.
Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, February 2, 2023   12:15 – 1:50 PM   1720/30 Global Cybersecurity Institute

Attendance: See Below

Agenda Item No. 1: Call to Order; A. Newman (12:15)
Meeting called to order

Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; A. Newman (12:15)
Motion, I. Puchades. Second, P. White. Approved by acclamation

Agenda Item No. 3: Communication Officer's Report/Approval of Minutes; Aldersley (12:16)
Draft minutes for the meeting of 1/26/23 were sent out on Tuesday, January 31st. One correction was received and the minutes were revised accordingly. S. Aldersley moved to approve the amended minutes. Second, H. Ghazle. Approved by acclamation. January 26, 2023 Meeting Minutes

Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; A. Newman (12:16)

A. Newman apologized for the absence of food, etc., due to mix-up with Panera Bread.   - The COACHE Survey will shortly be sent out to the community. This survey occurs every few years, the last time it was administered being 2019. Senators are asked to encourage their constituents to participate, especially as it will provide a measure of the post-pandemic campus climate.   - The Director of Compensation, Christine Ross, will give a presentation at the Senate's 2/16 meeting.   - On 2/23, the Senate meeting will be replaced by a Senate Committee Member mixer to which both the President and the Provost have been invited.   - It has been determined that the MyCourses contract will be renewed in 2024. However, faculty are being surveyed as to their satisfaction with MyCourses and the results will determine the length of the renewal. So far 159 responses have been received. Senators are asked to encourage their constituents to participate.   • H. Ghazle recommended that the survey be re-sent, since several senators noted they have not
 	
       received a copy   - It was announced at University Council, that 99% of the $1 billion development campaign has been received, $15 million (later corrected to $150 million) is in the form of research monies and gifts. A total of $120 million has been allocated to student and faculty support.   • B. Thomas: Has the $120m been spent or simply earmarked? What does it mean?
      • A. Newman: I didn't have the opportunity to ask. I will find out.
      • R. Zanibbi: Some of it is intended to support the creation of endowed chair positions
      • A. Newman: Two positions have been funded. My understanding is that the University is hoping
     for four more. Funding comes from the Board of Trustees, and includes federal and state money.
      • S. Boedo: I'm curious as to what is happening with the other $880m?

• A. Newman: That they did not share, but it's a good question.

Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; B. Strowe (12:21)

- ·Staff Council held a closed in-person meeting on 1/19/23 at which reps discussed ideas for how staff might become more involved in planning and institutional operations, as well as how to improve staff morale.
- The Controller's Office announced new training workshops as a result of SC feedback so that staff can better help with financial planning in different departments across campus.
- The Director of Compensation, Christine Ross, will attend the Council meeting this afternoon to discuss compensation and wage bands.

Agenda Item No. 6: Student Government Update; L. Dibble (12:22)

- Student Government had to re-vote on a couple of topics when it was discovered there wasn't a quorum when people had to leave.
- We voted in a new chair and new members to the Elections Committee, making sure that elections are fair, and we confirmed two other committee chairs.

Agenda Item No. 7: ICC - BS in Women's, Gender, & Sexuality Studies (WGSS); H. Nickisher (12:26)
Presentation file below

- H. Nickisher reported that no comments had been received on the BS program in Women's, Gender, & Sexulaity Studies program that she present at the 1/26 meeting of the Senate and moved to vote on the motion to approve. Second, R.Ulin. Motion passed 28:1 with 1 abstention

ICC - BS in Women's, Gender, & Sexuality Studies (WGSS) Presentation

Agenda Item No. 8: Diversity Education Module; T. Smith (12:29)

- T. Smith, Director of Diversity Education and the Division of Diversity and Inclusion presented a proposed module on Diversity Education which was envisioned in the university's Race and Ethnicity Action Plan. Once the module is finalized, all faculty, staff and students will be required to go through it on an annual basis in the same way that the Cybersecurity module is currently required. He has made a similar presentation to student and staff groups and is asking for feedback. The module begins by addressing the question: Why does diversity matter? It then moves on to a review of some basic terms, before describing where one can go to find support or advocacy and what specific programs exist on campus that support this work. Next, it addresses some relevant basic skills and common language and then discusses intercultural communication and common biases. Finally, it focuses on allyship and the meaning of a supportive community. The module will end with a short interactive quiz. The goal is to have thje module ready for the start of the academic year in the fall.

  • I. Puchades: I think this is very useful, but why will it be mandatory? Is the campus known for a lack of inclusivity?

  • T. Smith: I've worked at many other colleges, businesses and organizations and they all should be invested in this kind of work, just for the basic principle of we're all different. We all come from different places. So we learn how to communicate differently. Taking our deaf and hard of hearing population for example, if we didn't grow up knowing deaf individuals, when we came to RIT we had to learn new things to engage with that population on campus.

  • E. Lawley: Will this be like the other modules and we will need to complete it every year?

  • T. Smith: Yes.

  • B. Strowe: I would like to comment that a couple of Staff Council members have tried out a prototype of the module and we have received a lot of positive feedback.

  • S. Malachowsky: What is the source of the material in the module?

  • T. Smith: There are industry standards we have followed, plus our own experience and the feedback on the pilot project that we have received so far. We are working to make it accessible as far as reading level is concerned.

