

Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, March 23, 2023

12:15 – 1:50 PM

Zoom

Attendance: See Below

Agenda Item No. 1: Call to Order; L. Lawley (12:15)
Meeting called to order.
Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; L. Lawley (12:16)
Motion (Executive Committee): Seconded (Executive Committee) Approved unanimously
Agenda Item No. 3: Communication Officer's Report/Approval of Minutes; S. Aldersley (12:20)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• S. Aldersley: Before asking for approval of the Minutes, I'd like to note that I hope Senators received a copy of Senate Newsletter #4 last week. I intend to send out #5 next week and I invite Senators who would like to submit short pieces on governance or other Senate issues to do so and I will do my best to insert them into a future newsletter.• The draft minutes for the last meeting of Senate, 2/16/23, went out on Tuesday, and, receiving no corrections, I move they be approved as written. And Liz, I did not know that the Executive Committee could make a motion that didn't need to be seconded.• L. Lawley: Yes. Motions that come from a committee are presumed to be seconded, since there's more than one person on the committee.• Minutes of Senate Meeting of 2/16/23 approved by acclamation. <p>February 16, 2023 Meeting Minutes</p>
Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; L. Lawley (12:22)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• L. Lawley: On 3/2, Senate hosted a luncheon with Dr. Munson which was disappointingly under-attended. However, it did mean that the people who were there were able to discuss their concerns with him, and they felt very much that their concerns were heard and recognized.• On 3/9, Jim Watters held a Town Hall meeting about the state of RIT's budget and finances. If you were unable to watch, the meeting was recorded. Tamara, do we have the link for that recording that we could send out?<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦ T. Brown: I'm still waiting on it. But once we receive it, or if we receive it, I will make sure to get it out to everyone.• L. Lawley: Thank you. The Executive Committee felt that this was a pretty good first step in terms of increasing transparency in how our administrative and budget processes work, and we're hoping that that trend continues. Towards that end, the Committee met this week with Dr. Munson. In the past, the Executive Committee had regular meetings with the Provost and with the President but over the pandemic that process ground to a halt. So we are re-implementing that which will give us a chance to raise both general and specific concerns about governance with Dr. Munson on a regular basis.• Nominations are currently under way for next year's Executive Committee. We will be voting in mid-April. If you are interested in running for any of the five positions, please reach out to either Clyde Hull or Hamad. If you would like to know the responsibilities for each position, these can be found in the charter of academic governance in our policy manual. If you're on the fence, I highly recommend considering doing this because it gives you a real sense of how things are happening from an administrative and structural

standpoint, and amplifies your voice in those conversations. You have more of a chance to help set the agenda both literally and figuratively for what Senate does during the year. Having served on Executive Committee in four different roles over the past 25 years, I can say that I have never regretted it. I may have had brief regrets when yet another meeting showed up on my calendar, but overall the reward of engaging I have found to be much greater than the demand on my time.

- A reminder that last year we approved a policy requiring each college governance group to call an all-faculty meeting once per semester. We will shortly be asking each college to let us know how those meetings went. To that end we ask that senators from each college confer with one another, and appoint a spokesperson to give a very brief report on their college's meetings.
- That completes the Executive Committee report. Are there any questions?

Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; J. Prescott (12:27)

- J. Prescott: Hi, everyone. Yesterday we hosted our presidential awards for outstanding staff recipients, and it went really well.
- We are planning our staff picnic
- I want to note that Dr. Watters' Town Hall recording was made available, and there was an email that went out with the link. I believe it was only made available until the 21st. I'm not sure if that's something that Staff Council could make available for folks who missed it. I have reached out to our executive committee to see about that.
- We have not had anybody from Faculty Senate attend any of our meetings since September. Council members are a little bit concerned about that, and we're hoping that it wasn't due to a lack of communication about meetings or something like that.
 - L. Lawley: Thanks for bringing that up. Atia is aware of it and she has said if she can't attend herself, she will make sure to designate one of us. It's not your fault. It's our fault. We're going to try very hard to address that moving forward for both Staff Council and Student Government.

Agenda Item No. 6: Student Government Update; L. Dibble (12:30)

- L. Dibble: Hi, everyone. We have had a lot going on. I've tried to condense it a little bit into a short list of the more important things.
- It's election season, and that absorbs a lot of what SG does. We have a yearly election, and that involves a lot of events. And that's really exciting. We're also trying to get transition documents in order for the incoming new SG.
- It's Women's History month and I did a presentation for SG providing a little bit more education and the history of it.
- We got a presentation from Tigers Tackling Debt, which works with a nonprofit to alleviate medical debt in general.
- We had a couple of PawPrints, one that I've seen regarding RIT clubs being able to use vendors outside of those that are approved, or when a vendor is no longer approved, can we still buy from them? And also whether or not groups can use Venmo cash app to take in money donations, for example. We also did a PawPrint called Cafe Bars on Campus, which was unfortunately not able to happen.
- President Munson came and gave SG some updates in general.
- We also did a PawPrint asking for a sensory room which is already in the works. And then also you may have seen the PawPrint called "Make Munson Use a Wheelchair". Accessibility is looking into that. They're a little bit concerned about how it would be perceived outside of the small group that's involved in it. So we're trying to see if we can come up with a better solution that still tackles the issue and achieves the same goal.

