Senator	
Barone, Keri	CLA Senator	Excused		Perez Sanchez, Alejandro	CAD Senator	
Boedo, Stephen	ALT KGCOE Senator			Puchades, Ivan	KGCOE Senator	x
Brown, Tamaira	Senate Coordinator	X		Reed, Mary Lynn	COS Senator	x
Butler, Janine	ALT NTID Senator	X		Reisch, Mark	ALT CAD Senator	
Chiavaroli, Julius	ALT GIS Senator			Ross, Annemarie	ALT NTID Senator	
Crawford, Denton	CAD Senator	X		Shaaban, Muhammad	ALT KGCOE Senator	
D'Amanda, Elisabetta	CLA Senator	X		Sheffield, Jr., Clarence	ALT SOIS Senator	
Deese, Franklin	CAD Senator (Fall 2022)	X		Song, Qian	SCB Senator	
Dell, Betsy	CET Senator	X		Sparkman, Torrence	ALT SCB Senator	
Dibble, Leah	Student Gov't Rep	X		Thomas, Bolaji	CHST Senator	X
Eddingsaas, Nathan	COS Senator	X		Tobin, Karen	NTID Senator	X

Faber, Joshua	COS Senator	x		Tsukernik, Olga	ALT COS Senator	
Fillip, Carol	ALT CAD Senator			Van Aardt, Jan	ALT COS Senator	
Gehret, Austin	NTID Senator	X		Venkataraman, Jayanti	KGCOE Senator	x
Ghazle, Hamad	Operations Officer, CHST Senator	x		Villasmil, Larry	ALT CET Senator	
Gottlieb, Owen	ALT GCCIS Senator			Warp, Melissa	ALT CAD Senator (Spring 2023)	
Granberg, Ellen	Provost	X		White, Phil	ALT GCCIS Senator	
Hall, Lauren	Communications Officer, CLA Senator	x		Williams, Eric	GIS Senator	
Hazelwood, David	NTID Senator	x		Worrell, Tracy	ALT CLA Senator	
Heyman, Emily (sub - Brendan Strowe)	Staff Council Rep.	x		Zanibbi, Richard	GCCIS Senator	x
Hsieh, Jerrie	ALT SCB Senator			Zlochower, Yosef	ALT COS Senator	x
Jadamba, Basca	COS Senator	X				
Johnson, Dan	CET Senator					
Johnson, Scott	GCCIS Senator	x				
Jordan, Anne	Spring 2023 CAD Senator					
Kincheloe, Pamela	NTID Senator	x				
Kiser, Larry	GCCIS Senator	x				
Kray, Christine	CLA Senator	x				
Lapizco-Encinas, Blanca	KGCOE Senator	x				

Laury, Dino	NTID Senator					
Lawley, Elizabeth	Vice Chair, GCCIS Senator					
Lee, James	ALT CET Senator					
Liu, Manlu	SCB Senator	x				
Lutzer, Carl	COS Senator					
Ma, Yunn-Shan	ALT CLA Senator					

Interpreters: Nicole Crouse-Dickerson and Philip Ynzunza

Student Assistant: Paulina Hudspeth

Presenters: Keith Jenkins, David Wick, Elisabetta D'Amanda, Sandra Rothenberg, Larry Buckley