  • G. Babbit: I have noticed in the past that a lot of these modules are not very easily accessible by visually impaired people. Is anybody thinking about a way to make this accessible, not just to the visually impaired, but also maybe other types of neurodiversity?

  • T. Smith: Yes, right now we are trying to finish the content, but we will definitely be looking at that in the next round of development. We're not using software we've designed ourselves, but to the best of our ability, we will try to address that sort of accessibility issue.

  • K. Barone: Can you talk about any mechanisms that are used to test the efficacy of these types of modules? I'm just wondering what types of metrics you're looking at to measure the success of the module?

  • T. Smith: We will have to formally develop something. There isn't a whole lot out there to my knowledge in terms of measurement standards, but we will be looking into that.

  • I. Puchades: What is the length of time for people to go through the module?

  • T. Smith: Around an hour. What I'm finding thus far from our limited feedback is that some of the student leaders we've talked to they want more information and employees, faculty and staff want less information. So I find that interesting.

  • K. Tobin: Can you make the module available in an ASL video?

  • T. Smith: The software we're using does not allow for videos. We'll have to discuss other alternatives for that.

  • I. Puchades: Could you make the content different for different populations, like one module for faculty, and one for students? One for younger and older generations?

  • T. Smith: I think that's worth considering. What we're trying to do is build a foundational knowledge while making sure everybody gets the same information. This module isn't the be all and end all. People should still be engaged in professional development. I offer workshops for all employees. So it is not this isn't going to do everything. I think a lot of some of those nuances need more time than what this module allows for.

  • A. Newman: On that note, if anybody has any further questions, please reach out to Taj and discuss your questions with him directly. And now we will move to the next item on the agenda.

Agenda Item No. 9: RABC Report; B. Hartpence (12:45) *Presentation files below*

- B. Hartpence, chair of the Resource Allocation and Budget committee of the Senate resumed his mid-year report from the previous week's Senate meeting. He began by reviewing the committee's charges, including enhancing transparency, Activity-Based Budgeting (ABB), developing an RABC Operations Manual and the 03.0, governing Intellectual Property. After showing a definition of ABB, he described the function of the Technical Working Group (TWG), chaired by Sue Provenzano. The TWG's charge is to recommend budgetary models to the Provost, who has indicated an up or down decision on implementation of ABB by the end of the semester. The chief issue surrounding ABB is the formula or the model that's finally chosen. Now there are those that say that the colleges get a certain amount of money and after you pay for all the things that are unavoidable, like salaries, the amount of leftover money may not so it's not really a big deal. On the other hand, depending on the model that's adopted, because we have such variation between colleges, there might be a significant impact.
- A related issue is transparency. I've been on the RBC before and whenever you ask for information from the Administration, sometimes folks will say, "we'll get back to you", or sometimes your email goes into a black hole and there is no answer forthcoming. In other words, it's very difficult to get information. Now I don't know to what extent the TWG itself has access to all the information that's necessary to evaluate the various models but on the RABC it's certainly never been my experience. And when we talk to other folks it's the same thing. So it's related to transparency and it's not something that appears to be improving. We really have to pull teeth to get some details about some issues that we're charged to review. So right now we do have a transparency group that is looking at these sorts of issues. It's easy to say, "well, there's a technical working group that's out there, let them handle it." But maybe we ought to see if we can actually get access to the data so that we can ask informed questions about the model that's been developed. And, then this will be sort of a litmus test as to whether or not we can get the information that we actually need to function as an RABC.
- So this is the kind of thing we're working through. We've met with Dr. Waters. We're trying to get another date to meet with him. He was very willing to chat about current issues, but of course, but we rarely hear the motivation for a project, or the details behind it, so there's always a lot of questions unanswered and this comes right back to transparency and ABB again.
- I mentioned we're developing an Operations Manual. The goal is to help new RABC members with the
  - onboarding process at the beginning of the year.
- So, in conclusion, there are lots and lots of issues that come up. For example, across the campus, we have a couple of buildings going up, that may or may not pay for themselves. So that's an interesting question, right? We hope that the ABB process doesn't suffer from the same transparency issues, that it doesn't become like the One Payroll issue. So we're trying to be a little proactive and say well, what would be good questions to ask the provost? And when we finally sit down with her, and she says, here's the model, we can ask informed questions and maybe get some solid feedback to the provost. And also learn what we can say to other stakeholders. So lots and lots and lots of things. Lots of things that we worry about. Lots of things also that we're not sure that we can do anything about.
- The last thing I'll mention today is policy C 3.0, governing intellectual property. This is a policy that has been due for review for the last two years but there's never been time to take it up. Apparently there's an issue that came up recently in Imaging Science that is directly impacted by the policy. Discovery is underway. This is something that we've just picked up this semester.
- Thank you. Are there any questions?
  - E. Lawley: Is there any budget-related information that the RIT Administration automatically provides to RABC without your having to ask for it?
  - B. Hartpence: I'm glad you asked that question. The short answer is no. We are always in the process of asking for information. One of the goals for the operation manual is to say, well, there are places you can go to find information. But when you're presented with an issue, you don't always know what information you need, or where to get it. On top of that, from what I understand, the budgetary process that is in place right now has changed quite a bit over the last couple of years. There used to be a give and take feedback loop. Prospective budgets would flow up from departments to the dean and then back down. This is not the way it happens now.
  - E. Lawley: That was going to be my next question. The RABC chair used to be invited to participate in some of this process and together with the Chair of Faculty Senate would attend the budget hearings, both to listen and provide input, but apparently that is no longer the case.
  - B. Hartpence: Even last year, for example, we participated in an on-line budget presentation and

we asked for a copy of the material but we weren't given it. It's kind of silly having to rely on screenshots over and over again.

