Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, January 17, 2024   12:15 – 1:50 PM   Slaughter Hall 2240/2230

Attendance: See Below

Agenda Item No. 1: Call to Order; A. Newman (12:16)
Meeting called to order.
Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; A. Newman (12:16)
Motion: I. Puchades **Seconded: S. Johnson** **Approved by acclamation**
Agenda Item No. 3: Communication Officer's Report/Approval of Minutes; S. Aldersley (12:17)
I received no suggested edits to the meeting minutes for December 7th, and so move they be approved. **Seconded: F. Dreese** **Approved by acclamation** December 7, 2023 Meeting Minutes
Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; A. Newman (12:18)
- First, I'd like to wish everyone a Happy New Year. ·   - The Provost's website now holds all of our college tenure and promotion policies in one single location, which is a huge boost in transparency.   - Continuing in the vein of transparency, starting in February the Finance and Administration Office is   holding budgetary meetings where each of the college deans will be given an opportunity to present their budget for the coming year. The Senate chair and the co-chairs of RABC have been invited to each of these meetings, so we will be able to report back on a variety of things that are coming up.   - Another major topic has been the Google Storage drive issue. That reduction has been adjusted, so that   departments and faculty that rely heavily on the Google drive will be restored. We ask everyone

to be more careful with how you manage your space. This is still a short term solution, so at some point Senate and the Administration may want to start thinking about how to address the increasing costs of our usage of virtual data.

- Please don't panic, if you hear from staff about an optional shift to bi-weekly pay schedules. HR has let the

Executive Committee and the Chair of Staff Council know that they are putting this out as an option for staff only. Staff members have the ability to opt into this by February 1st. HR is being pretty clear about the information and as far as I know, anybody who opts into this will lose about a week's worth of pay. Please be assured that faculty are not going to have the option to do this.

- CTL has decided to switch off the AI checking feature of TurnItIn. They've been looking into it last

semester, and before that, and they have found that it's very unreliable for detecting whether AI was used in the writing of any papers. I think they have sent out notifications to that effect. But if you have a concern, please reach out to CTL and get more information from them.

- RIT's digital archive is being discontinued. Going forward, you will be redirected to the digital

institutional repository. Some of our Senate documents have already been placed in there. However, we are maintaining our own Google drive for Senate documentation.

- We're still working with DSO about how accommodation will work and how faculty members can reach

out and have accommodations adjusted to match the needs of their classes. We don't have a good answer for that yet, but we're doing our best to work things out. If you have any individuals who are reaching out to you about this, please redirect them to me and to the director of the DSO, Catherine Lewis, so that we can start a conversation about specific issues that you're experiencing.

Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; N/A (12:22)
There was no report.
Agenda Item No. 6: Student Government Update; A. Shuron (12:22)
Inaudible
Agenda Item No. 7: Policy Changes D14.0 (Policy on Awarding Honorary Degrees); L. Chase (12:23) *Presentation linked below*

·L. Chase: I am Secretary of the University. I work for the President, both with the Board of Trustees, but also with our Commencement speaker and honorary degree process and I'm happy to present some relatively minor changes to D.14, the honorary degree policy, with some background on why these changes are coming to the table today.
- This policy was last updated in 2010, and there have been some shifts in the methodology around honorary

degrees since then, which is why we're bringing this to the table today.
- There is a new objective that was given to me by the President when I took over this role about four years

ago, and that was to help to grow RIT's reputation and name recognition, in part through our relationship with elite individuals around the country and around the world through the honorary degree process. To do so we want to change from what had been traditionally a single honorary degree, conferred every year at commencement, generally to the commencement speaker, to perhaps three to five per year, using those relationships to help grow our brand. Also in making these modifications, we want to clarify some of the policy details. In doing so, I've worked closely with Sue Provenzano who has been managing this process for many years, and Diane Slusarski, the dean of the graduate school.
- So where are the changes in the policy? One is regarding the committee. First, we've modified the name. It

was too long, so we took out the word 'faculty' but we did not change the nature of the committee. It's still all faculty. The revised policy also dictates the membership details. They are still appointed by the Provost as they have been up until now, there is still a minimum of five which has been pretty typical, and the term remains three years. One of the bigger organizational changes is that the chair of the committee is changing from the provost to the dean of the graduate school. The timeline for review had been once in the fall, once in the spring. Now, with the increased quantity of honorary degrees, the timeline needs to move more rapidly. So it's now more on an as needed basis, probably still not more than three or four times in a year, but certainly more than twice. It does allow for the work to be conducted electronically, which is the way it has been running for several years, anyway.
- The process is really running the same way as it has been for the last several years, but the policy is now

dictating that more specifically. The coordination activity is now moving to my office. The process stays the same with the faculty. I'm just the paper mover, moving the nominations to the chair of the committee and then back again. The recommendation from the faculty committee goes up to the Provost. The current policy said it went to the President, but in practice it's been going to the Provost so this just memorializes it in the policy. We did change the nomination process so that alumni may now submit nominations as well. Since they are members of the rit community, we wanted to broaden our nomination process. There was a clause in the current policy that we will only give this award sparingly and with the change in methodology we are removing that. And then finally, the criteria really have not changed drastically at all. We've now added some language around diversity, broadly defined. We do look for each class of honorees for a broad mix of disciplines and experiences, gender, nationality, race, etc. We do allow, rarely, conferral of degrees in absentia. We do hope that all our honorees will be present at commencement to receive their degrees, but on occasion there may be somebody who's conferred in absentia. And we did provide a clause where the Board of Trustees, who ultimately has to confer these degrees can remove a degree if necessary. We hope that never comes to pass, but at least we are covering ourselves in that case. Finally, there are some editorial revisions. We took the opportunity to remove binary language. For example, we changed the names of a couple of titles or offices, and cleaned things up that way.