Agenda Item No. 7: MS and BS IE/MS in Engineering Management; G. Thurston (12:32) *Presentation linked below*

- G. Thurston: Grad Council reviewed an MS/BS program in the fall that was prepared principally by Katie McConky of Industrial & Systems Engineering. She is listening, and is available to answer questions.
- This is not only a change in name. Both degrees are changed from a Masters in Engineering to a Masters of Science and Engineering Management, and the motivation is that the MS degree is much better understood by employers. Very briefly, both the core program and the electives were tuned and revised. One course was removed which isn't as relevant anymore. One of the major changes is that a project with paper and a thesis option were added. Adding the research elements not only gives more options for students but they are also required for all MS degrees on the Dubai campus, which was one of the considerations.
- In summary the Grad Council was impressed with the thorough work and the motivation for it and voted unanimously to approve and bring these changes to the Faculty Senate. Are there any questions?
 - S. Aldersley: I think you said that for MS degrees a thesis is normally a required component, and I'm wondering why it's just an option in this case?
 - G. Thurston: That's only true on the Dubai campus. But, let me ask whether Katie can address it
 - K. McConky: Three to five years ago we were asked to combine our Master of Engineering and Master of Science degrees into one single degree. In making that change, we created three options to complete the program. So one option is a very heavily focused research thesis, another is a project with paper, and then the third option is a capstone. It is fairly standard across engineering programs, that you could have a variety of options to complete an MS degree.
 - C. Licata: I just wanted to add that from the New York State Department of Education perspective, every MS degree is required to offer one of three options. So this program is fully in compliance with the options that are designated.
- L. Lawley: We will treat this as a motion from Grad Council. Please register your vote in the Chat. It looks like we have unanimous approval on this. George, thank you very much.
- This brings us to the next proposal, which is the new BS in Global Public Health from the College of Health, Science and Technology.

[MS and BS IE/MS in Engineering Management Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 8: Proposed new BS in Global Public Health from CHST; C. Stebbins (12:38)

Presentation linked below

- C. Stebbins: Thank you, Liz. And good afternoon. I'm with the College of Health Science and Technology and also a member of the ICC, and am presenting on behalf of Heidi today.
- The proposal was drafted and presented by John Oliphant from the college. He is on the call also, so if there are questions that come up he can assist me in answering them. I'm just going to run through a few slides that were provided to me by Heidi.
- The ICC reviewed the proposal from CHST for a BS degree in Global Public Health. The idea was originally proposed in 2011. Some work was done in 2015 to research what other schools are doing. The intent paper was circulated in 2020, and received provost approval.
- The program intends to seek accreditation from the Council on Education of Public Health, (CEPH).
- The program includes a global perspective. As you can see listed here by these three bullets it's believed that will allow RIT to stand out apart from other public health degrees, recognize how interconnected the world is, and build on RIT's global focus and connections.
- Here are the curriculum goals. I'll let you review those on your own, and they should have been in the proposal also.
 - L. Lawley: There is a link to all of the materials for today's meeting in the Senate Google Drive. So if people want to download their own copy to read in more detail, they should be able to do that.
- C. Stebbins: We believe that the addition of this degree aligns with RIT's mission, vision and values and strategic plan, and again, we'll be working to achieve accreditation for this program.
- Here are some summary thoughts. Students in the degree program will be involved in original research, and design creative programs to improve health in various populations. Students will have a constant infusion of global perspectives on public health issues throughout the curriculum. Whether students choose to study or work internationally, or stay close to home, having a global perspective and awareness of different cultures is important in our interconnected planet with its ever growing amount of people moving from place to place.
- Global health is by definition an interdisciplinary field, and this can be a means to create synergy and allow for collaboration with various academic units across campus. And with its focus on various determinants of health, cultural humility and the goal of training a future workforce, this seeks to ensure that the degree perfectly aligns with the goal of inclusive excellence. Finally, ICC unanimously approved this degree

moving forward.

