

Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, February 1, 2024

12:15 – 1:50 PM

Zoom

Attendance: See Below

Agenda Item No. 1: Call to Order; A. Newman (12:15)
Meeting called to order.
Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; A. Newman (12:16)
Motion: F. Dreese Seconded K. DiRisio Approved by acclamation
Agenda Item No. 3: Communication Officer's Report/Approval of Minutes; S. Aldersley (12:16)
<p>S. Aldersley: Good morning everybody. Having received no suggestions to edit the draft minutes of the 1/18 meeting I move they be approved. Similarly I received no suggestions to edit the draft minutes of the 10/5 meeting and I move that they also be approved. You may have noticed in the minutes that a couple of Senators did not identify themselves. If you want to have your name in the minutes, please say who you are when you speak.</p> <p>Seconded: S. Johnson</p> <p>Approved by acclamation</p> <p>January 18, 2024 Meeting Minutes</p>
Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; A. Newman (12:18)
<p>A. Newman: First, thank you everyone for all of your prompt and detailed responses regarding how RIT should schedule classes on the day of the eclipse. We got some really wonderful data from Senators and I want to applaud you for being on the ball with this. I received a number of spreadsheets showing how people voted and overall it seems that a simple majority of our faculty supports closing for the day. Many people did cite concerns such as safety, childcare, and the value of recognizing a once in a lifetime event as good reasons for canceling. But there were also some impassioned pleas to not cancel classes, and instead to use that time as a learning moment as well as to protect the time for their classrooms and for their teaching goals. I assembled these concerns in a spreadsheet and forwarded them to the Provost with a proposal to allow instructors to have some flexibility and we're currently waiting on a decision.</p> <p>P. David: Thanks everyone. I hope you're doing well and welcome back to a new semester. Atia mentioned that it's February already, I just can't believe it. What I have been advocating with the President and the university in general is to give faculty freedom to make the choice on how they want to deal with eclipse day. The general recommendation is to go online as much as possible. Some faculty want to have classes because they are teaching labs and other kinds of activities, and losing a full day would be a significant loss for their instructional objectives and so on. So people who want to teach class and do a lab will have the liberty to do so. But others can make the</p>

decision to go online or cancel class. The general thinking is the university is open, and between 2:00 to 5:00, people are expected to allow everyone the freedom to go and observe. Even if you are a stickler and choose to have class during that time, during the eclipse, please allow students to go and observe it. That's the thinking at this point. There are some questions about how this would affect staff. We've talked with HR as well as Student Affairs and Facilities Management. They think they have a pretty decent plan that aligns with what we want to do on the academic side.

A. Newman: Thank you, Dr. David. Carrying on with my report, I want to remind everyone that we have sent out invitations to the President's luncheon, scheduled for the 22nd of February. If you haven't yet responded, please do so. We would like a really good showing. Last year we had a very productive and informal conversation with the President regarding things that were important to us at the time. I won't go through the list, but one of the major outcomes of that luncheon was that the executive committee now has regular meetings with Dr. Munson a couple of times a semester, which I think is an important thing to do. So if you are aware of issues that you want to discuss with the President or you want to just learn more about something, this is a great opportunity to do so. So please do sign up and join us.

Another thing that I wanted to give an update about was a concern that you may be receiving from your constituents. This year we're going to be sending out a notification to a number of faculty informing them that they are now part of this year's dismissal for cause committee, both for tenure track and non-tenure track. Do not panic. This is not because anybody is planning to take any action. It's actually because we were reviewing these policies as part of the five-year cycle and we realized that the way these policies are written right now, we are required to convene these committees every year before the first of February. Unfortunately, these policies are really prescriptive and they have a very detailed way of how we have to assign people, and that's why certain people have now been elected to be a part of the committee, but we don't foresee the use of these committees. I do, however, foresee a change coming to change how they are formed.

One final thing, just as a quick reminder, according to E.36, every college cohort will be asked to report at the end of the semester. So if you haven't already got it on your books to convene a faculty-led meeting, this is a good time to start thinking about it.

Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; K. Ehrlich-Scheffer (12:24)

K. Ehrlich-Scheffer: I have a couple of updates from Staff Council to share. First is that Staff Council has transitioned to holding all meetings on Zoom for the remainder of the year. At our most recent meeting on January 25th we heard from Keith O'Connor, health and fitness specialist from Better Me. We also heard from Dr. Risa Robinson and Dr. Larry Buckley who presented about the Middle States re-accreditation process and the importance of having ample community involvement. They also explained about the survey requesting feedback for the third priority.

The biggest news really that impacts Faculty Senate concerns the committee reports from our standing committees who are giving updates on progress on their plans of work. In a particular note, our Policy Committee is working on military leave policies, the roles of remote staff members in Staff Council, and also a comparison of the staff versus faculty grievance policies. So we anticipate some policies working their way through the process in the future. Coming up on the 8th, we're going to be hearing from United Way and on the 22nd from Public Safety.

Agenda Item No. 6: Student Government Update; A. Shuron (12:25)

A. Shuron: Hi everyone, hope you're doing well. Just two quick reports from Student Government. First, we're appointing an SG representative to our new ad hoc committee for student wellbeing. We had a lot of success with our previous accessibility committee, so we're hoping we'll be able to tackle issues that students have concerning mental health and mental health resources on campus. In addition, we recently approved the elections calendar, so petitions for student government office will open February 19th.

Agenda Item No. 7: Policy Changes D14.0 (Policy on Awarding Honorary Degrees) VOTE; L. Chase (12:26) *Presentation linked below*

L. Chase: I had the pleasure of being with you on January 18th when I presented proposed policy changes for D.14, the awarding of Honorary degrees. I believe those changes have continued to be shared with all of you and we are hopefully bringing this to a vote. And I'm happy to take any questions. If there's any discussion or questions.