S. Malachowsky: I have a question about removing degrees. Is that a new authority? Does that extend to even after the person is deceased?

L. Chase: That isn't clarified one way or the other.

S. Malachowsky: There's always a temptation to go back in history with modern eyes and to take down statues for lack of a better way of putting it. Is that something that was thought about by the people creating these changes?

L. Chase: There was no discussion about that level of detail. Certainly, from my history in the Development Office, we know that donor names on buildings or activities, if those individuals get themselves into trouble, we don't want to associate ourselves with them. But you're absolutely right. There is a window of time, an element of hindsight that could come into play, but we leave it to those in power at the time to make the best decision for the university.

J. Capps: Can you say a little bit more about how the nomination process goes? It seems like now you could get a lot more nominations.

Chase: You're absolutely right. We need more nominations in order to confer four to five in a year. And in my experience, sometimes we can even invite somebody and they choose not to attend. So I might need to extend it to seven to nine invitations for a particular year. So we need to grow the nomination pool, and therefore the approval pool. In practice, nominations come to me, and there is a nomination form. They come from deans, the Provost, or from faculty members. They come from a variety of sources. I do a lot of searching, individuals who may have a relationship with university, or with whom we'd like to have a relationship and then I put together a database, which I review on occasion with the President and the Provost, and they prioritize ones that they could see approving if they received faculty approval. We decided a couple of years ago we didn't want to go through the whole process of the faculty review committee if the President or Provost is going to veto it at the end. So we get a pre-approval from the President and the Provost, and then they go to the committee and if the faculty approve, then it comes back and then they may sit in the database as approved by faculty until the right time to extend an invitation. So just because they've been approved by faculty does not mean that they're going to be conferred any time soon.

M. Laver: I just have a small comment. And I hope it's received in the spirit in which it is offered. This has nothing to do with policy, but in your preamble to the policy you use the phrase 'elite individuals', and I know exactly what you mean. But that term is a little bit problematic to me. And I think as we shop this policy around perhaps we could rather say in the policy language, 'people who have achieved outstanding recognition in their field' or something like that.

B. Thomas: *Inaudible*

Chase: You're right, and I shouldn't use the term 'veto.' The faculty may find that somebody has met the criteria to receive an honorary degree and the President may decide that this individual is not someone that he or she wants to go forward with for a variety of reasons. Maybe their reputation is not great for us. So they'll still stay in the database.

B. Thomas: *Inaudible*

Chase: It's a good question. I've not seen it happen yet. So hopefully we won't be put in that situation. But it's a good question. *Inaudible*

S. Malachowsky: Going from one to four or five is quite a jump. Can you elaborate a little bit more on why such a big change?

Chase: I think it's in part because we are growing as an institution. We have elevated our status as an R2 university. And this is what the big-league universities tend to do. We've limited ourselves by having only one honorary degree option. What I've been finding in the three years I've been working on this is that there are some people who we offer an honorary degree to who will only accept it if they're the commencement speaker. They want that opportunity to be in the bigger spotlight. But there are others who will willingly accept it, and who can help us to move university forward. So we get more out of a variety of these individuals.

S. Malachowsky: Was it codified before that it was just one?

Chase: I don't believe so.

S. Malachowsky: So it's not an actual policy change to go from one to four or five?

Chase: No, but it's only been given rarely and the faculty are only reviewing twice a year. So it's more getting ourselves prepared for offering more than one. There have been several occasions where more than one has been offered in a year, and has been conferred in a year, a commencement speaker, and one or two others. I know the year we honored President Clinton as our commencement speaker, we did two that year. So there have been a handful of cases, and also some cases when none were conferred, when the commencement speaker was not viable for one reason or another.

Policy D14.0 Presentation

Agenda Item No. 8: Middle States Process and Discussion of Institutional Priorities for Self Study; C. Licata, L. Buckley and R. Robinson (12:38) *Presentation linked below*

C. Licata: We're here today to share with you the timelines for the Middle States process. We have two really fantastic committee chairs, Lisa Robinson, department chair in Mechanical Engineering, and Larry Buckley, associate dean in the College of Science. Lisa, Larry and I are going to help drive this process over the next two and a half years. And in that spirit, I'm going to let Risa drive this presentation.

R. Robinson: I just want to acknowledge the steering committee for the re-accreditation process. We have very wide representation from across the university from all of the divisions, faculty, students and staff. This is an overview of the process. It's a major event for the university. It used to happen once every ten years, and they changed it now to happen once every 8 years. It's very important because it dictates whether or not we are able to receive Title IX funds, student financial aid. The last time that we went through this was in 2017. The self-study is a three-year process. We started in the fall. The self-study tells the RIT story, and then we will have a visit from the evaluation team in the spring. They'll come to Henrietta, and they will also visit two or three international campuses.
The self- study is going to cover seven accreditation standards which are consistent across every university accredited by Middle States. We'll also have an opportunity to focus on three

institutional priorities. This is an opportunity where RIT gets to make the self-study unique to us. We will also be covering four self study outcomes. The process is going to take three years. And at the end of the day, what is it that we really hope to achieve? We really don't just want this to be a matter of compliance. We want to take a step back and look at the university, see where we are, see where we'd like to go and be introspective.

The steering committee has 17 members, and we will be forming 7-10 working groups, one for each of the standards and these groups will be responsible for collecting and analyzing the data, writing the document, and making recommendations.

H. Ghazle: You mentioned Title IX, just for the record it's Title IV.

L. Robinson: Sorry. Yes, thank you, Title IV. These are the seven standards. The standards themselves have not been revised, but the criteria for each of the standards have been. Firstly, Equity and inclusion has been integrated amongst the standards along with a few other specific changes in the criteria, but pretty much what you would expect to see when we're evaluating the university. We want to look at our mission, our ethics and integrity policies, student experience, educational effectiveness and assessment, planning, resources, administration and how we handle our governance and leadership.