- L. Lawley: Thank you, Carla. Any questions or discussion of this before we move to a vote?
- C. Cray: Thank you. I'm Christine Cray from the College of Liberal Arts, Department of Sociology and Anthropology. COLA has a number of courses related to health, equity, and culture. Some of our faculty have backgrounds in public health. I know that this was approved by the ICC, but I understand that members of our faculty did try to have some of the courses that we offer accepted within the curriculum. It seems really appropriate, given how so many health issues really depend upon the human element. And so I just want to register disappointment that some of the courses, you know, or any of the courses were included. It's just discouraging. Thank you.
- L. Lawley: Thank you, Christine. Carla, do you want to respond to that at all?
- C. Stebbins: John could probably respond more appropriately. I'm pretty sure some of those courses were included, because there was quite a bit of discussion about it.
- J. Oliphant: I am super passionate about working with the folks over in COLA, and spent lots and lots of time partnering with them. The first step that we took was creating a Global Public Health minor and many, many classes from COLA are included as acceptable within that minor. Then I think four or five core classes within the major are also coming out of COLA.
- We ran into a problem of running out of credits. Dr. Granberg and her team allowed us to expand beyond 120 credits to 122. But you know we had to balance meeting the accreditation standards with all of the many classes that RIT has that are relevant. We do have 12 credits for open electives, and we put together a list of recommended immersions, minors, and courses, many of which come from COLA, that our advising team will be recommending.
- I'm sorry it came across to you as disappointing, but I'm not sure if you caught how much collaboration there has been and how much we recognize that there is a great resource in COLA that we want to partner with. This is all about breaking down silos and working together, not creating an Us versus Them approach at all. I hope that helps.
- C. Kray: Thank you. I looked in the Senate drive, and I didn't see a copy of the full proposal, just the powerpoint. Honestly I was working with things that have been communicated to me by other faculty members about the proposal, not having seen it myself. I wish we had the full proposal, so we know what we are voting on.
- L. Lawley: John and Carla, would you be able to send a copy of the full proposal to Tamaira so that she can put it into the materials for this week?
- J. Oliphant: Yes. It's a giant document, so I had to upload it into the ICC MyCourses shell. If it would be helpful I could share a screen to look at what the courses are.
- L. Lawley: You could share it with Tamaira Brown, who handles all of our administrative support.
- J. Oliphant: Okay. Tracy Worrell and other Senators from COLA have been very supportive every step of the way with this proposal, so I think they're all very comfortable with it.
- L. Lawley: I see a comment in the Chat from Tracy, saying that she can support and attest to the work between CHST and COLA on this.
- Are there other concerns that people would like to raise before we take this to a vote? All right. We will do it by acclamation again. And if there is anyone who has an objection to approving this, if you could put "No" or if you are abstaining into the Chat. It looks like we have unanimous approval on that. Oh, we have one abstention.

[Proposed new BS in Global Public Health from CHST](#)

Agenda Item No. 9: Changes to the RIT Academic Calendar; C. Hull (12:49)

- C. Hull: Thank you, Liz. The Calendar committee ran into a little bit of a bump. The proposal that Scott and I brought to Senate also went to the other governance groups, and there was some feedback. One of the biggest points from the staff was 'We want Labor Day off,' and it feels like that without Labor Day off, they're not willing to support the proposal, and that was one of the options that was on the table. The feedback we got from faculty about Labor Day off versus other options was the majority supported Labor Day off. There was a significant minority that wanted to eliminate all partial weeks, including in Labor Day week. Basically SG actually just said 'No, let's just keep the original calendar.' So we're working through some issues, but the proposal isn't dead.
- Which brings me to a survey that is coming out sometime in the near future from Joe Loffredo to all the faculty. And on behalf of the Calendar Committee, I would very much appreciate it if everybody here

could ask their constituents to keep an eye out for this and also, you yourselves, please take it. (Don't share the link, because it'll be a customized link.) Maybe remind your constituents after you've seen it in your inbox: 'Hey, that survey I told you about is now out. Please go take it.'