Motion to approve: J. Capps

Seconded: S. Johnson

E. Williams: What am I voting on? I see in the email ... Am I bringing up the same thing? I see a PowerPoint presentation on Policy D.14 awarding honorary degrees. I don't see a document with the policy text.

A. Newman: A red line document? I don't know. Let's take a look. Do we have the red line document? I feel like we did, but maybe that was from last week?

E. Williams: It's not in the email that was sent out for today's meeting.

M. Anselm: It's in the Google Drive, but it's not red line. It's the question I asked last week. I asked if this was the new version that was on the Google Drive. It's not redlined. It's just what we're being asked to vote on. So in general, whenever we're going to vote on something, if we could have it in the folder or the email that we're getting for the meeting, that would be great.

A. Newman: Dr. Chase, would you mind providing the document at a later date? Obviously we've all read the policy, and as it's written, it does not seem to be objectionable to anyone. So we'll just collect the information from you and share it with everyone at a different time. Any more discussion or questions?

H. Ghazle: Is the issue here that we're not going to vote on this till we receive the red line document?

A. Newman: I was assuming that the vote is on the floor, so we're going to vote on it. Unless that is not okay.

H. Ghazle: Okay, Eric, are you objecting to having the vote?

E. Williams: In general, I think we should, but you know, if people really don't think this one is important enough to see the full text, it's fine. I would abstain for the vote.

A. Newman: Tamaira, do you know if we got a red line document?

T. Brown: It's not a red line document because the policy has been rewritten. Lisa had a few different documents and they were sent out when she initially came to present in January, so I can move those over to today's folder, but it's not a red line document because basically the policy has almost been completely rewritten, but the document is in the Google Drive.

A. Newman: Yes, I know we have the document in the Google Drive. We can just move it into the current meeting.

T. Brown: I'll move both of them. The current version and then the new version. So both of them are in today's folder. Both versions are there and you have to kind of look at both since it's not a red line, it's a rewrite.

A. Newman: Okay, so I think that does settle that question to a certain extent. Obviously it seems a little difficult to manage if it's a full rewrite, it would be hard to provide a crossed out version, but we'll work with that. I'm going to say that this means that we're voting right now and if there are no objections to taking the vote now, I think we would have to vote regardless unless there was a counter motion.

Motion: To approve the re-write of Policy D.14.

Approved: 38:0:4

[Policy D14.0 Changes Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 8: Open Committee Position; H. Ghazle (12:35)

A. Newman: Next, we have our academic calendar up for discussion. Is Clyde here? Scott?

S. Johnson: I'm here, but Clyde is not and Clyde was kind of spearheading this so let's give him a few minutes.

A. Newman: Absolutely. Actually, this would be a great time, if no-one objects for Hamad to bring up the need for another Senate representative. Hamad, would you mind explaining what we're looking for?

H. Ghazle: Sure. We had our colleague Andre Hudson representing the Senate on the selection committee for the Isaac Jordan Faculty and Staff Pluralism Award, and as you know Andre is now the Dean of the College of Science. So we need somebody to represent the Senate on this committee. And I would feel very lucky if someone would volunteer to serve on the committee and we can elect them today. If not, we will send an email out to everybody asking for nominations or self-nominations. If you feel shy about it and you don't want to say anything today please email me so we can go ahead and do what we need to do. But the preference is to find somebody today.

A. Newman: Do we have any volunteers? This is for the Isaac L. Jordan Pluralism Awards Committee. You get to be part of a committee and represent the Senate and basically, give somebody a prize. I don't even know if it's a cash prize. Is it?

H. Ghazle: Yes, there is something that comes with it for the nominee. I think the policy is E12.5 and it falls under section 2B.1 If you look in there to learn more about this that would be great. Really, to my understanding it's not much time. Hopefully somebody at the end of the meeting will say something.

A. Newman: If our next presenters are not ready, we might have to move forward and come back to them. Would that be okay with you Scott?

S. Johnson: Yes, I don't see Clyde yet.

A. Newman: Okay, we can rearrange. We should have rewritten the agenda for that, but it's okay.

S. Johnson: Yes, he barely could make it with the 12:40.

A. Newman: So this is a good time to check and see if Heidi is here.

.....

Agenda Item No. 9: Academic Calendar; C. Hull and S. Johnson (1:05)

A. Newman: So now we're coming back to our regularly scheduled programming. I see Clyde is here. And so is Scott. They're going to talk about the academic calendar.

C. Hull: Okay, thank you. Hello everybody. I got to watch most of what went by just now and it really makes me miss you guys. But getting back to the topic at hand. Maybe Scott and I can save you guys a few minutes. We do not have a formal proposal. We are not coming to you for any kind of a vote. This is more a matter of transparency, making sure that we report back to Senate as to what's going on.

As many of you know last year there was some discussion of changing the calendar. Which policy says that we should do, at the discretion of the Provost, but no less often than every five years. It had actually been more than five years, because we postponed it for the pandemic. About halfway through the year, Provost Granberg was leaving and she didn't want to make decisions that the next provost would have to implement without having been