Here's the timeline. The first box there is for year 23/24. We started in the fall, we formed the steering committee and we'll be forming the working groups in spring. We'll be submitting a self-study design in the spring which is essentially a roadmap showing how we're going to conduct ourselves over the next three years, and how we're going to engage the community. We'll be getting a visit from Dr. Sean McKitrik, Vice President of Middle States, who was our Vice President last time. So he knows us, and that's going to be very helpful. He'll let us know if he thinks that we could improve our process. He's really there to support us and make sure that we're on the right track. The next one is year 24/25. That's when we're really going to start gathering data and writing the self study draft. There'll be two drafts. We'll be asking for feedback from the broader community. We'll get a visit from the team chair at that point again to make sure that we're on the right track. Then in January 2026, we submit the self-study. The team will come and visit us and up to three global campuses, that's yet to be decided. Then they decide what the accreditation action is and then we have an opportunity to respond. Most of the heavy lifting is happening next year. That's when we're really going to involve the working groups. We'll put them to work in the fall of next year when we'll be writing and revising the draft.

Now I would like to talk about the three focuses of the self-study. One is the seven standards, the second is the three priorities, and then the four goals.

The goal of the self-study is that after we go through this process, what is it that we hope to achieve? And here's where we really want to move away from just looking at this process as compliance. Certainly we want to be able to meet the standards. Middle States asks us to have the same first three goals as every other university.

But then we want to also look at this with a mindset of continuous improvement. How can we constantly grow? How can we continue to improve ourselves? And we want to make sure everyone feels like they're part of the process. Then the fourth one is the one where we get to choose, and we have looked at the fact that the strategic plan is coming to an end in 2025. This is a beautiful opportunity to weave together both of these processes and we can use the self-study process as a way to jump start our strategic planning and have each process inform the other.

The other component of the self-study is our institutional priorities, and here's where we get to make it an RIT experience. We can choose to focus on any institutional priorities that we feel are important. This is the lens through which we're going to write the self-study. Institutional priorities are important, because for each one of these we're going to be writing what they call

'lines of inquiry' which are essentially research questions that ask us to specify to what extent we are achieving XYZ. The steering committee went through the strategic plan, we looked at the President's addresses and we drafted some priorities, which we ran through at the kick-off meeting. The President looked at it, the Provost looked at it, and what really rose to the top are these first two: student success and expanding our research enterprise.

So we feel like those are two key ones we'd like to focus on. But then the third one we weren't sure about. These all seem to have a lot of traction and a lot of interest: build and enhance equity and inclusion into all aspects of the university; prioritize wellbeing of students, staff and faculty; and ensure experiential learning beyond the classroom. So here's where you come in. We would like to ask for your feedback on all of these priorities. How do you feel about the first two? And then what should be the third one? We'll send out a Qualtrics survey with those three and a narrative around each one, and we'll ask you to rank them according to your preference. We're going out to all the governance groups, Faculty Senate, Staff Council and Student Government, and then University Council. I know some of you are on University Council, but you will only take the survey once.

So thank you. Any questions or comments?

I. Puchades: How is this process different from ABET?

R. Robinson: So there's overlap, there's differences and there's commonalities. ABET also has criteria that we have to meet and there's also a self-study. But the criteria are quite different. We do have Criterion #7, institutional support, but that's really as far as we reach up into the Institute. Most of the ABET stuff, if you're not familiar with it, engineering and engineering technology and they also have some sciences as well natural sciences. But it's pretty introspective inside the program. It's really a program focus, whereas Middle States is across the entire institution. It looks at all levels of administration. ABET is every six years, this is every 8 years. Other than that, the commonalities are the data that we collect with ABET, the assessment process that we go through that we submit every year to Leah and her team with student outcomes and that's data that can be rolled then into Middle States. It's a small but important part of it.

H. Ghazle: Can you go back to the slide of priorities. Now. I want to go to the one where we choose. That's going to be a very tough one. For many years RIT has been proud of providing experiential learning. From your perspective, what has prompted the decision to choose those three particular items?

R. Robinson: How did we land on those three? First we looked at key ideas in the Strategic Plan that's ending in 2025, and then at the President's addresses and communications that are going out and taking the temperature of the steering committee from all across the university. And these are the ones that bubbled up when we all got together and read through those documents. We actually had a longer list, and then we ranked them, and then we collapsed them and it ended up in six. The one that's not here is community engagement. Then we ran it by the Provost and the President, and that's how we ended up with these five.

Senator ?: My question is in regards to how the working groups will be formed. Is that just the steering committee? Or will you be asking Senators to ask our constituents if they'd be interested in participating?

R. Robinson: I'm gonna defer that one to Chris because she formed these last time.

C. Licata: The Steering Committee is going to start talking about the working groups next week. In the past we have asked the governance groups to submit names for working groups, so next week when we meet on Wednesday, we'll be talking about what methodology we want to use to solicit individuals who might be interested through the governance groups, so the answer is yes. We want to get those working groups set up this year but the work in earnest will really begin next year with the data collection. Looking at the working groups, we want to try and get individuals who are situated in the university in a place where they're able to contribute to one of the seven standards. So #3, #4, and #5 are basically where most faculty sit: student learning experience; assessment; support of student experience. So typically, that's where we would love to have faculty members. And others as well, particularly governance. So that'll be coming.

I. Puchades: Couldn't you argue that #4 and #5 would go under #1, for example. They are looking at all the aspects that contribute to student success, well-being across campus as well as experiential learning. As well as #3, it could also be included in #1 and #2. You want to have diversity in both #1 and #2.