- This survey is about final experiences. The reason that's come up is because, as you may recall from when we had our discussion of the proposal a few weeks ago, some faculty members thought that it might be cruel to have all final exams compressed into one week, and one of the points at the time was well, we did it like that in the old days. SG is also feeling some concern on that same point. In the discussion, one of the things that came up is that some people, and this is pretty common in CAD, have a final project and it's due during the final week. But you don't have to start the project in finals week, you can work on it all semester and many people do. I do some similar things in my classes. I have a final experience and it varies from class to class. For example, in one class I open the final exam the day after the last day of class. Actually, the last time I did it, I opened it right as class ended. And then I sat there in the classroom for half an hour after class was over, talking to people about what they saw on the exam. They didn't have to start the exam until finals week. They had a week from when it opened to do it.
- The reason I'm bringing this up is because the SG representative felt that if a good number of faculty were assigning that sort of a final, so that students would actually be able to start some of their finals before finals week and during finals week, they wouldn't be dealing with five exams in five days. Then SG would be willing to support this compression of finals week, which is what we're using in order to enable having two extra weeks of break time for faculty and students. They don't object to the two weeks of break time. They just worry about the final exam, and if it turns out that there's enough evidence that faculty do this it would alleviate the pressure enough so that my understanding is that SG would then support the overall calendar.
- I do this. Other people do this. It is a valid approach to a final experience. It's a matter of academic freedom. We may actually need a written policy that says it's okay to have a final experience that is consistent with what the instructor of the class feels is best suited for the class, unless the department, the college curriculum committee, the Dean and the Provost have all agreed that this particular class needs to have a specific final exam experience. Let the instructor decide and stop harassing people about how they think it's best for their class to be delivered, but that aside, this survey just says, 'Do you do this now? What sort of final exam experience do you give in your class?' And what sort of final exam experience are you planning to do next semester. It's so that we can get some data to see what percentage of classes actually will need a time slot in finals week, and what percentage of classes won't because they can do something along this line. Please make sure your constituents understand it's anonymous - it's not anonymous from the provost's office, but it's anonymous from the point of view of the grumpy chair in your college who might want to give you grief if they know what you're doing, which they shouldn't do. Please do not tell your constituents, 'hey, if everybody says no, we won't do this and the calendar negotiations will fail'. We want honest responses. That's why the survey is coming out.
 - L. Lawley: Okay. I will call on people for questions in a minute. I don't know if Ellen is willing to respond to this right now and say whether or not this is something that she would consider providing guidelines from Academic Affairs as opposed to an actual formal policy. And Ellen, if you don't want to respond to that at this point, that's fine. But I just wanted to give you a chance to respond on the issue of policy versus guidance.
 - E. Granberg: Thanks for the chance to comment on this. When Clyde and I talked about this, my immediate response was that something like this might be best handled in policy, but I'm certainly happy to look at whether or not we could do it with informal guidance. It's probably arguable that this falls under the arena of academic freedom. There may be some New York State requirements that we have to meet in terms of how the final exam time is counted as a part of instructional time, but that's certainly something that we could look at, and if it works to do it as a memo, we could get that done for sure.
 - L. Lawley: Great. Thank you, Nathan. You have your hand up first.
 - N. Eddingsaas: I do projects as well. But one issue does have to do with the State. My understanding is that when we went down to the 14-week semester, the only way we could do this for 3-credit courses is by making it a requirement to meet during the final session. That if you did not meet during that time you did not meet the hours needed. So that's the issue.
 - C. Hull: It's not a requirement to meet physically in a classroom with the instructor for the three and a half hours. It's that you have three and a half hours of instructional experience. I was reluctant to try this until I wound up teaching a class where it was mandated by the college that I have an online experience. The exam is actually longer than three and a half hours. So I warn students about this and that's one of the reasons why I give them a week. It may take you more than three and a half hours, and if it does, well, you have 168 hours to do it. They don't complain about that. They seem fine with it, but it's definitely an educational experience that they're getting during that week. You know I have students taking my final exams from India, etc. I don't care where they're doing it from. But it's still an interactive experience. They can get feedback while they're working on the exam, or whatever you want to call the final experience.
 - L. Lawley: There are a lot of different approaches that people have taken to this, but I think Chris Licata wants to weigh in on the issue of specific State requirements.
 - C. Licata: Thanks, Liz. From the State's perspective, it's true when we went to a 14-week

semester, we needed to ensure that the instructional effort on the part of the student was equated to the extra week. So as long as we can demonstrate that there is a comparable instructional effort being made on the part of students in terms of learning, we're okay in that regard. It's not seat time, it's rather the effort put forward by the student and the faculty member in that fifteenth week.

- L. Lawley: I think Ivan has a question.
- M. Anselm: Ivan, we can't hear you.
- C. Hull: I think Ivan is asking about whether there will be another survey. This one is very focused on specifically how you do your final experience. Will there be a future survey on calendar options? Ivan if that's more or less what you were trying to ask? All right. So my answer is at the moment this is the survey and if the results of the survey are greatly disappointing, then there may not be any more for a while, but I represent the Senate on the committee. Scott and I are both plugging away for what we think is going to be best for the University, for the student experience, for the faculty. And SG appreciates that. So, assuming that we wind up with something other than it's still the current calendar to bring back to the faculty, I think that it would make sense for there to be a survey going out at that point, saying something to the effect of 'What do you think? Should we support moving forward with this?' I just don't feel like we're at that point right now, maybe in a week, if things go well, but you know, maybe it'll take longer.
- L. Lawley: Okay, Nathan.
- N. Eddingsaas: I am for this. I use this myself. But I have the students meet during that time, because we are actually explicitly told we have to see them in the seats. We have to have instruction on that day. So what I'm saying is that when you put out this survey, make sure that it is abundantly clear that that's not necessarily the case, because, as it is right now, at least in the College of Science, we are explicitly told, 'you have to meet during finals week.'
- C. Hull: It sounds to me like somebody in the College of Science is, with the best of intentions, trying to enforce a rule that they think is in place that is not in place. Academic freedom suggests that faculty not be told that they must have things happen in person.
- N. Eddingsaas: Just put it in the survey, saying that it is not required. Spell out what you just said in the survey. Because I know that multiple people were told: 'You have to have this meeting time.'
- C. Hull: That's great feedback. Thank you. I will ask Joe to include that in the survey.
- L. Lawley: We are running out of time. We have two more people. So, Scott?
- S. Johnson: I want to say as a member of the Calendar Committee that when these surveys come out you're going to get one per class that you taught in the fall. So if you taught four classes, you're going to get four separate surveys. So you can answer differently for each one of your classes if that's how you do them.
- C. Hull: That's a very important point.
- M. Anselm: If I understand correctly, one of the options is to do one week only of finals. Did the committee consider DSO accommodations? I know we're having trouble scheduling those. If we have even less time for finals, how are we going to be able to get those students who need accommodations scheduled?
- C. Hull: This issue has come up many times in the discussions of the Calendar Committee, and every time Joe Loffredo has said he can make it happen. He's made it happen before, he can make it happen again.
- L. Lawley: Okay, Jayanti. And this is our last question.
- J. Venkataraman: I just need a clarification. Are you going to send out a survey for every class we teach?
- C. Hull: Joe Loffredo is.
- J. Venkataraman: For each class there's a different survey? That's a lot of surveys for one person.
- C. Hull: It's a very short survey. It says, 'What is your final experience for this class?' And you pick one and then you're done. And the reason why you don't get one survey if you teach four classes has to do with how they're going to be able to save the data, but it's a very, very short survey, you might be able to do all of them in a minute.
- J. Venkataraman: To get surveys answered by faculty is quite a struggle. If I was teaching five courses, to get five surveys, I don't know if it's feasible.
- C. Hull: We know we're not going to get a 100% response rate. But one of the reasons why I'm here asking, 'please please ask your constituents to answer this survey and tell them it's short, and tell them it's important,' is because, if three faculty members respond and two of them are Scott and me, it's not going to carry a lot of weight.
- L. Lawley: We have an enormous amount of Faculty Affairs content that's very high priority for us to deal with, so I'm going to cut this off with the possibility of bringing it back for more conversation or potentially using our Slack workspace. So Clyde, thank you so much. And let me now turn this over to Sandi so that she can talk about all of the charges that they were asked to deal with this year, and where they are currently on each of those, including anything that they would like us to consider for approval.