involved in the process. So everything ground to a halt. This year, Scott and I spoke with the Provost to see what he was interested in in terms of the calendar. And when faculty go to administrators with proposals, frequently the administration already has something on its agenda. It seems like the Provost is concerned with making sure our students graduate. And among the things the Provost should care about, that seems like a very reasonable thing. I also would like to see all of our students graduate. So no complaints about the focus he brought to bear on this, but it was an interesting sort of thing because he really focused on the one change that seems like it would actually help students who might be falling through the cracks and falling out of the RIT process, help keep them in the system and help them continue to move forward towards graduation. So of the various things that we had previously been discussing, extending winter break by a week to give more time to help students who need help between semesters, for example, figuring out if they're going to change programs, and if so, what program they are going to change into is the focus? Just letting them know what the situation is because sometimes things aren't processed until after the holidays and then at the beginning of January, students come back to campus and find out, 'oh my goodness this is just happening'. So giving staff an extra week to get things processed will give us all a chance to deal with the students who need the extra help and give them a little bit longer to figure out what's going on. This is not going to affect the straight A students. They're just going to come back and presumably get more A's, but it would help the students who might need a little bit more help. So the Provost expressed interest in pursuing that particular bit more than the rest and so that looks likely to be the focus of calendar discussions. We have reached out to the president and vice president of Student Government and they are planning to meet with us together with the Provost and a couple of other administrators. I believe that meeting is scheduled to happen next week. So at this point there are absolutely no proposals on the table, nothing to vote on, but we wanted you to know what was going on. We do remember some of the points from last year. The first thing that people are most likely to ask is 'are you going to make summer shorter'? The obvious answer is I'm not going to make anything happen like that, but we're not going to recommend shortening the summer because we understand that basically the entire campus unanimously said 'do not shorten summer'. And we don't really want to shorten summer either. So summer being shortened is not on the table. Other than that, we're kind of exploring the options to see if there is a way forward to have that extra week in January after the holidays. Scott, do you want to add anything?

S. Johnson: We were trying to make drastic changes last year and a lot of people were freaking out about that, including Student Government. So we've decided to dial it back and try to do smaller incremental changes over time instead of doing one giant massive rehaul of the calendar. The shock factor got to a lot of people, especially the students, so we're trying to dial back and do minor changes instead of doing huge overarching drastic changes.

C. Hull: I think last year Student Government was a little bit blindsided and we're trying to avoid doing that again this year and make sure SG is aware of what's happening and is involved in the process right from the start. Hence we're going to try to meet with the leaders of student government as soon as possible.

A. Newman: Excellent. Thank you so much. Are there any comments or questions?

C. Hull: It looks like we're going to give you back some time.

Agenda Item No. 10: ICC Charge; H. Nickisher (12:40) *Presentation linked below*

H. Nickisher: It's a good thing I came in on time. ICC has been sitting on this for a while and I'm ready to go. I'm presenting on one of our carryover charges. Which I believe ICC got, maybe the fall of 2021. I believe also that it was a charge that initially came in from the College of Liberal Arts, but the Provost was very supportive of it, which was to investigate these policy changes or make these policy changes with regard to duplication and course development. Initially, this was a charge that was to be discussed in tandem with a second charge, which has also been a carryover related to the discussion of ABB. And while the decision whether to transition to ABB remains under discussion, ICC was advised to proceed with this charge. So the following represents our recommendations. All of you should have received this. I can certainly go through my slides here. Just let me know if I need to speed them up. This is the current language and of course I have the policy broken down. The areas highlighted in yellow are specifically those places in policy where we have proposed changes. This is the first proposal. Again, if you've already read it, let me know. Otherwise this slide can hang out for a little bit. So back to another section of the same policy. And again, specific areas where we have made recommendations. This slide and the next one is what the current language in this section C of this part of the policy is. Nothing changed here. And so our proposed language. And then lastly, part of this is an amendment to Appendix D for a modified course and that is what you are looking at presently. And that is the content of our revisions.

A. Newman: Excellent. Thank you.

H. Nickisher: Sorry Atia, I would just like to say here that this charge and these proposed changes to policy, of course, have to do with concerns about resources, but also, and perhaps especially for all of us involved in the shared governance process, they support more and better transparency surrounding the curriculum development process. Of course, before anybody says anything, the best way for the proposed to work is to have a curriculum management system, but that is underway, so before that gets into place, it might be a little lumpy bumpy, but we've been somehow managing already anyway. So that's where we're at.

A. Newman: That was a really good point to make. And it is really exciting to know that we're getting a curriculum management system. Last year no less than four standing committees were saying we need one. So exciting things ahead. As you know, when a standing committee makes a motion, we don't need a second which means there is a motion on the floor and we're open for discussion.

S. Aldersley: I wonder if there's a timeline on getting the course management system?

H. Nickisher: If I may, I'm going to direct that to the provost.

P. David: Yes, Stephen, the bid is out and they have identified the provider. It's going to be CourseLeaf, which was the program that was identified by the last two committees. And I think within the next six months or so, it will be operational. They have asked for support in terms of personnel, which we have offered, so I'd say six months to a year, it'll be in place.

S. Aldersley: Thank you.

R. Zanibbi: I just wanted to ask how, until the system shows up, especially if it is a year longer and these things tend to roll out slower than anticipated, what is the way that we find course proposals before that system's available? Because I don't believe presently we have course proposals available across colleges. So if a college curricular committee is supposed to check for overlap that might be difficult currently.

H. Nickisher: I think maybe it's a two-part answer to your question, because if one is proposing a new course and the issue might be whether or not there's an overlap or duplication, there are courses that you can search through on SIS already. So, you know, courses that exist versus those which are proposed, but you're right and I don't have an answer but, well this is maybe not the best answer, but what are the chances of two different colleges more or less at the same time putting forward two proposed courses which are going to have this problem or issue.

R. Zanibbi: Well, my understanding is that we'd also be looking at modifications. So for example, if one college is going to propose a course that may not completely duplicate but overlap with another college's course, then to check that you would need access to the actual course proposal because I don't think SIS includes the Word documents that I know in my college we use to list the set of topics and the textbook and the title and who potential instructors are and all those details. My understanding is SIS just has a description and title, so we wouldn't have the level of detail of topics that this policy proposal seems to suggest should be considered.