      • B. Strowe: Regarding the ABB project, are there any plans to potentially implement it in other areas of the university besides Academic Affairs that might affect staff as well?

      • B. Hartpence: At this point the review is limited to the Academic Affairs side of the house. Whether it will affect what they do on the other side of the house is unclear to me.

      • B. Strowe: Do you know if it's going to affect departments that are in some way affiliated with Academic Affairs?

      • B. Hartpence: The big issues concern the colleges and the departments, but of course anybody under Academic Affairs, for example, staffing positions that might not be directly attached to a college will also be theoretically impacted. But again, everything is in the form of the model that goes forward.

      • H. Ghazle: The first question I have, C3 has some other other policies that are linked to it, intellectual property, copyright, so in other words, 3.0, 3.1, 3.2, somehow they are related. So maybe a possibility if you get on somehow I mean probably it's going to be that one.

      • B. Hartpence: Yes, I think so. So we can look at the policy. We can say, Oh, yes, that's a good policy. We should maybe fix this or fix that, but we don't know yet motivation behind the request for the review or what the actual issue at hand is. So that's what we're doing in the discovery.

      • H. Nickisher: One of the charges that ICC has is to look at policies, specifically D.1, curriculum development, having to do with course duplication. Could ABB be relevant there?

      • B. Hartpence: If we say, well, we're going to focus on credit hours generated or FTE, you can emphasize one of those and deemphasize the other, but it might encourage folks to develop courses that duplicate courses in other colleges, so that they can get the budget the next year. Hopefully, that will be factored in. But yes, that is an acknowledged concern, and has come up before it.

      • R. Zanibbi: So in terms of I think it was three point something, there was a sub-policy that was evaluated, I believe Senate approved changes, because there were concerns about faculty ownership of online materials created during COVID. So that's not D, but I think it was there and I should really, let me check on that and get back to you.

      • E. Lawley: That was 3.1.

      • B. Hartpence: If anyone has any information, send me an e-mail and we'll include that in our review.

      • E. Lawley: I just want to follow up a little bit on that because there is supposed to be an Institute intellectual property policy committee. Based on the website it looks like the last person who served on it was appointed for 2004 to 2010. So it seems a little out of date, which is not surprising to me, because unless there's oversight, people tend to forget to ask us for input. So I would suggest that the executive committee should look into whether or not this committee exists. And since it's specified in policy, if it doesn't exist, it ought to exist really soon with someone from this body as a representative on it, and hopefully that will give you feedback into the things that you're looking at.

      • A. Newman: Thank you Bruce. Next, we have another returning topic with Clyde Hull and potential changes to the RIT semester schedule.

[RABC Report Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 10: Potential Changes to the RIT Semester Schedule; C. Hull (1:01) *Presentation files below*

● Maybe we can start here and take a little bit longer, but I do want to make sure we leave plenty of time for Scott's stuff. We talked to the provost and the provost seems to like the proposal, but is not committed to any of the specific options regarding whether or not we have Labor Day and so forth, but the general outline? Yes. We had a comment on the issue of our spring break and public school spring break. The provost has been thinking about that and one possibility is that we might be able to move our

spring break for one week, one way or the other, that is, if that allows it to increase the odds of landing on public school breaks. So we might actually be able to fix that a little bit more. But if Easter is like, Week 11 or Week 12, or Week 2, then we're not going to do that. But if it's like, Week 8 or 9, we shouldn't have a lot of situations where they're just one week apart. Hopefully, if that flies, that was a nice thing that came out of the meeting with the provost. I also did get some feedback, but we are not looking for a vote today. What we're doing here is sharing work in progress for input from Senate before the work is finished, so as to avoid coming back to you at some point and saying, "Hi, we are done. Please vote 'yes'. And don't ask any questions." So now would be a really good time to give us feedback. So we got feedback from one person who said five days of exams is not long enough. I respectfully disagree, but we will be sharing that with the committee at the next meeting. So further feedback would be welcome. My college meeting was a couple of days ago and we discussed this. So the feedback there if I can click forward to the options. This slide is very popular. It's my favorite slide in the presentation. It was their favorite slide as well. Brendan, I don't know if Staff Council has discussed this yet. I know you guys were planning to discuss it, but the staff in my college seem to have a preference for keeping Labor Day. So maybe Option Two, so we can still have Labor Day. But basically any option that allows us to have Labor Day off was was most popular with the staff in our college. But that was like three or four people out of a room that had more people in it that I'm with right now. So one of the things that I'm thinking is maybe it'd be possible for Faculty Senate to survey the faculty and for Staff Council to survey the staff and for Student Government to survey the students to see what they think about these different options. I don't think the calendar committee should be doing stuff like that. Now, I wouldn't say do that this week, because as a committee, we haven't met yet. And we're getting input already. It might turn out that one of these options is just not possible. Or a fourth option might come to the table. For example, if you have a fourth option in mind then email it to me and it will come to the table. So I'm going to stop now because I want input.