Agenda Item No. 10: Faculty Affairs Committee Charges; S. Connelly (1:10) *Presentation linked below*

- S. Connelly: Thanks, Liz. We had a list of about ten charges this year. We've tried to group them together in a way that'll allow you to see our thought process and the need for feedback for some, discussion for others, and lengthier discussion for still others. All the charges have been reviewed and discussed at length with subcommittees, and with the full FAC in many cases, and with external folks as needed. I have Charge #2 and #3 highlighted here. These are going to come back at another meeting.
- We'll take Charges #7 and #9 together, and Charges #1, #4, and #5 will also be in this first set.
- Charge #7 was a recommendation to assess campus academic policies pertaining to pandemics. The FAC recommends dropping this charge, because there are no RIT policies on pandemics. Academic policies were modified temporarily over the past couple of years and if needed again, we will do it again. We have a much better process now for doing these things. So we recommend dropping Charge #7. We also recommend dropping Charge #9 - "A lot of outstanding service to RIT receives no official recognition. We should have several annual rewards for outstanding services (as we do for teaching)." The FAC talked about this quite a bit, and it all came back to what does this gain individuals, and what would it gain RIT? So at this point we move to dismiss both Charges #7 and #9.
 - L. Lawley: In the past we really haven't voted to remove charges. So I think it's just fine for you to tell us that the committee discussed those charges and has chosen not to make any recommendations for changes.
- S. Connelly: If anyone has questions, I'd be happy to come back to it. Now, Charge #1. This was resuming the question of the title changes for lecturers, senior lecturers and principal lecturers to assistant, associate and full teaching professors. It turns out that changes to E6.0 that were voted on by Senate in 2020 were never all approved by the offices of the Provost and the President. As a result, we need to clean up E.6 before we can move forward on any other changes to it. If the Provost would like to comment on anything that I may have missed?
 - E. Granberg: Not unless you want me to comment on anything in particular.
- S. Connelly: Okay. So FAC moves to restore the parts of E.6 that were deleted so that we can make new proposals on the policy next year.
 - L. Lawley: I'm not sure that we need to vote on that as a motion, or whether we can simply say what we voted on previously was rejected by the Provost and the President and thus did not go into effect. And if it turns out, I'm wrong, we can bring this back or this particular case.
 - E. Granberg: I think that's right.
- S. Connelly: Perfect. We do want to initiate a charge to ourselves and the Provost's office for 23/24 that will fully investigate the implementation of title changes and all downstream effects, with regard to merit pool, promotion and annual review for NTT faculty. It's one thing to say we just want to change the title of something, but that's harder in policy when you have to integrate the changes across all other policies, and we need to have conversations with HR and Legal relative to this. We don't want folks to think that this is something that the FAC wants to go away. Everyone on the committee is very supportive of getting NTT faculty to where they need to be at the University. But we're concerned about doing this piecemeal and that's where this charge for next year is coming from.
 - L. Lawley: This is essentially part of the charge we already assigned, so there's really no need to vote on it. When we come to the fall, and we're approving charges we will just include this in that process.
 - J. Venkataraman: Can I say something Liz?
 - L. Lawley: I'm trying to hold questions as much as possible to the end on anything that we're not immediately voting on, just so we can make sure we get through stuff, but if it's quick, go ahead.
 - J. Venkataraman: This relates to charges that were dismissed by the committee. We passed a policy last year that all charges which are dismissed are also voted upon and recorded. And so we need to do that because it should not come back for five years. I'm glad Clyde is here. He worked with this. and he can add to it, too.
 - L. Lawley: In the policy?
 - J. Venkataraman: Yes, that it was discussed, and voted upon by the Senate that there is no change in that policy. It was reviewed and we need to vote on this.
 - L. Lawley: Clyde, can you clarify that?
 - C. Hull: I think that the wording may have been confusing there. The spirit of the policy relates to the situation where a charge is given to a committee, and the committee says, 'we don't need to do this.' And the next year, with new people on Senate, the same proposal is sent to the committee again. You wind up charging the same committee several times with a dead charge, and every year the committee wonders why it keeps coming back to them again. So the the spirit of the policy revision from last year is just to say, if the committee says, 'No, we don't need to do this'