H. Nickisher: Well, I think that's where the chairs of the college curriculum committees then reach out to whatever the other college or colleges may be.

R. Zanibbi: Okay, so it would be an informal process and there wouldn't be a shared repository. There's no shared repository for people to access.

H. Nickisher: Not at present, but presumably that's what will be part of a curriculum management system.

R. Zanibbi: Right. So I worry a little bit about implementing this before that management system is in place just because of the difficulties that might entail.

H. Nickisher: Chris, I know you are here. I just want to say that there was a subcommittee of ICC that initially drafted these proposed changes that consisted of Chris Licata, Jennifer Bailey from KGCoe and Jason Listman who was the NTID rep at the time. So Chris, do you have anything additional that you can add to or give to Richard with regard to his question.

C. Licata: Sure. So I think it's a really fair question to ask and I just want to clarify a little bit on the timeline for the implementation of CourseLeaf because it does have implications for Richard's question. As the Provost said we will start with CourseLeaf implementation in June for the catalog section of that product. That will take us almost a year. We won't start the curriculum management portion until the following year. So we are talking about starting the curriculum piece of CourseLeaf, not in AY24/25 but in AY25/26. So realistically, it's that far out. So. If these

changes are made, we will have to rely on what Richard categorized as a more informal process for sharing those course outline forms. Now the course outline forms do exist within the colleges. So if we got to a point before the implementation of CourseLeaf where you wanted to delve into, or needed to delve into the learning outcomes, etc., etc., what we would need to do is retrieve those outlines from the college.

M. Laver: Heidi, very thorough in your work as always. I expect nothing less. So thanks for that. I guess my question is when we talk about course overlaps and things of that nature, a lot of times we see things like this in universities that have a responsibility-centered budget model where, instead of outsourcing your physics education to the College of Science, Engineering wants to keep all those dollars in house and so they offer their own courses. I mean, I get that kind of model. But at RIT, my question is simply have we seen a lot of this already? In other words, is this a problem that we need to resolve? Or is this a problem that we think might rear its head as we introduce more interdisciplinary programs like AI and cognitive science and things of that nature? In my time in the curricular bodies over the years, occasionally we'll see some overlap in courses, but the last time I can remember this being a serious problem was when I believe Engineering wanted to offer Physics for their Mech E. majors and Science was a little worried by that. So in other words, is this a problem that we see regularly?

H. Nickisher: Maybe the simple answer to your question is, again it's sort of a combination. As I said the first generation of this charge came from somebody in the College of Liberal Arts. So I think something had happened. But the fact that Dr. Granburg was very supportive of this charge, I think to the latter part of your question, I think it was just being proactive in making sure that this doesn't become a problem.

M. Laver: Thank you.

H. Ghazle: Now we have a system that we may be looking into very soon, but the implementation? We don't know. Now we're leaving it up to the department to fish and fetch for the information. And we know how difficult it is sometimes to get that type of information. The question I have, what is the harm in waiting? I know we want to be proactive. But I'm thinking about time. I'm thinking about the effort and the stress and the anxiety and also leaving it up to the interpretations of people, saying, oh well, I think this course will overlap or it may not overlap. If the system's going to come soon, I'm hoping within six months for implementation, maybe it would be beneficial for us to wait till we implement it. The process would be more efficient and more productive. That's my 5 cents and I do appreciate all the work you guys are doing on this committee.

H. Nickisher: Thank you, Hamad. Again, this charge was sort of ready to go at the end of last spring. And at that point we weren't anywhere near as close to having a curriculum management system. I think the main reason I didn't bring it at the end of last spring was for the points that you make in terms of this may cause a lot of stress trying to navigate the SIS system. But it's ready to go. Whether you want to implement it today, tomorrow, six months from now. And that is why I bring it to you.

D. Newman: My question is whether there is any recourse at this time for where there's been overlap already. Is there any policy about fixing that problem?

H. Nickisher: No, as a matter of fact, this is about going forward because unfortunately, there are probably more of those instances than we'd like to deal with.

Dr. David. Thanks to the ICC committee and Heidi for her leadership. This is a very sound policy. Most universities have something like this. It's just a safeguard, just guidelines, but the policy alone is not going to address the issue which is one of trust. We have to trust our colleagues and the default model is based on trust. When a college proposes a new course, the assumption is that they've done some due diligence reaching out to colleges that have related courses and there is a discussion that takes place among relevant parties. I think that default model is the standard. It'll continue to grow. This was just a little bit of a safeguard to tamp down any perverse incentives if we went to ABB. That was the intent, I think, and my reading of this from what I could glean. So in general, this doesn't change anything dramatically. It just codifies it a little bit until the new system is in place. It will be very difficult to enforce in a rigorous way, but the default still remains. It has to be one based on trust and professional courtesy for our colleagues in other colleges.

J. Capps: I have a question about the definitions of overlap and equivalence. So these are presented in terms of 50% or 80% and my question is how you measure 50 versus 80 versus 75 versus 45? My concern is that this promises a really high degree of precision. But I think in practice that's not going to be easy to achieve. And then my concern is that this won't really provide as much help as we would like it to because people will instead debate whether these two courses overlap only 75% or 65% or 45% or whatever, so I guess my question is, how are these percentages measured?

H. Nickisher: I don't know if I want to say thank you, John, for that question, because it confirms what I figured would be the question that would come up about this. And I also don't know that I have a really solid quantitative

answer for you. I guess to some degree and also falling back on what the Provost just said about trust, with regard to percentages, there's going to be some negotiation there. And while courses will be categorized as either overlapping or equivalent, programs will get to decide the impact of that for their students. I think the biggest concern for the ICC when we were talking about this especially with regard to the 80%, was about emphasizing it, wanting it to be a high percentage, to make it clear or clearer in terms of where the overlap or equivalency is going to fall or how you define that. I don't know if that answers your question at all.