R. Robinson: You're absolutely right. The Steering Committee grappled with that. We tried re-rewriting, re-arranging, trying to make each one unique and exclusive. But it's very difficult to do that because they are all correlated. One thing I'd like to point out though is #3, 'Well-being,' we really wanted to emphasize well-being of faculty, students and staff, so that's why we pulled that out and made it a separate one. Diversity, equity, inclusion is also going to be woven in, because it's also listed as a criterion under many of the standards. When they revised for 2023, diversity, equity and inclusion is also in there. So there is a lot of overlap. We're going to have to tease it out, but we recognize that. We'll give you a description of each one and we tried to make them each as unique as possible.

I. Puchades: The only thing I would point out is that it almost feels like if you choose one, you exclude the others. Which is presumably not the intent.

R. Robinson: You're right. There's no way to exclude any of these. They're going to come in one way or another. It's really a question of what is the main focus of the self-study, what the lines of inquiry are that are going to let us take a deeper dive into the three that we choose.

S. Aldersley: You said that the last time the University did this was in 2017. I assume there was some sort of response from Middle States at that time, some sort of formal letter. Perhaps you could share that letter with the Senate, so that we can see what was said last time.

C. Licata: We'd be happy to share it. There's five actions that Middle States can take. One is they can reaffirm your accreditation. The second is they affirm your accreditation and they commend you. The third is they can reaffirm your accreditation and ask you for a follow up report because they're concerned about something. The fourth is they can give you a warning which means you're not where you need to be and you need to demonstrate how you're going to get there. They can postpone your whole process if they don't like what you've presented, or, and this is something that we don't think will ever happen, they can put you on probation. Last time, we got reaffirmed for accreditation, and we got a commendation about our assessment process. When you see that letter, you'll see that. There were two things they asked us to look at and these were two recommendations that we had made ourselves in our self-study. But they thought after being here for two and a half days and talking to people they were two recommendations that we really needed to to keep on our radar. One was to improve our transfer credit process and there's been a lot of work done on that. And the second one was related to

Standard Six with planning and resources, and they wanted us to really think more critically about how we could use our budget process and tie it more to the strategic plan. That's normal and we report on that every year in our update. We're hoping again to get a commendation and re-accreditation, but we expect they're going to come back and say 'you came up with a couple of recommendations that are really important to the university and we want you to keep going.'

B. Thomas: I have a big picture question. Many universities and companies seem to be pulling back on the question of DEI and disbanding units that handle issues of diversity and inclusion. It seems like in our own case, we are not pulling back, we are expanding, so if we are going to be doing this, I'm just wondering where we are compared to what's happening in other institutions.

R. Robinson: If DEI were to rise to the top three, this would be a great opportunity for us to look at where we are. Where do we think we want to be? What are the resources and processes we would need to put into place to get to where we want to be? And that would be in the form of recommendations that would come from the self-study.

R. Olsen: Just a clarification question. Are we required to look at three priorities?

R. Robinson: Middle States recommended we do that. Three years seems like a long time but there's a lot to do and if we added a fourth that would add a lot to the workload.

H. Ghazle: I'm going to go back to Ivan's comment. If we are able to incorporate wellbeing and experiential learning into student success, then we'll end up with one left. Because there's a correlation between the two. Hopefully that will come up with these surveys.

R. Robinson: Each one of these priorities will have lines of inquiry. They recommended three, so that means we can do a deep dive into student success. And if we were to roll up the three priorities into student success, then what we would end up doing potentially is having one inquiry for each area. We just have to be thoughtful about what's going to guide our research questions going forward.

[Middle States Process and Discussion of Institutional Priorities for Self Study Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 9: B02.0 Charter; A. Newman (1:05) *Presentation linked below*

A. Newman: Next, we have our discussion on the B2 charter changes. Hopefully, everyone got the email. The first link we sent out was attached to the wrong file, and most of you didn't have access. But we sent out a second link with the changes that the Executive Committee has been working on. I put it into our share drive.
The Executive Committee, as you know, has been working on updating and editing our charter. At the beginning of this year we sent out a document with proposed changes. We also made a PowerPoint to summarize things. The documents that Tamaira has opened, you're welcome to jump in there as well. We have made a small PowerPoint that will make it a little bit easier for us to talk about things, point by point.

B. Dell: The PowerPoint is available in today's meeting folder, but the longer document is not.

A. Newman: I put the document in your email. If you can just move it into the Senate meeting folder that would be great so you guys will be able to review the document itself. As you know, we've been going over this for a while and there's a bunch of things that we already did. The first one was the one that was voted on at the meeting of October 5th which, ironically, are the minutes that we just haven't been able to finish. But the Senate has already voted to remove voting rights of deans and the provost delegate from our standing committees. This was something that we discussed in detail, as you will remember. It seemed like a non-contentious issue so we ended up voting on it right there and then.

The other non-contentious issue was the nomination process. The Nomination Committee never convenes and the process happens, shall we say, in a sort of muddled way. And we want to make it less confusing. We also started talking about how the ICC and its subcommittees should work, because those are literally the only subcommittees that get formally mentioned in the charter, which is kind of unfair, since the FAC and a variety of other committees tend to form subcommittees as they work as well.

So overall our recommendations are pretty clear and very, very simple. The first one is just the executive committee moves to discontinue the nomination committee in favor of establishing a nominations officer position that will be an elected position each year. We also want to make sure that the nominations officer should not be a member of the Executive Committee since that would obviously create conflicts in terms of how somebody gets elected to the Executive Committee. So we're proposing that a candidate for the nominations officer cannot also be a candidate for the Executive committee. We're also proposing that the election of the nominations officer should be performed in the first month of the fall semester so that that person comes into their role earlier in the year rather than at the last minute, giving them time to speak to senators and get to know who wants to do what, and in addition, actually cultivate members for the Executive Committee.