there's a vote in Senate saying we agree with the committee that this charge does not need to be pursued, and that shields the committee from having the same charge come back anytime in the next few years.

- J. Venkataraman: It was also that it was going to be recorded. It was something discussed, so that five years later it can come back when it goes through policy revisions.
- C. Hull: Yes, there needs to be a recording some place, like a document that lists charges that were dismissed so that we know the history of these things, but I don't think it needs to be recorded in a university policy that is up on the website. But it does need to be recorded in a document that the Senate has access to, which says that these are the charges that the FAC dismissed, that this one was dismissed in 2023 and shouldn't come back until 2028 at the earliest. So I think what Jayanti is saying is that Senate should probably vote to approve rejecting those two charges and that will protect the committee from having to see those charges again for several years, unless someone makes a really good case but they have to acknowledge that it has already been dismissed, but here's the reason why we should bring it back, anyway.
- L. Lawley: All right, so since this is coming from the committee, it is seconded. Is there any discussion about the dismissal of Charges #7 and #9? Not seeing any hand raised, we will move to a vote. We will do it in terms of acclamation again. If you have an objection to approving this by acclamation, please post 'No' in the Chat. Seeing nothing, it is approved.
- S. Connelly: Charge #8 is looking at the external member on a tenure committee. It often happens when we have folks hired over the summer, typically in administrative roles, who need to be quickly reviewed for tenure and promotion that the external representative on such committees is not always a full professor. If you have someone who's coming in who would be moving into the rank of full professor, an associate professor would not be able to review their portfolio. So what ends up happening is folks would have to be called in quickly in the summer to serve on the review committee. After talking to a number of different folks about this, including the Provost's office, we recommend no change to the policy. The reason is that we're more concerned that if we change the policy to say that the external person on a tenure and promotion committee must be a full professor, we're actually limiting the pool significantly. Depending on who is being promoted within the college, an associate professor in the role of the external person on a tenure and promotion committee during the year may be just fine. So our position on this is actually just to keep the policy as it is for external members of promotion and tenure committees.
 - C. Hull: I was one of the people involved with proposing this charge. I've been on the Faculty Senate side when the administration has come and said we're making an offer to someone at the rank of full professor in three days. Can we get a full professor to serve on the review committee? Because the current representative is an associate professor. Some of the considerations that you brought up really matter here. How do you get a full professor to serve when it needs to happen really fast? What I found particularly frustrating about this from an Executive Committee point of view is that we would be assigning people to these committees in the spring, and we would ask the colleges if they are planning to have anyone coming in as a full professor, and they would say 'no' and so we would assign full professors randomly. And then two months later, a college would inform us that they have a dean coming in and they need a full professor to review the candidate. At that point we can't move full professors around. It's very frustrating for the Executive Committee trying to find the right person for the job on such short notice. Maybe this isn't the right solution. But I would ask the FAC to consider finding some other solution to the problem. Because eventually it's going to come up again and the University is going to have to delay an offer while we take a month to find somebody who can fill this job. We don't want that.
 - L. Lawley: That concern is clear. Are there other questions about this before we go to the motion from the FAC?
 - B. Thomas: I have a question. I was on the subcommittee of FAC that looked at this. And what we discussed was that if there were no full professors on the promotion committee to review documentation, there are other full professors on Senate to whom the ExComm can reach out to do the job. So, rather than put something in policy, we thought that would be an easy way to achieve the purpose, and we made the recommendation to the full FAC. I think there's probably a section of the policy on this right now. So we didn't see a need for us to make any change at all. That's why you see what Sandi is presenting today.
 - L. Lawley: Okay, thank you. So in the interest of time here, there's a motion on the floor from the FAC. If you vote in favor of this, then you are basically taking this topic off the plate of the FAC for the next five years. If you vote against it, you are saying that you would like the FAC to go back and reevaluate whether the policy should be changed. And again, this is specifically about policy, not about whether there could be other guidelines. All of those in favor of keeping the

policy as is, type 'yes' into the Chat. Those who are opposed, or abstaining, please put that into the Chat.