    • E. Lawley: Thank you, and thank you, Joe. This is not the first time that these things have been discussed in Senate. I clearly recall the conversation when we went the other way, to not have classes on Labor Day, because for most of my time here at RIT, we did have classes on Labor Day. So we've already had that lengthy discussion and surveying of faculty. It was absolutely clear that staff wanted Labor Day. And the majority of faculty wanted to start classes on Labor Day because of the issue if you start classes on Tuesday, for classes that have lab setups and things like that, it shifts everything in a problematic way. So from an institutional memory standpoint, we've had this conversation, and the conversation flipped. Now at the time, one of the big arguments was that having classes on Labor Day was a financial burden, because we had to pay holiday pay to staff on those days. What didn't get discussed at the time was that there was an October holiday. And so if the idea is that we swapped those holidays, then I assume the financial impact is then blunted, right. So I just wanted to make sure that that context was there, because this is not a new discussion. But I have to say I am immensely impressed with what came out of these discussions and with Joe's ability to be flexible in this because this is one of the best things I've seen on calendar in many years.

    • C. Hull: On behalf of the whole committee, thank you. Joe heard that I had called him the Mighty Joe Loffredo last week, and now he's actually seen me doing it!

    • E. Lawley: Joe knows how unusual it is for me to heap praise on people in the Senate.

    • C. Hull: This may be the first time I've seen you do that. I was also there for the last discussion and I remember these things of which you speak. I also remember arguing on the same side as you. I don't remember us being against this specifically but against some things that happen that maybe we can't undo.

    • B. Thomas: I have two questions. First, I'd like to discuss this with our constituents. Are you okay if we send the presentation to our colleagues?

    • C. Hull: I think that anything that goes to Senate is fair game. If we send you slides, it's very fair game for you to share with your constituents. And in my college, my slides have already been shared. Now Scott's stuff might be a little bit earlier in development. Ask him separately about his because, you know, that's at a different stage with this. But this, yes, by all means, please do share with your constituents. Do a presentation in your college. And then let us know what you think.

    • B. Thomas: My next question has to do with when classes end. For colleges that have programs where students have to go out to the hospitals or through the facilities, I'm not sure how their ability to be attached to hospitals for their clinical training and other things will be impacted. So that's my concern, really. So I would suggest that you reach out to the people who run those programs directly.

    • C. Hull: I will return to Liz's point that a lot of this is just going back to stuff we've done before. So

the summer would still be the same length. The summer where we actually make the transition will be one week longer because classes will be starting one week later. So we'll have one extra week of summer for the one year. After that summer is the exact same length every year. And I particularly recall that this is actually not so good for me personally because my middle child was born on the day of commencement, close to 12 years ago. And as it happened, she was born after commencement, so I did commencement, went home and took my wife to the hospital, and the baby happened. But she hasn't had a birthday anywhere close to commencement ever since. So we're still in the ballpark of where it has been traditionally. So hopefully it will work because we're just reverting to what we used to do before, five years ago and definitely they'll have the same amount of time before the semester starts. I will also say that we would be finishing more like most of the other universities out there if we do this. We are currently one of the earliest ones to stop and one of the earliest ones to start. So we will be more like industry standard, if you will, if we make this change.

    • B. Dell: So, 100% supportive of the spring break idea, aligning it, but you should be aware that the spring breaks within our region do not align with it.

    • C. Hull: So my understanding is that, in general, public schools tend to either have their break before or after Easter. So if moving it by one week puts us contiguous with Easter and it wouldn't be otherwise. Then we can move it a week, and then some people will get that break and other people won't. But if we never move it, then the our odds go from zero to like 5%. If we can move it then our odds go from like zero to more like 30 or 40%, which is better.

    • B. Dell: So, good to see that you've thought of that. Regarding the long January break, just a perspective of a parent of RIT students. That is a long break for college students. They may think they would like it, but from having RIT students in my house for a whole month who don't really have time to find jobs. That's just a perspective I would like to share. And then the other thing with Labor day, you say that faculty were really in support of it, I'm someone that work life balance, Labor Day, having my husband take my kids to the family picnic was very difficult. And so I would hope, in support of work life balance, that that day we continue to have no classes. And then also, I don't know if commencement will ever wind up on Memorial Day weekend again, with pushing it out? But that was another issue.

    • C. Hull: No, it will not. I know this because the Mighty Joe Loffredo said so. On the other one, I think that might be one of the reasons why it'd be a good idea to survey the faculty, the staff and the students again to see where we land now. Now that we've tried it, maybe some people that didn't want it, like it now. Maybe some people who wanted it don't want it anymore. Let's find out what our constituents actually want and then hopefully do that, whatever that is.

    • A. Newman: Okay, thank you so much Clyde.