A really important topic which we've talked about internally is we want to make sure that any executive committee that gets formed contains like-minded individuals who are not afraid of the role. So I think it's really important that whoever comes into the nominations officer role will be someone who is proactive and interested in making sure that they form a good executive committee for the future Senate. So of course, this would rewrite that part of the current policy and it would rewrite it in this form. We're not voting on this today. This is more just to lead you through the process and make sure that we get feedback before any of these changes get sent out to the overall university, because, as you know, once the Senate votes on any charter changes, they must go to the university's voting faculty for majority approval of whoever votes. So you know, it is going to be a long process to get these changes through. The nominations officer will be responsible for soliciting nominations and running elections for the Executive Committee as well as all of the at-large positions on the standing committees. You may have noticed that our Operations officer has been doing the at-large positions which we know hasn't been correct. But again, in the absence of a functioning nominations committee that is what we have had to be doing. We want to address this as quickly as possible. Nominations and elections being the responsibility of the Operations Officer that is the person who will help elect the nominations officer, after which the nominations officer can continue the process of electing their successor. Next, we're continuing in our effort to try to reduce the number of standing committees. Not counting the nomination committee, we still have a dozen left. There's been a lot of conversation about the importance of these committees, and the reason for their existence. We know the value that they all bring. In no way does the Executive Committee think that the work that they do is not valuable. The practical matter is that having a dozen committees trying to get work done is not a good way to work. Efficiency experts will tell you it's a terrible way to run things, and the Faculty Senate should be aware of these things and take that into consideration. So the Long Range Planning and Environment Committee, we think, should be absorbed into the RABC. The Academic Support and Student Affairs Committee should be absorbed into the Academic Affairs

Committee because they have overlapping areas of interest, even in the descriptions of the committees themselves. If you read the charter, you will see that there are a lot of overlapping areas of interest and this is one of the reasons why it's sometimes hard to assign charges, and as a result charges sometimes get distributed between two or three committees, which then creates confusion and committees have to coordinate with each other to get the results that we're trying to achieve. So our thinking is, let's put them all into one place and allow them to actually do the work. Then there's a third one, which is the RSC which we recommend should be merged into the FAC. I know from conversations I've had with Senators recently, that the RSC obviously provides a very, very important function in terms of reviewing and maintaining research and scholarship policies. But again we argue that the Faculty Affairs Committee actually has or should play a role in that as well, because the way research is done affects promotion and tenure, which means the minute you start fiddling with research policies it automatically cascades into the faculty affairs realm. If that's the case, then having them live in the same space might actually speed up and improve that process by reducing back and forth, so we don't have to keep coming back to employment policies every five minutes. Let's not kid ourselves: E.4, E.5, and E.6 are the most reviewed policies that we have in the Senate. I know I've seen them every year that I've been on Senate and they're messy. So this is why the Executive Committee recommends rewriting E.6 right now. Even in the rewriting, trying to fix the stuff that was previously approved and partially signed and not signed, and then signed, it's a mess, and this comes from committees writing separate pieces which then contradict each other and make no sense, and then have to be re-edited. We need to stop doing that because we waste a lot of time and many years of people's lives.

As for the ICC, we want to essentially redesign the ICC subcommittees, partly because through our conversations with various people, though we know that there's a lot of work these committees do, we also know that the way they are referred to in the Charter makes it seem that they have to be formed all the time. The Charter states that the chair of ICC is the person who triggers the creation of these committees, but we've behaved as if it always has to happen. When we've spoken to the Honors Curriculum Committee, they say that their job is to simply be advisory, which ultimately means that we don't really need to have people's time and service taken up, when you know in theory, you could just have somebody from ICC be the person who reaches out and manages such things. In the same way, we have the University Writing Committee which has to work very closely with the University Writing program, and then we have the General Education Committee that has to work with the Office of Educational Effectiveness. The way these committees do their work ought to tie in very closely with the ICC but sometimes they sort of go off on their own, and don't interact with the ICC as well as they should. This needs to change. Ultimately they are subcommittees. They need to be working and housed in the committee that manages them or should manage them. Therefore we recommend that they be collapsed back into the ICC and allow ICC to expand as needed. The other element that we want to get rid of is the requirement in the current language that every time a subcommittee of the ICC is formed it has to have the exact same makeup as the ICC. Right now ICC has, I think, 14 members and that means that currently, the subcommittees each have multiples of 14, so three extra sets of 14 people. So if we're able to remove that it reduces the required manpower for any of these subcommittees to function. I can understand that there can be some hesitancy around this, but that's why we're doing these presentations so that we get feedback and find better solutions.

The DEIC is going to be an interesting one, because the DEIC is a relatively new committee which I'm pretty sure wasn't formed until 2020. One of the things that we've been talking about is how the DEIC functions and the kind of impacts that it is capable of making. In its initial year the DEIC did a lot of work. They did a lot of research. They made some great presentations, and they taught us a lot, but as a subcommittee of the Senate their job has to be to write and propose policy. The problem has become that whenever we have had any diversity-related charges, those have ended up being shared with either the ICC, the FAC, or the AAC, or any other committee

that also owns that space. And as a result, the DEIC has been stuck running around between numerous other committees trying to do the job of those other committees. Which is a lot to ask, and it makes it even harder to do the work that they are asked to do.