J. Capps: I'm still not clear how if this becomes an issue how it's going to be decided whether courses overlap, 75% or 80% whether they hit that threshold or not, but I appreciate your response. I'm not sure that there really is an answer to that question.

H. Nickisher: Chris, do you have anything to add to that?

C. Licata: Well, John, we struggled with that on the committee as Heidi indicated and, to be perfectly honest the first time through the draft, we didn't have any percentages in there. And then the question was, well, how do you decide? Where do you draw the line between equivalent and overlapping? And so we reasoned that we had to provide some guidance, as imperfect as it might be. But I think the way we thought that one would come to a decision about whether it fell into the overlapping or equivalent category was that you would take the course outline and you would look at the learning objectives, you would look at the week by week topics that were covered and the time that was assigned to those topics and that you would actually try to do some type of a mathematical calculation really, with respect to the content covered, the amount of time on that, the intensity of the assignments associated with that that represented the grade at the end and that that would really be your guide. So it isn't the kind of thing that you would just look at the course description and make that determination. You absolutely would have to delve into the additional detail that's provided on the course outline form. And of course this goes to the original question that Richard raised about making sure that we have those outline forms because you'd have to be able to delve into that to do that analysis.

B. Thomas: Good job Heidi. I'm not sure how you were able to present this given all the questions that have come up. I think we had this conversation at Senate once before. My own concern will be that there are courses taught at a higher level, maybe a 400 level, while a similar course is taught in another college at a 200 level. And there might be overlap of setting topics or for instance the level at which the courses are being presented. It's difficult to be able to tease that out right now based on the paper that we have right now. When this came up on RABC, I recall very well, our worry was if you install ABB, everybody begins to battle everyone to try to bring money to our college. How do we solve that problem? That was one reason why I thought maybe to slow down a little bit? I confess I've not read the documentation you sent. So I don't know what the changes are from the old policy that you are proposing. So my view would be if it's not too urgent, we can wait.

H. Nickisher: Bolaji, I can certainly appreciate that for some of the very reasons that you state. But again, it would be nice if we could pass it not only so I could get it off my docket, but also to have something to begin to work with because I think part of the issue is going to be that there are a number of variables and so at least we have a place from which to start with what we're asking to put in place.

A. Newman: You make a really good point, Heidi. We always have to remember that perfectionism is really the enemy of getting anything done. There has to be a starting point before we can fix something that just isn't there yet. If there's no further discussion, there's a motion on the floor, which means we have to vote.

J. Lanzafame: Is it not possible to pass it and not have it be immediately activated? That might solve the concerns that people have about it not being easy to implement before the curriculum management system comes up. That'll get it into policy, but it doesn't have to be an immediate actionable policy.

A. Newman: That's true and that has been done before in the past. Heidi, would you accept that as a friendly amendment?

H. Ghazle: Point of order. Just to ensure that everybody is aware, let's assume if we approved it right now. That does not mean it's going to be implemented. Once we approve it, it goes to the Provost and the President. They have to make the decision whether to implement or not to implement. So if we approve it now, the Provost could wait for some time to implement it. So that goes along with what Joe is asking. It goes back to the Provost and the decision goes from there.

A. Newman: But we as a Senate can also choose to decide when we want a policy to start or be implemented.

D. Prabu: Two things. If you approve this, I would like us to just act on it and get it done. Heidi has been thinking about this for six months or so and the committee has done a lot of hard work. I don't think in the spirit of what the policy says, people are going to go crazy just because this thing was announced. It's just a matter of what already

happens is going to continue to happen. I think that's the effect it's going to have. If there are egregious sorts of people who are trying to game the system, this policy would flag that. So if there is any way that we could just get this done and approved that would be great. I do have one friendly amendment, something that has been nagging, and that's when this comes to implementation, how the heck are we going to operationalize percentages and this and that. So I would like a simple qualitative approach rather than a quantitative approach to this. Something like there are two kinds of overlap or something like that, a significant overlap versus some overlap. Just two simple things. Hey, there are some things that are overlapping here that require further discussion. And then, oh, this is a bizarre case that is essentially a duplicate of this other course, but with a different spin or something. I think if there is a way to find a solution there, but I don't want to make things difficult for the ICC.

A. Newman: Heidi, would you like to respond?

H. Nickisher: I'm wondering with regard to maybe going back in to the document and adding words, qualifying words, like 'some' or 'significant', are you suggesting that we do take this document back so therefore it is off the table today and then re-present it with modifications to certain words.

D. Prabu: No, I'm just asking a broader question to you and the group here. You're the ones who have to implement it. Do you think you can reasonably determine if something is overlapping at a certain percentage? Collective wisdom here is what I'm searching for. If we think we can do this in a meaningful way, by all means we should do it. I don't want to pass a policy that we don't know how to implement, because it's perhaps too rigorous in its definition.

C. Licata: One thing we probably want to keep in mind is that when we begin to do the groundwork for the curriculum management system, we're going to have to define every business process that's involved, including the course outline form. The course outline that we see today does not need to look exactly the way it will look in the curriculum management system. We have flexibility as a university. And so if we were to implement this immediately and give ourselves this next year to see what challenges we are facing, both with the course outline form and to the Provost's point, how we can make those determinations about what's equivalent and what's overlapping. We could then use that information as we begin to build the curriculum management system to make sure that we've got some safeguards in place there to make this easier for us.

H. Ghazle: I just have a point of order. I'm just looking at my notes: we have a motion on the floor to go ahead and approve the ICC's recommendation and we also have an amendment on the floor from the Provost. I just want to make sure that you have that in mind. The issue at this point is we have the motion. Are we going to go ahead and vote on the motion and if we have already accepted the amendment. This is what we're dealing with right now.