Calendar Presentation

Agenda Item No. 11: Potential Changes in Class Schedule; S. Johnson (1:15) *Presentation files below*

- So this wasn't really something that officially was coming out through the committee but came as a result of the committee. Some of the options we're trying to do is I was trying to do a four day week and when we missed Monday, we would do it on Friday, that sort of thing. So the whole idea of changing MWF to MW came as a result of me trying to manipulate the schedule. So this isn't something we've really vetted a lot through the committee at this point. This is more of I want to get your idea before I push it through.
- All right. So as I mentioned last time, these are the current schedules. MWF are 50 minute classes, and then at a certain point in the day they change to 75 minute classes, I think that's around 3pm. And TR are 75 minutes, twice a week with 15 minutes in between unlike MWF, when they're 50 minutes three times a week with 10 minutes in between. So my idea was to change MWF to a MW format, and follow the TR schedule. You get your 15 minutes in between, you get your 75 minutes twice a week. Fridays become lab studios or whatever your four credit classes still can be run three days a week. There will be timeframes and they're in classes typically according to policy on Friday, I believe stop before the

evening. I forget how early they stop but they stop before the evening. So it was only really the first five or six slots that were actually MWF. After that, they became MW anyway. So there were no Friday evening classes technically. There were some rules broken there, but at least from my department, we do have a four credit course that runs MWF and MTR for two hours and it messes up time blocks. But we can't avoid that because we don't have enough labs to do it just two, three days a week. So we are aware that there's going to be exceptions to this and exceptions already exist. So if you were to look at these side by side and don't mind my photoshopping I literally just took MWF away and just copied the first half of this, over to the MW that already exists. There is a MW that exists and afterwards the evening begins at the bottom. It becomes MW only.

- These are the different patterns that RIT currently has for classes. So when you select a class, you can select one of these patterns. And there's more off to it. There's like 12 patterns if I remember, only cut off the ones that were really needed for today.
- The first pattern here if you look is for the MW 50 minute classes. The next pattern is for the TR classes. The next pattern is for MTWF. If you look at that, it's just the different patterns that you could select for your class. So these are the patterns you could select for MWF currently, until this time slot, and then it becomes MW. So I've got everyone on the same page now with how the chart looks? If you have more questions on this, you can always email me.

    • H. Ghazle: Very often more flexibility occurs after four o'clock, right? After four o'clock classrooms open up.

    • I. Puchades: So,looking at the chart, you're going from eight time slots to five time slots.

    • S. Johnson: When you do the math, you lose two time slots going from MWF to MW.

    • S. Boedo: I have two questions. You haven't really provided a really good rationale why you want to do this. Regardless of that, at least our Department of Mechanical Engineering, we have about 1,000 students. We would need significant resources to see if we could actually do this. We did a preliminary study many years ago and found that maybe some students would be taking six straight hours of classes but that was a very preliminary study when we did semester conversion. I think from our department, and maybe from our college, we would just need more time.

    • S. Johnson: I'm not saying we're going to do this right now.

    • S. Boedo: I know that but I'm just just saying that there is already a concern among our faculty. I brought this up briefly before I came to this meeting. So they are they're very concerned about it. The other question I had was tied to the calendar stuff. Many of us were here during calendar conversion to semesters. We started at 15 and a half weeks, we went to 15, then we went to 14 and a half. Then we ended up at 14. Then we moved days around. We've had this discussion as Liz has said, and we have come to this relatively happy, somewhat functional sort of compromise, that seems to work reasonably well. It's not perfect. How would you think, if we're talking about changes again to the calendar, and many of these questions are the same questions that came up seven, eight years ago. I had exactly the same questions eight years ago. What are your thoughts on that? Going forward and thinking about making any change?

    • S. Johnson: Okay, so the reason why the committee was actually put together is we're required to review the policy every five years. And as part of this, I started looking through the policy, and we were getting some feedback like the extra week that staff wanted. So that made us look at the calendar. I heard from some people that they didn't like the dangling Monday, so we looked at that, some people didn't like the whole idea that the finals were split over two weeks, and you know, with the weekend in between, so we tried to look at all of these ideas and make something that worked for a lot of the comments we were getting, and it was not easy to do. But it was a part of the process of actually looking at the calendar and doing the review that required us to look through this. So every five years we have to do this. Whether we decide to make no changes or not. We still had to look at it. So we came up with a way to take in what staff was saying and what we were hearing in general from faculty and there was a survey that went out a couple of years ago for faculty feedback on the calendar. So we looked at some of that information. And we tried to determine what faculty wanted, how to help staff, how to help students, and this is what we came up with. It may be that we decide not to do this. We may decide to keep the calendar exactly the way it is. But our job was to try and solve some of these issues that people were bringing up to us. Not the MW thing but the regular calendar that Clyde

talked about. That was our way to try and solve those issues.

• C. Hull: If I can just supplement that. Scott referred to the data. We had an overwhelming number of faculty members say 'make winter break longer'. And the only people who said don't make winter break longer said 'I would like a longer winter break but you can't make it longer, so let's make summer shorter but I don't want summer to be shorter.' So we summarize that as, 'make winter break longer, but don't make summer shorter.' So this is based on huge number of people saying we want this. Basically nobody is saying keep it exactly the way it is. So we have some reason to think the faculty prefer changes.

• A. Newman: We have a long list of people waiting to ask questions so I'm going to start bringing up the names from everyone who raised their hands earlier.

• J. Venkataraman: I have two questions. One on meeting times, and one on the calendar. Making MW the same pattern as TR. The four-credit hour classes which we have in engineering and our math and science courses are like that, too. So you said that exceptions could be made. Will exceptions be made for MW two-hour blocks for these classes?