We do understand that from our strategic plan, and from many of our conversations, diversity, equity and inclusion must exist in every space. Our recommendation going forward is that when we write policies, an existing member of each of our standing committees self-nominate as a DEI advocate to form a sort of floating DEIC group. Their job would be to work in each of the committees separately, and then come together a couple of times a semester or maybe a couple of times a year. That's for Senate to decide. When they come together they bring DEI concerns from all areas into a single space, talk about it, decide their strategy, and then bring that back into the respective standing committees, essentially meaning that the DEIC is constantly working in all areas in which Senate is making decisions. We are aware that this is a relatively radical idea which I'm sure is going to cause logistical problems.

Senator ?: What you are saying is that if I am on the Academic Affairs Committee, for example, I would nominate myself as the DEI advocate on that committee?

A. Newman: Exactly. And then, for example, if you're in Academic Affairs and somebody on Faculty Affairs nominates themselves, so then all of the DEI advocates meet once or twice, depending on how often you want to. So say the FAC or the AAC is dealing with this issue and you have a concern with X language that impacts DEI. You get together with all the other DEI advocates and talk it through. You could confer with Dr. Jenkins, for example, and then bring any recommendations you may have back to their individual committees. So in this model, it's not just one advocate being isolated. Instead, you have the backing of the other DEI advocates as well as being a functioning member of a committee that is drafting policy recommendations. Because ultimately, it is my contention that when people write policy that isn't DEI friendly, it's not because of a malicious intent, it's because of a lack of knowledge or perspective. So if we have somebody in every committee bringing in that perspective I think it could work.

So, that's the DEIC. Like I said, these are all ideas we've discussed on the Executive Committee. We don't know if they are going to be popular with the faculty at large. But we have been looking for solutions to reduce the number of people necessary to accomplish the work of governance while at the same time increasing the effectiveness of our committees.

Additional considerations: We don't want to have three at-large senators assigned to standing committees. If we reduce that number to one, senators will be able to be active in other areas without feeling consistently overloaded. If committees are ever overloaded, of course, they could request more at-large members.

One of the other things that we recommend is an edit to the preamble of the Charter. Under faculty responsibilities in Article 3.1, we think we should probably include research and scholarly activity. When that part of the charter was written, I don't think research and scholarly activity were a priority. So, if we are aiming to get to R1 status, we should probably include that.

Finally, the Global Education Committee is something that we're not going to recommend changing other than to ask them to focus more on facilitating international research for faculty on our main campus.

And that concludes my presentation.

J. Lanzafame: Two quick points. I mostly agree with your recommendations. But I'm a little concerned about the DEIC issue only because you only know what you know. You can't guarantee by just taking somebody on a committee and making them the de facto DEI officer, that even though they're trying to bring that perspective, they really are qualified to bring that perspective. So you might want to think of something beyond that. The other thing I would mention is if you're going to decrease the number of committees and decrease the number of at-large members, I think it's B2.5.9 that requires senators to also be on standing or university committees.

A. Newman: We have more than enough university committees.

J. Lanzafame: It's hard for large colleges. Because for people like me elected from a college that has 300 plus faculty, I'm a little concerned that it will be a challenge.

A. Newman: I would defer to Hamad on this, but from the numbers I've seen, we have challenges even now. For example, take the Middle States accreditation effort, we haven't been able to assign a representative there and I would've wanted a senator. Part of it is because our faculty and our senators are on multiple committees. And there's always going to be university level committees looking for members. But we can always revisit that at a different time, and increase the number of at-large, just to allow Senators to have university committee experience. Actually, I don't think the current language precludes it, because committees always have the option to request additional at-large numbers.

M. Laver: Just looking at the slide where you're proposing discontinuing the Long Range Planning and Environment committee and moving it into the RABC, the last time I was on senate, eight or nine years ago, I remember these committees, FAC, AAC, RABC almost every year they always had charges where they would come to us and say, 'Well, we didn't get to these. We have to roll them over to next year'. There was a little bit of that this year, if I remember correctly. So you know, anecdotally, if that's the case, year after year, if they're rolling charges over, I don't know that absorbing other committees into them is a responsible thing to do, unless we find a way to manage the number of charges that get assigned to them.

A. Newman: That's a good consideration. This was a discussion in our conversations, and the need to actually start working thematically has come up as well. I think that some of the changes that we're making just in terms of how policies are done, the Senate calendar for example, where our standing committees are now being asked to bring their charges in sooner and wrap things up on a schedule should actually reduce the number of carry-over charges. Plus part and parcel of the absorption process is to counter the situation where something gets done by one committee, which counters or contradicts the work of another committee, so that then it keeps going back and forth. So some of that I think, will answer what you're saying, but, yes, we have to figure it out.

H. Hamad: Point of order. I think that to give more people a chance to talk, it would be advantageous to let them make their comments and leave responses until afterwards.

N. Eddingsaas: My concern is basically similar to Michael's. To think that changing the timeline of when things are due is going to reduce the number of carry-overs, I don't see that happening. The reason that there's carryover is that there's too much work to be done and not enough time to do it. On paper, and in principle the idea of putting the committees together, especially in the way that you did it, looks great. But then you look at the one where you have FAC and RSC together, those are two of the busiest committees and thinking that half the number of people are going to get the work done earlier because of the time frame and that that's going to reduce the number of carry-overs, no, I think that will increase it. I agree, having earlier deadlines for when things are due is good. But it's not going to change the number of carry-overs.

J. Capps: We sent out the link to the college, and we got a couple of responses back. It's not clear how widespread the concerns are, but they're worth raising. One was about the DEI Committee. The language in at least one of the versions we saw said that it would be dissolved. But now I hear about re-imagining it, which seems to be a good thing. The concern is that if there's just someone designated but they have no place to go to, no cohort, then that puts them at a disadvantage. So that was one concern. The other one had to do with voting rights of students on

three committees. The thought there was that curriculum is solely the responsibility of faculty. And so for much the same reason that we are shifting administrators to being non-voting, students should also be in a non-voting role as well. Absolutely, students should have input on these committees, but faculty have the sole prerogative to vote on curriculum.