A. Newman: The big question right now, because we're over time by about ten minutes, is do we need a second to approve an amendment?

H. Nickisher: Excuse me Atia. There may be an amendment, but it wasn't clear what was specifically being amended.

A. Newman: Good question. Michael is saying he didn't hear an amendment either. Is there a proposal for an amendment to the current motion?

D. Prabu: If there was any suggestion that way, I withdraw my former statement.

A. Newman: Okay, thank you. So there is then no amendment on the table. Michael, are you going to add to the conversation as the final person who speaks?

M. Laver: Yes, thank you. I want to ask Heidi what the vote was at ICC for these recommendations. Was it unanimous? Was there any opposition to this?

H. Nickisher: It was very nearly unanimous. ICC consists of 13 members, including one student, a dean's representative, and a faculty senate at-large rep and it was only one so that's 13 so only one of the college representatives declined to vote so percentage-wise that's 92%.

M. Laver: Historically ICC has done really good work and I've always trusted their judgment and we elect people to serve at the ICC and presumably you've taken a deep dive on this. So I support this and I'm happy to vote for it if that's the ICC recommendation.

A. Newman: Excellent. Thank you so much. So now we're going for a vote. I'm sorry, Ivan, we are so over time. At this point in time, if you have any more comments, please send them to Heidi and she will put them into the packet that goes to the Provost.

Motion: To approve the revisions to D01.0

Approved: 35:3:1

[ICC Charge Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 11: Policy E06.0; A. Newman (1:10) *Presentation linked below*

A. Newman: I was going to say I'm shocked I would have expected the calendar to be a big topic. But thank you so much for presenting and for coming back and updating everyone on this. I know we were all thinking about how short the winter break was.

Moving forward, we have a couple of things on the agenda that we want to bring up and one of them is policy E 6. I'm going to just give some background on this. I'm going to share my screen. So while I'm sharing my screen and just getting you guys caught up on the background, and some of you know this because I've already talked about this *ad nauseam*, is that policy E 6 has been a topic of discussion for quite a while. It's one of the policies that gets revisited very regularly by our Faculty Affairs Committee and occasionally by some other committee that may need to make some adjustments.

A few years ago when I was vice chair with Clyde, we made some adjustments. We voted on extending the non-tenure track faculty contract length and we were all very excited to get things going. When I moved that policy over into the Provost's office with Dr. Granberg, I got a notification that an entire section had been missing, the Professor of Practice part, which I obviously hadn't looked at during the process so I was like 'okay this is just something that happened and we'll put it back.' As I did that over the summer and took over responsibility as chair, more things came to our attention and that's going to be where you start to see two different sets of highlighted changes. If you scroll all the way down you're going to see we have a little key to guide you through the process. It turns out there were revisions that were approved in 2020 that the Provost either hadn't seen or hadn't been delivered, which was awkward because they had all been voted on by Faculty Senate but then had not actually ended up on the version that went to the Provost. Which meant that the revisions that were approved by Senate in 2022 were sort of being built upon older revisions that should have been approved by the Provost except that she hadn't seen them. And this created a few issues.

And then there were the actual revisions themselves. While Dr. Granberg agreed with the extension of NTT faculty contracts, it seemed that the FAC had made some additional changes that were not acceptable to her and they were actually flagged by Legal. This was the removal of this sentence that said 'may be renewed at the sole discretion of the university.' This was the question regarding the contract of a NTT faculty member. RIT lives in New York State which is an at-will employment state, which means RIT is under no obligation to actually continue to employ someone for no reason. So, the removal of these sentences and the addition of when notice of renewal was going to go through, was very problematic for the Provost and she and I had a conversation about this before she left. And this was something we discussed, it was going to go back but with the additional messes of everything that we've been looking at and with the previous changes already having been voted on by Faculty Senate, it became harder and harder to try and explain this to the FAC and I felt it was too much, because we already had previous changes that had been voted on. So, in any case, clarification ended up becoming a really big issue. Which meant that the executive committee decided to take this on as a charge to bring this policy back to a place where we're able to show it to the Provost and start off with a clean slate. I had a conversation with the Provost on this recently and we went over the issues of this policy, the parts that were previously voted on by Senate, but not approved by Dr. Granberg, the parts that were approved by Dr. Granberg and then the final part that wasn't approved because of legal issues. And we now have a red line version, which I will now open up and share with you.

So in the edited version we went back through the yellow highlighted parts and we put back all of the things that Dr. Granberg had flagged as being legally not acceptable. So you will see there's a number of things that are rolled back in all of the edits, for example NTT faculty are renewed at the sole discretion of the university, and the removal of particular policy numbers because they give an idea that those are the only reasons why somebody might be fired. So the idea being that we are trying to reset this, because we want to have this policy approved by the Provost so that it can be now given to the FAC so they can actually address the second half of the motion which is to review NTT faculty titles. My apologies for being confusing about all of the different things that have been happening to this. It's been a little bit of a mess.

The reason why we're presenting this right now is because it's so convoluted that we as an executive committee thought that it feels weird to bring these changes and to put them into policy officially without once more reviewing it with the Senate so that we can discuss this and so that we can again start off from a good starting point where both the Provost and the Senate agree what happened. Since posting these documents and since speaking with the Provost there are a couple of things that have come to our attention that I want to discuss as well. First, the Provost

hasn't yet signed off on this because, being new here, he would like to make sure that this is once again reviewed by Legal so that it comes to a state which is acceptable to both Senate and the administration. The second thing is, Laverne just pointed out that it seems that the document we received didn't actually update the NTT contract lengths that had been approved by Senate in 2022. Which means there's going to be an additional change to these documents to reflect the changes that were approved by Senate that will just bring up the numbers of the contract lengths. I'm blanking on what the new contract lengths were, so it never occurred to me that the numbers were wrong. So these are some of the changes that are happening and again, this is more of a 'let's bring this to Senate and discuss it in case there are any concerns' and then go from there, once it gets signed off by the Provost and the President, this document will then go in its clean version to our FAC so they can actually address their carryover charges from last year.
Are there any questions?