• S. Johnson: I believe exceptions are being currently made for those two-hour block classes even on TR. Like my department has a class that meets MTR for two hours.

• J. Venkataraman: If that kind of accommodation is made, then I guess because as you said before in your previous presentation, TR are very competitive days, because people like that block. So I do agree with that. And we have to cram all our graduate classes into TR and try to find slots. So it does lessen that burden, but we would like the option of exceptions for the four-credit hours.

• S. Johnson: Joe's here and we'll talk about this further. We just passed this idea around in the commission really quickly. But I wanted to get faculty feedback on whether they want this to happen before I push the idea and there there are exceptions we will have to talk about. Like in our MW classes like I said in CS we have MWF classes, and we have MTR two-hour classes. So all of our intro courses have lecture on Monday for two hours and then either MW or TR, they have two-hour labs. So we already break the patterns. Yeah, we mess our rooms all up. I'm sure our scheduling officer loves it. Because we not only reserve the lab but the room as well. Because we do recitations in the room while half the class is doing labs. So things are all over the place.

• J. Venkataraman: My calendar question. I'd like to propose a mix and match of Options One, Two and Three and have an Option Four. Other than that, why do we have to change the start and end times which as Steve pointed out are functioning well for our students. When they graduate in May it's a week earlier. They either take employment or take the two weeks grateful for their next employment. So that was one of the things raised the last time when it was moved back. So if you can put those three options with the same start and end dates, that would be good I think. Then the five day exam, it looks nice and clean on the calendar same five days. But if we look at what we have presently, students have two weekends to study. That is, before the exams start there is a weekend. They have that, plus Reading Day, the three days of exam, then another weekend before another three days of exam. So to fit it all into one block with them just having one weekend to study seems kind of cruel. It's just back to back to back, doing exams the whole week. It may look nice and clean, but I think it is better for the students to have those two weekends.

• S. Johnson: Part of the issue of starting later is so in the fall we can start later in the spring and still have a break and not coincide with starting on Martin Luther King Jr. Day. As soon as we do that and we have to take that day off, the whole dangling Monday comes back, which extends the whole semester out again, which kind of throws the whole idea out the window of having the same length summer. So the reason why we shifted a week ahead for the fall is so we can start a week later in the spring to avoid that extra day. As soon as we add that extra day, then we have to add Reading Day after it and then the exams span two weeks, therefore making summer shorter, therefore we then have to re mix everything up again. And it kind of blows the whole pattern out of the window. It's hard to make all of this work by moving just one piece. If we take one piece away, a lot of this just crumbles on itself. There was a little quite a bit of planning to get this to work exactly the way it is.

• C. Kray: I have a question related to the calendar issue. Can you address what the motivation for change is? And I just want to add a couple of things. Ten minutes between classes is really, really difficult for the captionists, so I love the 15 minutes. The question was also asked, we had trouble the

last time around having enough classrooms, right? But we now have more classrooms than we did the last time we were making decisions about the calendar, because the buildings that are being built. So with more classrooms, it could be possible.

• S. Johnson: Not necessarily.

• C. Kray: But then we're also teaching more online, so that might free up some classrooms. So the picture might look different than it was, you know, five years ago. Then the question I had related to the options for the calendar. You said Option One allows us to start the week of Labor Day. Does that mean Options Two and Three force us to start the week before Labor Day?

• C. Hull: No. Joe catch me if I say anything wrong, please. We would start that week regardless. But if we start on Labor Day it's a full week and I think that gets us down to maybe one partial week, no two partial weeks, as opposed to you know, we'll have more partial weeks if we take Labor Day off. But we would start that week. It's just a question of do we start on a Monday or later in the week. Tuesday?

• S. Johnson: There will be a couple of years where we do start the week before Labor Day, just to balance it out. Where Christmas like kinda lies. So we may have to start the last week of August. There may be a few years. And that commonly happens in the calendar now. We don't always start around the same time. There's some years where we have to re-balance things out and start either sooner or later. And that's where we were able to get the extra week for winter break this year. We could start a little bit sooner.

• G. Babbitt: I want to clarify. It sounds like departments with lots of wet labs would be able to have flexibility given the setups of wet labs and the staffing of it and the load on equipment and things like that it really couldn't ever be done in one day. That's pretty flexible under this? And the other thing I have a concern about is, it was brought up earlier as kind of just having students run through lab after lab after lab on a single day seems pretty taxing.

• S. Johnson: There's more to that chart, if you're talking about this one, than what's shown here. There are several patterns and I think there are some lab-based classes that fall into the other patterns. So with the pattern I'm looking at here the change only applies to three credit courses that meet for one hour three times a week, MWF. If they're the other patterns of classes. I think there's a pattern further on this chart that is meant for 4-credit and other courses. There's several columns to this chart I just didn't want to display it and take away from everything that's just being changed here.

• R. Ulin: I want to encourage you to move on with the 75 Minute option. The reason is that there have been some real changes in pedagogy over the years, certainly in the humanities and social sciences. We do far less lecture than used to be the case. And there's more a tendency to make classrooms student- centered, have lots of discussion, to do small group work, and so that's just much more feasible in a 75-minute class than in a 50-minute class. So I really like that you're raising the issue of making MW parallel to what happens TR. I think that's a good thing.