B. Dell: I was just curious about the feedback loop. For people who are standing committee members, should they bring back feedback directly to you? Some of these changes, for example, the DEIC ones, the people on the committee had not heard about that.

A. Newman: We're currently sending the proposed language to senators first for feedback from their constituents. And then we plan to incorporate the feedback and improve the proposal. Essentially, we're bringing you the draft right now. But when we incorporate the feedback, we'll clean up the draft and get something that makes more sense for the population at large and that will include the standing committees. Where possible we're having conversations to get information about how things are working and what things could be working better. Basically, we're trying to get as much input as we can and this is one of the input processes. So we're going to continue to do what we're doing today. Ironically, the DEI concerns that you've raised are one of the reasons why we've introduced the re-imagining idea because there was some feedback similar to that that came to us as well, and we agreed that that makes sense. And there's ways to fix it. So we hope that we're going to get to a point where we don't have a dozen standing committees.. Even if that means creating a structure where each committee can have no more than five charges a year, or something like that.

G. Wainwright: I would like to suggest that you get the sub-committees, especially those that are impacted by these changes, to comment on them. Because if you don't, you may find yourself going back and re-imagining again because of the concerns that they bring forward.

H. Ghazle: I just want to ask the entire group: Do you think it's the appropriate time for us to be discussing these changes to the Charter. Being quiet doesn't help!

F. Deese: It makes a lot of sense to me. I mean, why not now? I'm not saying anything about the specific suggestions but the idea of doing this is really important and it seems like the right time.

A. McLaren: I think that what Gretchen said is right. I think that what we tend to do is just keep on flipping back and forth. Understanding what people have done beforehand, so we're not just doing this, like going back and forward. So we understand we can really move forward.

A. Newman: What do you mean by flipping back and forth?

A. McLaren: Having comments on how it was changed beforehand, so we can understand where it has come from. So we're not just changing it into what it used to be, and then we're re-changing and then changing it back. You know what I mean?

A. Newman: That's fair. I will say, though, that this version of the charter, most of these standing committees have been at RIT for, I'm going to guess it's been at least a decade or more. There is ebb and flow in any organizational structure. So even if it were going from our current version back to the way it was in the Faculty Council days, where maybe they only had five committees, I think that's okay. The problem is that our current structure dates to a time when our faculty had more time, and there were fewer people on campus. But now we're looking at it from the point of view of having a student population of roughly 14, almost 15,000. Our faculty and staff came up to 2,600, and the committees have to somehow represent all of them. They have to talk to everyone. They have to do everything. The Senate has to be able to do everything, and we have to deal with university level committees besides. The fact is that over the past two years, we've

hit a wall on who we can get to volunteer. We have really, really good faculty who are just drowning in service work and that is something that we have to take very seriously. I know everyone likes to think that cutting down the numbers isn't going to help because they have so much work to do on the committees but we also have to consider that we actually have a very small number of faculty who work on all these committees. You know, we may have 300 faculty on the books doing the work of the Senate. But the actual work that's being done is probably being done by maybe 100 people, 150, maybe. I could name a bunch of people around this table who are on multiple standing committees, and are probably the ones who are doing a lot of the writing.

I know from speaking to chairs that there are people on standing committees who never show up, or who aren't capable of showing up because of their schedule. So let's look at the realities: are all of these people really needed to do all this work, or are we just making it so that the few people who are doing it get more credit for it? Because then, if we have only five committees, we can go to the provost and say, the chairs of each of these committees deserve to have a course release, because they're responsible for doing a lot of work. But we can't do that when we have thirteen, because then that's thirteen people and the deans will be like. "I don't care. You do whatever you want." So it's about leverage. It's about how we manage our time and our resources.

B. Dell: I was just going to make the point that I think that's part of the problem. Service isn't valued. Not by our departments and not by the higher leadership.

S. Malachowsky: I was just going to say that having so many committees now with so many at-large members has a dampening effect. It's a nonzero effect. When we think 'should we make a new committee for this, or should we throw people at this?' And I think, it tends to push it towards the answer being 'No', because there's just so much already. There might be issues that come up, where we really do want a committee. And right now the answer would be, 'no, we already have way too many committees'. I'm not saying we should already plan to add more committees. I'm just saying right now that the possibility of being able to do so is basically zero, whereas it becomes more practical or doable if we make a significant reduction. And I think that's part of the reason why we were looking at not just reducing by one or two, which seems a small adjustment, but bringing it way down, that kind of gives us a lift while at the same time giving us more flexibility.

H. Ghazle: This is a great discussion, and a discussion that will continue. These are just recommendations. So if this body decides "no", it's "no". So you have the ultimate power as a Senator to say, "no, I do not agree with the changes here." But the more input we get, the more feedback we get from everyone and you have to remember also, we're not the only ones who are going to make this go forward. Once this is done, it has to go back to the faculty at large to also get their input and feedback. So it's not something that's easy. Then of course it has to go to the administration. The key at this point is to ask, 'can we go ahead and somehow craft a charter that will meet the needs of all of our constituents on this campus?' I think this is important. It's going to be challenging. But the key is how we can all come together to come up with something that will meet everybody's needs.
In terms of some history, I remember in the beginning we had so many committees that we dropped some. Then we said, 'There's not enough,' so we increased the number. And now we say there's too many. Going back to Amy's comment, now we say, let's go back down. So it's like it goes up, down, up, down. At this point we need to have something that will last. I'm not saying forever, but something that will also meet the needs of the future, as well as today's. I think it is crucial for us as a group to do that. Collaboration is needed, and at the same time feedback and input. So guys, you make it.