B. Thomas: How do you define 'clean state'?

A. Newman: Basically everything in this policy needs to be approved. That's the goal. So because all of the changes are ones that were already voted on by Faculty Senate, we don't actually need to carry a vote here. That's our estimation. But what we do want to do is make this an informational process where everyone knows what's going on with this policy and why this policy feels stuck in limbo because I know there are a lot of questions there.

M. Anselm: What's the timeline for this review process you're proposing before it goes to the Provost.

A. Newman: Right now it's with the Provost, or rather we've given it to the Provost and he is moving it forward to Legal. From there I'm going to assume if Legal works at a halfway decent rate, it should come back to us in a week or two. What I am going to do is give this current version to the Faculty Affairs Committee, with the understanding that any changes that come through Legal they have to incorporate. Just to make sure that we don't hold up the work of the committee itself. And I think Dr. David can give us a little bit more information on the timeline.

P. David: You're right Atia, so the goal Martin is to take it to Legal within the next two to three weeks. I can get all the 'i's dotted and 't's crossed from a legal standpoint, right, because we don't want to run afoul there. Once that is done, then it will come back to you. The goal is to pass this by the end of the semester, fully pass all the way through and lock it up as a fully-fledged policy. That's the general thinking, so we'll work toward that.

M. Anselm: I do have a follow up question. So that's the timeline and from my understanding it's the FAC's responsibility to review this document so we don't need an ad hoc committee or something to go through all this again. That's FAC that's going to be charged with doing that?

A. Newman: They already have a charge on their docket that requires them to edit E.6. Our job as executive committee is just bringing it to sort of a neutral place so that the FAC can bring its hopefully final recommendations on E6 by the end of the semester.

B. Thomas: I have a more of a procedural question. Usually, when the FAC is making major changes to policy, they chat with Legal before it comes to Senate. And the Provost's rep also gets feedback from the Provost before we move forward. There were several policies that we had made changes to when I was chair, but we had to pull them back because Ellen said she wasn't comfortable. Do you know if these changes went to Legal or to the Provost's rep. before Senate voted on them?

A. Newman: I can't speak with absolute certainty, but from the conversation that I had with Dr. Granburg, what I understood was she was aware of the extension in the contract lengths. But the thing she found unacceptable was that the FAC had struck out a few sentences. And that was her big concern and that's why it wasn't signed. And that's one of the reasons why we as an Executive Committee took this on as a charge to fix it because there was no point in giving it to a new FAC because obviously last year's committee had done their work and it didn't make sense to assign them to work to fix something that somebody else had done. So for us we were just taking the notes that we were given from Dr. Granburg and bringing it back to a place which would have been, by our estimation, acceptable to her and was also approved by Senate. Like I said, in my memory, I don't remember us discussing striking out any of these things and I didn't find any notice of it in the minutes themselves. So from my understanding, I think the Senate voted just on the contract length. We didn't look at the nitty gritty of what was detracted at that point.

H. Ghazle: Just to let you know, being a member of the FAC, the committee is waiting for the executive committee

and the Senate. The sooner the committee gets the changes the better. I will let them know that this is happening, and we know from what the Provost said that we're talking around two-three weeks, right? Just wanted to let you know that the committee is waiting for them.

L. McQuiller Williams: I just want to clarify in terms of the contract lengths, because what Atia showed everyone in those documents doesn't actually include the extension of the contract length, so it makes it even a little bit more complicated. And I think what's very important here is when Atia stepped through the history, particularly the highlights, what was highlighted in green were changes that were approved on April 30th, 2020. The yellow highlights are what was approved by Faculty Senate on February 3rd, 2022. What happened in terms of the extension, of contracts, and I know some people had questions, effectively what was voted upon by Faculty Senate was extending the contracts for senior lecturers from three to five years and for principal lecturers from five years to seven years. That wasn't approved by Faculty Senate until April 14th, 2022. So that was an additional change that's not reflected in the information that was here, but I wanted to make sure that that was clear when you are reviewing the documents, in terms of that was something that's additional, just to make things a little bit more complicated if they're not complicated enough.

A. Newman: Which means that very soon, probably in the next day or so, I will change the numbers of those contract lengths and forward those to Dr. David so he can send those to Legal. Again, you know, when we voted on them, I think the conversation was so heavily focused on titles and contract lengths that maybe a lot of us kind of skipped over the question of actually reading the red line document in that much detail but Legal caught it and Dr. Granberg caught it and they made sure to push back on the deletion of these particular sentences. So from our part, we're going to do what we can to put it into a good working place and hopefully never again will a policy get this messy. And just as an FYI, this is one of the reasons why we've now made it a practice and a policy where if any standing committee has to change a policy, they have to get the copy of that policy, the Word Document, from our office so that we can be sure that the only edits that are made are made to the latest version of a policy, as opposed to the version that may be sitting in somebody's hard drive somewhere, and they pull it back out and they change it. So, little changes, better results as we go forward. Any more questions or comments?

H. Ghazle: Yes, just to let you know, since we're talking titles, we're talking contract lengths, etc., there has also been a proposal or request to look into non tenure track clinical faculty. That would also be part of E.6 as well, So there may be more changes in addition to the ones we're talking about now.