• S. Johnson: I am teaching in the beta shed this semester. And I do 100% active learning in my classes, no lecture. I do that in all my classes. I don't lecture in class anymore. I record videos and everything's activity-based in class now and the 75-minute pattern works well. But my other section this semester that is 50 minutes, I do the activity the first day, then what do I do the second day compared to the class that I have 75 minutes to do an activity with? Do I stop them part of the way through and continue here? It just becomes easier if I can find my MW the same as my T,R especially with the active learning stuff. Having only 50 minutes to handout 120 activities, collect 120 activities meet with 25 groups, in 50 minutes, even with a second instructor, is almost impossible. Not to mention we've gotten nastygrams saying we must end class in the shed on time and get our students out of there because you have to get 150 out and 150 in in 10 minutes and compound that with five rooms in the shed that size and two elevators.

• S. Malachowsky: Is our student government representative here? Because I've talked to some students, this is something that comes up, I mean, they love the Towers of Power, right. And one of the things I kind of asked was, well, what would you be more willing to get rid of your Towers of Power if you could, you know, spread them out over two more days instead of three more days and, and many students were okay with that. That was actually only spreading about one more day. The other thing that I wanted to address that we haven't really talked so much is things like Senate. So we have a

meeting on Thursdays at 12:15. Do you think there would be an implication or a plan to move most meetings to Friday or has that been considered at all by the committee?

    • S. Johnson: That was one of my considerations for coming up with this that we wouldn't as faculty just get Friday off. Friday, it could be days for office hours, could be days for meetings, department meetings, research stuff, things of that nature. So you'd be less likely to teach on a Friday unless you taught the special lab-based courses and studios and things of that nature. So it would open up. I had to leave my class early to get here for Faculty Senate today. And that's not fair to my students. Fortunately, I have a second instructor who could take over for me but still it's not fair to my students that I have to leave early to get here. But yes, that was considered. One of my considerations was it wouldn't just be a day off for faculty. It would be a day to do other stuff.

    • J. Faber: On behalf of the College of Science senators, I've been collecting some feedback from various people, which I'll send by email rather than go to it now. The question I had for the MW plan. Math in particular, we have exceptions to the rules and exceptions to the exceptions, and a lot of things that don't fit into this blocking already. Is it feasible in some ways to move some courses to the new plan while leaving some on the MWF plan? I know that that's complicated.

    • S. Johnson: I don't know if that's possible. But what you're going to end up having is if you use a room from 8:00 am to 9:00 am on MWF, that room is now not going to be available for a MW version until 9:30. So that room is now empty. Is there a possibility that we could schedule only rooms that are for MWF? That would not be part of what I could decide.

    • C. Hull: Can I add to that? So two things. One is I noticed that Joe looked up when you started asking what's possible, what's not, so he might want to answer this as well. But the other thing that occurs to me is if you look at a pattern like this, I'm assuming that you'd be thinking about a bunch of classes. If you take two MW blocks, and fill them with three classes, then we're not leaving rooms sitting empty for a long time in between, and you probably have enough classes to do that. So I think that that might be a solution in any colleges that want to do something like that.That might also help alleviate the whole we're missing two time slots thing because now we're kind of missing like 1.8 time slots and leave the rest in there.

    • J. Loffredo: I think this is a great conversation, but I would humbly request that we should try to separate it though from the calendar. We might fast-track the calendar, because this is going to take a lot more work. And the worst case scenario, we're losing 50% of our time blocks, which means 50% of our classrooms, that's about 18 general purpose class rooms. So we've got to be really be careful about the resource implications.

    • P. White: It's just a comment more than a question. One of the things you mentioned that I think has been sort of slipping, and it actually has ramifications for MW on the calendar. If a Friday was off, you said you could make it a week we wanted to give Monday off from school, we could just make Monday into Friday. I know it doesn't quite work out – it becomes whatever, Monday-Friday day. I can't come up with a clever term for it.

    • S. Johnson: I call it Funday. I can handle that question and we discussed this and Joe had mentioned that it is not possible to make Fridays completely off mainly because of some of the things Jayanti has mentioned those special lab days, those studios, things of that nature which cannot be condensed into those other days. There's just not the space or the time to do it. So, yes, we thought about that and we could not make it work.

    • R. Zanibbi: So what is the significance of the 70 days? Why can't we just take Labor Day and MLK off? I know that for wet labs and things like that, there might be some workarounds that are needed, but I know institutions where you just started on Tuesdays and nobody said everybody has to get exactly the same number of days.

    • S. Johnson: Well, the one day a week classes might be a little difficult if you only have a Monday night class for three hours. Where do you make up that extra lecture?

    • R. Zanibbi: Other places I've been they would squeeze something in.

    • S. Johnson: What happens now in the fall when you lose two of those?

    • E. Lawley: Richard, for classes where there's a lot of physical setup, moving a lab to the next week creates a lot of difficulty for them. That was one of the big issues.

    • K. Tobin: MW, did you contact the interpreting coordinators? Because we're barely keeping up

now.

> • S. Johnson: A member of our committee is from those services and access services is one of my issues. They tend to want two people for 75 minutes and one person for 50 minutes a lot of the time and now we would actually need more people. But I have a student this semester who's actually in my class who doesn't have interpreting services that need them because they're already short staffed.