- S. Aldersley: I'm seeing 27 yes votes and 4 abstentions and no negatives at this point.
 - L. Lawley: Okay, let's move on.
- S. Connelly: Charge #4 'best practices for student evaluations and recommendations related to their use for both annual evaluations and promotion and tenure.' Our recommendation is very straightforward. There is an entire task force associated with S-Rates and their implementation, and because they have ongoing knowledge of this, we decided that if they give Senate an update on how that work is going, that would be desirable. So we recommend that the S-Rate Task Force provide regular updates to Senate, one per semester minimally, for the duration of the Task Force.
 - L. Lawley: In the interest of time, unless somebody has a very important comment, I would like to move it to a vote. Those in favor of this recommendation, please type 'Yes' into the Chat. Those opposed or abstaining? Looks like unanimous approval. Let's keep going.
- S. Connelly: Charge #5, clarifying the time a lecturer has to be in each rank before applying for promotion. This goes back to the E.6 issue I mentioned before, and as a result we are looking for a new charge for this to clarify any discrepancies in timelines in E6 associated with promotion and tenure for all faculty, not just NTT faculty.
 - L. Lawley: Questions or concerns about this?
 - E. Granberg: Sandi, on this one, and we might need Tamaira's help because I thought we were all up to date on all those changes. I'm confused about what's needed here.
 - S. Connelly: This relates to the matter that we talked about before for the need to start with a clean E.6. There are differences at different points in E6, for example, whether you can apply for promotion after 5 years of service, or at the beginning of your fifth year, things like that. There were some language issues there that Atia was particularly concerned about when she and I met.
 - E. Granberg: It might be worthwhile to take an editorial look because of the changes that Dave and I were not comfortable with, none of them involved this point. If you could show me what it is that's concerning the committee, it might be an easy fix.
 - S. Connelly: I'll have this subcommittee actually go through and highlight all the points. I think it's not that the meaning of the words is different, it's just that they're written differently. So there's confusion from folks about when they can actually go up.
 - L. Lawley: It may be something we could fix this semester. If it turns out that there are other wording issues from before we can initiate a new charge to review Policy E: 6 for consistency, which will cover some of the other issues besides time in rank.
 - S. Connelly: Thank you.
 - L. Lawley: Any other high priority comments or questions on this because we are already closing in on time available? I am going to drop new business, because I think the FAC stuff is more important, but that still puts us behind. Seeing no hands, is there any objection to approving this by acclamation?
 - B. Thomas: Can you clarify what we are approving? That we approve setting up a new policy for E.6 for next semester, or agree to the changes?
 - L. Lawley: This is a specific charge for the FAC next year to review policy E.6 for consistency, and that's because the previous charge didn't necessarily represent the issues properly. So, rather than dropping the charge, we're essentially modifying it. It will not change anything about the timeline for covering it. So are there any objections or abstentions regarding approving this charge? Seeing none, we can move on.
- S. Connelly: Charge #6 looks at reviewing policies related to awards, promotions and other material submissions that require action outside the 9-month faculty contract. HR has commented on this, and the idea that faculty should not be assumed to be available for summer work, the definitions for add-work and so on need to be carefully considered here. This is a multi-part charge. We recommend changing the window for all teaching award submissions to September 1st-15th, so that is during the 9 month contract. We recommend moving submission of promotion and tenure packages to September 15th. We actually are asking you to take this back for discussion to your colleges, and we want to come back with this in a month. If it has to extend into the next year, we'll talk with the ExComm about that, because we think it's important to get feedback from the colleges. I know Ellen has a lot of concerns about a September 15th deadline for promotion and tenure packages, maybe less so for the teaching awards packages. We know that there is concern for faculty contracts, and we know there are a lot of downstream dominoes and that's why we want to get everybody's feedback.
 - L. Lawley: So this is just a recommendation. You're not asking to remove the charge. It's simply an update on where you are with the charge which is to ask people to go back to their colleges. Would it be possible for the committee to write up a paragraph or two to clarify what exactly you want Senators to ask about, because I think that will help in terms of discussion.