Agenda Item 10: New Business; A. Newman (1:43)

A. Newman: We're running up against the time for new business. I don't know if we have any. I'll make one final comment. Obviously reducing the number of committees feels very drastic, which is why we're taking it as slowly as we are. But I will remind you, it's also possible to have ad hoc or temporary committees. For example, we formed a committee to look at the Academic calendar in a finite amount of time. The advantage of working with a smaller footprint, and having the ability to expand to meet unexpected or even expected needs that just come and go every once in a while is a good thing, and it should be something that we take into consideration.

S. Aldersley: So this was the beginning of this discussion. What we thought when we first started to discuss this last spring was that we would aim to go to the faculty for a vote or a series of votes, because that's an option, in late spring, hopefully before summer. This is an evolving document, for example, the notion of re-imagining the DEIC. That just came up. So presumably the recommendations are going to continue to evolve as we take in feedback. What we want to see is that senators go back to their colleges and collect feedback, not as a matter of urgency, but soon. Because if we don't take care of this in the next couple of months, it's not going to go to a vote this academic year. One question we will have is, is this a package? Or is this a set of individual votes? There's a lot of interconnectivity between the recommendations, but I don't think we really want to think of it as a package. At least we can pull some of them out for individual votes. Maybe some will have to be voted on together. I don't know. It depends how the specific language ends up.. But I do want to encourage senators to collect feedback as soon as possible. Incidentally, I think the idea of going to the Standing Committees specifically is probably a good idea. In summary, the Executive Committee is aiming to get this all taken care of, one way or the other, because Senate votes first, right, before the faculty, before the end of this academic year.

A. Newman: On that note, this discussion is officially wrapped up. Do we have any new business?

S. Malachowsky: I just wanted to recommend that if you guys haven't seen the Shed yet, there's an open house today, today, starting now, and there's some really cool stuff, like the maker space that you and your students might find highly interesting. I recommend it.

Agenda Item No. 11: Adjournment; A. Newman (1:47)

Attendance 1/18/2024

Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended	Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended
Abushagur, Mustafa	KGCOE Senator		Lanzafame, Joseph/LRPEC Rep	COS Senator	X

Adrion, Amy	ALT CAD Senator		Lapizco-Encinas, Blanca	KGCOE Senator	X
Aldersley, Stephen	Communications Officer/ SOIS Senator	X	Laver, Michael	CLA Senator	X
Anselm, Martin	CET Senator	X	Lee, James	ALT CET Senator	
Bamonto, Suzanne	CLA Senator	x	Liu, Manlu	SCB Senator	Excused
Barone, Keri	Treasurer/CLA Senator	X	Malachowsky, Samuel	Vice Chair/ GCCIS Senator	X
Boedo, Stephen	ALT KGCOE Senator		McCalley, Carmody	ALT COS Senator	
Brady, Kathleen	ALT NTID Senator		McLaren, Amy	CAD Senator	X
Brown, Tamaira	Senate Coordinator	X	Newman, Atia	Chair/CAD Senator	X
Butler, Janine	NTID Senator	X	Newman, Dina	COS Senator	
Capps, John	CLA Senator	X	Olabisi, Joy	SCB Senator	
Chiavaroli, Julius	ALT GIS Senator		Olles, Deana	COS Senator	X
Chung, Sorim	ALT SCB Senator	X	Olson, Rob	ALT GCCIS Senator	X
Crawford, Denton	CAD Senator	X	O'Neil, Jennifer	ALT CET Senator	
Cromer, Michael	ALT COS Senator	x	Osgood, Robert	ALT CHST Senator	
Cui, Feng	ALT COS Senator		Puchades, Ivan	KGCOE Senator	X
David, Prabu	Provost	X	Ray, Amit	CLA Senator	X
Davis, Stacey	ALT NTID Senator	X	Ross, Annemarie	NTID Senator	X
Deese, Frank	CAD Senator	X	Shaaban, Muhammad	ALT KGCOE Senator	
Dell, Betsy	CET Senator	X	Sheffield, Jr. Clarence	ALT SOIS Senator	
DiRisio, Keli	CAD Senator	X	Song, Qian	SCB Senator	x
Eddingsaas, Nathan/RSC Rep	COS Senator	X	Staff Council Rep		
Faber, Joshua	COS Senator	X	Student Government Rep	Alex Shuron	X
Fillip, Carol	ALT CAD Senator		Thomas, Bolaji	CHST Senator	X
Ghazle, Hamad	Operations Officer/CHST Senator	X	Tobin, Karen	NTID Senator	X

Ghoneim, Hany	KGCOE Senator		Tsouri, Gill	KGCOE Senator	x
Hardin, Jessica	ALT CLA Senator	x	Ulin, Robert	CLA Senator	X
Hazelwood, David	NTID Senator	Excused	Van Aardt, Jan	ALT COS Senator	
Hsieh, Jerrie	ALT SCB Senator		Warp, Melissa	ALT CAD Senator	
Jadamba, Basca	COS Senator	X	Weeden, Elissa	GCCIS Senator	X
Johnson, Dan	CET Senator	X	White, Phil	ALT GCCIS Senator	
Johnson, Scott	GCCIS Senator	X	Williams, Eric	GIS Senator	
Kincheloe, Pamela	NTID Senator	X	Worrell, Tracy	ALT CLA Senator	
Kiser, Larry	GCCIS Senator	x	Zanibbi, Richard	GCCIS Senator	Excused
Krutz, Daniel	ALT GCCIS Senator		Zlochower, Yosef	COS Senator	X
Kuhl, Michael	KGCOE Senator	x			

Standing Committee(s) Represented: (ICC, LRPEC, RSC and UWC)

Interpreters: Nic Crouse-Dickerson and Jennifer Mura

Presenters: Lisa Chase and Risa Robinson