> • C. Hull: I'd like to just really fast one last point about this. It hasn't come up as an equity issue. We represent all of the faculty. Many people here are full professors and you know very senior on the totem pole, and just go, 'give me TR classes' and get them. But we represent untenured faculty, we represent lecturers and so forth, who don't get to have that benefit. But if you look to see who's getting them, you know, it's the people with the clout getting TR and the people who don't have clout are being shoved in but we represent those people too. So when you're thinking about whether we want to have more MW classes, and on Fridays? It's not just the students who would like that. It's also some of your constituents who maybe don't speak up much in public.

> • H. Ghazle: There's something that's hidden. Maybe among your the reasons why you're suggesting this is lack of adequate classrooms. We're don't have enough classroom on this campus to accommodate all the courses that we're teaching and all these sections. So on that slide, it might be beneficial to put a bullet there because there are some people who may need to come to Joe and ask him for exceptions. We have to fill out these exception forms for certain slots, because we don't have enough classrooms. And at the same time, I would say, is better utilization of our classrooms.

> • S. Johnson: You would think that since we're getting all these classrooms in Wallace and the Shed, but actually, from what I understand, the classroom swap-over is going to be a wash with the same number of classrooms that we currently have, even with that open, because we're losing classrooms for labs.

> • R. Zanibbi: Just quickly related to that. One thing that I've heard mentioned multiple times, last time we did this work, we'll be able to have classrooms. Enrollment has increased by what? 1000s, right? So unless the number of rooms has increased proportionally, we definitely need classrooms.

> • A. Newman: Thank you both so much for coming. If you have any more questions or comments, please direct them to Scott and Clyde. And if there is no new business, we are adjourned.

[Class Schedule Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 12: New Business; A. Newman (1:46)

None

Agenda Item No. 13: Adjournment; A. Newman (1:46)

Attendance February 2, 2023

Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended		Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended

Name	Role			Name	Role	
Abushagur, Mustafa	KGCOE Senator			Malachowsky, Sam	Treasurer, GCCIS Senator	x
Adrion, Amy	ALT CAD Senator (Fall 2022)			McLaren, Amy	CAD Senator	
Aldersley, Stephen	Communications Officer, SOIS Senator	x		Newman, Atia	Chair, CAD Senator	x
Anselm, Martin	CET Senator			Newman, Dina	COS Senator	x
Babbitt, Gregory	COS Senator	x		Olabisi, Joy	SCB Senator	
Bamonto, Suzanne	CLA Senator	x		Osgood, Robert	ALT CHST Senator	
Barone, Keri	CLA Senator	x		Perez Sanchez, Alejandro	CAD Senator	
Boedo, Stephen	ALT KGCOE Senator	X		Puchades, Ivan	KGCOE Senator	x
				Ray, Amit	CLA Senator	
Brown, Tamaira	Senate Coordinator	X		Reed, Mary Lynn	COS Senator	x
Butler, Janine	ALT NTID Senator			Ross, Annemarie	ALT NTID Senator	x
Chiavaroli, Julius	ALT GIS Senator			Shaaban, Muhammad	ALT KGCOE Senator	
Crawford, Denton	CAD Senator			Sheffield, Jr., Clarence	ALT SOIS Senator	

D'Amanda, Elisabetta	CLA Senator	X		Song, Qian	SCB Senator	
Deese, Franklin	CAD Senator	X		Sparkman, Torrence	ALT SCB Senator	
Dell, Betsy	CET Senator	x		Thomas, Bolaji	CHST Senator	X
Dibble, Leah	Student Gov't Rep	X		Tobin, Karen	NTID Senator	X
Eddingsaas, Nathan	COS Senator	X		Tsukernik, Olga	ALT COS Senator	
Faber, Joshua	COS Senator	x		Ulin, Robert	CLA Senator	x
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	
Granberg, Ellen	Provost	Excused		Warp, Melissa	ALT CAD Senator (Spring 2023)	
Hazelwood, David	NTID Senator	x		White, Phil	ALT GCCIS Senator	X
Heyman, Emily (sub Brendon Strowe)	Staff Council Rep.	X		Williams, Eric	GIS Senator	X
Hsieh, Jerrie	ALT SCB Senator			Worrell, Tracy	ALT CLA Senator	

Johnson, Dan	CET Senator	x		Zanibbi, Richard	GCCIS Senator	x
Johnson, Scott	GCCIS Senator	x		Zlochower, Yosef	COS Senator	x
Kincheloe, Pamela	NTID Senator	x				
Kiser, Larry	GCCIS Senator					
Kray, Christine	CLA Senator	x				
Lapizco-Encinas, Blanca	KGCOE Senator					
Laury, Dino	NTID Senator					
Lawley, Elizabeth	Vice Chair, GCCIS Senator	x				
Lee, James	ALT CET Senator					
Liu, Manlu	SCB Senator	x				
Lutzer, Carl	COS Senator	x				
Ma, Yunn-Shan	ALT CLA Senator					

Interpreters: Nicole Crouse-Dickerson and Jennifer Mura

Student Assistant: Guru Goutham Gangadharappa Ramesha

Presenters: Heidi Nickisher, Taj Smith, Bruce Hartpence and Clyde Hull

Tech Crew