- S. Connelly: Certainly. Can I send that to Tamaira to go out?
- L. Lawley: Yes. Jayanti, is this something regarding the process?
- J. Venkataraman: Yes. The request should also go to the Eisenhart Awards committee. They will want to comment on the timeline. We changed it to an earlier date, because it's very difficult to get started after September 15th when the timeline is so short.
- L. Lawley: The idea here is for you to go back to your college, have that conversation, and when this comes back to Senate, we'll be able to have comments on what the best direction is on this.
- E. Granberg: I have a quick question. Sandi, are you talking about making the deadline for promotion later or earlier? So are you saying, move it so that it's after the summer or are you saying, move it to the beginning of the year before somebody goes up?
- S. Connelly: After the summer.
- E. Granberg: Okay. So I suggest you have this conversation with me, and let me talk to Dave because it's possible that this would be something that would not get approved. You can certainly get the feedback from the colleges, if you wish, but it might be worth having a conversation with us.
- L. Lawley: There's not really an action item on this other than a recommendation that Senators solicit information on this and bring that back. We have time to do one more.
- S. Connelly: This is the last one. Charge #10 asked us to investigate venues for allowing NTT faculty to apply for a periodic leave of absence or sabbatical. Fortunately this already exists in policy, except that no one seems to know it's there. So what we did was actually go through the relevant part of E.17, and I believe Tamaira sent this out as well, and recommend language changes, not policy changes, just changes to the language that's there. We've added a paragraph to the beginning because there was no introductory paragraph. If you only read the first part of the policy, you didn't know this applied to NTT faculty. Other than this paragraph, we've added bullet points to make the policy read a little more clearly, for example, to distinguish non-paid versus paid leaves and we've added professors of practice.
 - L. Lawley: There's a lot of red in this.
 - S. Connelly: There is a lot of red, and it's a lot of paragraph adjustments, because this was solid text before.
 - L. Lawley: Because I suspect that people are going to want some time to look through this so that they feel comfortable that they know what they're voting for, I'm going to suggest that we wait to make the motion to make changes until the beginning of the next meeting. It'll come in as old business, essentially. Are there questions about that? All right. We will not have time for new business today, but we can look forward to a whole series of meetings continuing over the rest of the semester. So lots of stuff still for us to do.
 - L. Lawley: Thank you so much for all the work that you put into this and the clear presentation of the issues. It's much appreciated.

Faculty Affairs Committee Charges

Agenda Item No. 11: New Business; L. Lawley (1:48)

There was none.

Agenda Item No. 12: Adjournment; L. Lawley (1:48)

- L. Lawley: Can I have a motion to adjourn the meeting.
 - Aldersley: So moved
 - Dell: Seconded..
 - L. Lawley: Great. Is there anyone opposed to adjourning the meeting? All right, then. We will consider this meeting closed. Have a great afternoon, everybody, and

Attendance March 23, 2023

Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended		Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended
Abushagur, Mustafa	KGCOE Senator			Malachowsky, Sam	Treasurer, GCCIS Senator	x
Adrion, Amy	ALT CAD Senator (Fall 2022)			McLaren, Amy	CAD Senator	X
Aldersley, Stephen	Communications Officer, SOIS Senator	x		Newman, Atia	Chair, CAD Senator	Excused
Anselm, Martin	CET Senator	x		Newman, Dina	COS Senator	x
Babbitt, Gregory	COS Senator	x		Olabisi, Joy	SCB Senator	x
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
Brown, Tamaira	Senate Coordinator	X		Ray, Amit	CLA Senator	x
Butler, Janine	ALT NTID Senator			Reed, Mary Lynn	COS Senator	

Chiavaroli, Julius	ALT GIS Senator	X		Ross, Annemarie	ALT NTID Senator	
Crawford, Denton	CAD Senator	X		Shaaban, Muhammad	ALT KGCoe Senator	
D'Amanda, Elisabetta	CLA Senator			Sheffield, Jr., Clarence	ALT SOIS Senator	
Deese, Franklin	CAD Senator	X		Song, Qian	SCB Senator	X
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			Tsukernik, Olga	ALT COS Senator	
Fillip, Carol	ALT CAD Senator			Ulin, Robert	CLA Senator	x
Gehret, Austin	NTID Senator	x		Van Aardt, Jan	ALT COS Senator	
Ghazle, Hamad	Operations Officer, CHST Senator	X		Venkataraman, Jayanti	KGCoe Senator	x
Granberg, Ellen	Provost	X		Villasmil, Larry	ALT CET Senator	

Hazelwood, David	NTID Senator	x		Warp, Melissa	ALT CAD Senator (Spring 2023)	
Heyman, Emily (sub - Joanna Prescott)	Staff Council Rep.	x		White, Phil	ALT GCCIS Senator	
Hsieh, Jerrie	ALT SCB Senator			Williams, Eric	GIS Senator	
Johnson, Dan	CET Senator	x		Worrell, Tracy	ALT CLA Senator	x
Johnson, Scott	GCCIS Senator	x		Zanibbi, Richard	GCCIS Senator	
Kincheloe, Pamela	NTID Senator	x		Zlochower, Yosef	COS Senator	x
Kiser, Larry	GCCIS Senator	x				
Kray, Christine	CLA Senator	x				
Lapizco-Encinas, Blanca	KGCOE Senator	x				
Laury, Dino	NTID Senator	x				
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: Jennifer Mura and Nic Crouse

Student Assistant: Guru Goutham Gangadharappa Ramesha

Presenters: George Thurston, Carla Stebbins, Clyde Hull, Sandi Connelly and Corinna Schlombs