A. Newman: Exactly, and that's one of the reasons why we want to get it to the FAC as quickly as possible. Once these previous changes are put to bed and made made clear, then we can allow FAC to add the additional titles and their own proposals from this year's business.

[Policy E06.0 Annotated](#)
[Policy E06.0 Edited](#)

Agenda Item No. 12: B02 Adjustments; A. Newman (1:28)

See below

Agenda Item 13: New Business; A. Newman (1:23)

I. Puchades: One thing I've heard from my constituents is that teaching in the SHED and teaching in Wallace hasn't been ideal for Engineering. Especially in the library. The new classrooms have small TV screens. They're supposed to be large screens, but they're small. Many of the engineering faculty have slides with lots of equations and the students cannot see them. If you have 50 students in a classroom with three TV screens on the front and two on the side, that's not an ideal situation. The students cannot see the slides. They cannot see the numbers. The reflection prevents them from seeing the numbers. Some faculty have asked for screens and projectors and they've been denied, which I don't think is the right answer.

That's the main complaint. I've heard from maybe ten different faculty who have requested not to have their classes put in the Wallace library. I don't think that's a very good start for a new building. In the SHED itself, in the bigger classrooms, there are also some issues with technology, for example, Wi-Fi dropping off, projectors not working, so I think this is something that should be addressed asap. There's also some concerns with some of the facilities, the bathroom locks being broken, the elevators not being lined up from floor to floor. And I don't really know who to complain about this, other than they're all complaining to me, so I'm not sure who should take that on.

A. Newman: That's a good point. The Executive Committee is scheduled to meet with the VP of Facilities Management, so maybe this is a question for us to find out where we can put this information. I feel like there's a lot of questions about where to send information like this.

S. Aldersley: I wanted to ask for an update on the publication of the COACHE results. I think in the past the results have come out much more quickly. I've heard without any evidence that some of the results are not positive. And I'm wondering why they have not been released.

A. Newman: I think Laverne is the best person to respond to that.

L. McQuiller Williams: We are actually in the process and by we, I mean myself, Atia and Sarah Sarchet, of scheduling presentations, particularly to share the results. In the past, the actual summary reports have been shared at town hall meetings which in past years have taken place, usually in April or May. We are trying to schedule those a little bit earlier this year, but in particular just waiting to finalize and get dates. But we will definitely share those results and of course the summary reports as we have done in years past. So really looking forward to that.

S. Aldersley: Thank you. Can you say when the results will start to be released? I don't understand why it's taking so long to get to a point where faculty can see what the results were.

L. McQuiller Williams: Because traditionally ever since we started this back in 2013, we have released the results after we've actually met with faculty. So again, based on that timeline, that has typically taken place. Because it's really stepping through the results. If you just see the summary report, how do you interpret it? That's why we step through before we actually post the summary report. So again, we do hope that that's going to take place earlier than it has been in the past, which we expect is going to happen in either March or April.

S. Aldersley: So you're going to go to the colleges to discuss the results even though faculty haven't seen them yet. And when are those college meetings going to begin?

L. McQuiller Williams: I apologize, Steve, I think there's miscommunication. It was not about going to the colleges, the first step would be having a town hall meeting for all faculty. We think that should happen first at a town hall meeting followed by a meeting with Faculty Senate.

S. Aldersley: Can we expect that town hall meeting to occur this month?

L. McQuiller Williams: Most likely that probably will happen in March.

S. Aldersley: Thank you. I understand that that's what's going to happen. I just don't think that spinning it out this long, particularly given the rumors that the results are not strong, is necessary. But if that's the way it is, that's the way it is. I just don't understand it.

L. McQuiller Williams: That's completely understandable, Stephen. And we appreciate that feedback. And also, and I know Atia mentioned this early on, we did receive the results a little bit later than we have in the past, so it was, actually delayed two months before we even received the results from COACHE.

A. Newman: I would like to bring up one final thing. I think one version of the agenda had B.2 as an agenda item, but the agenda that I'm looking at in the drive is different, so I just skipped over it, I'm sorry. I wanted to first thank everyone, for the feedback that is being sent in. Changing a charter is big and important work and it has to be something which everyone is participating in, so having different people's opinions and concerns in our minds as we're developing this is really valuable and I want to thank everyone for doing this. But I will also emphasize the fact that we have to figure out how to make the Senate work better than how we are doing it right now. Twelve standing committees is a lot. And if each standing committee has a minimum of ten people that's a lot of people that are being made to write policy and who have to give up a lot of time and service hours to support the workings of the Senate. I will say though that one of the things that we're trying to do is to incorporate the suggestions that we're getting and just this week we decided what we would do is put together a small questionnaire to clarify what our motions are and what is happening with our proposed changes and we're going to send this to Senators only because you are the recipients of information from all of your constituents.

What we would like to do is have you be involved in the wordsmithing of these motions to refine these particular parts of our academic charter. So, please keep an eye out for this survey. We will send it out through the Senate website, and you will get a link. It will be a slightly longer survey because obviously we're making a lot of changes. But if you could give us feedback and give us an idea of what things are working and aren't working, then we can again get even tighter with our language. Would any of the executive committee like to weigh in and add anything I've missed.

S. Aldersley: I think it should be obvious to everybody that this document is a work in progress. And what the Executive Committee came out with to begin with was a draft and no more than a draft. Believe me, we debated it amongst ourselves at great length. I fully anticipate that in one place or another it might get changed. So all the feedback that we're getting is most useful and as Atia said, it's not a small deal to change the charter. So please keep the feedback coming.

Agenda Item No. 14: Adjournment; A. Newman (1:32)

Attendance 2/1/2024

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	
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	
Brown, Tamaira	Senate Coordinator	x	Newman, Atia	Chair/CAD Senator	x
Butler, Janine	NTID Senator	x	Newman, Dina	COS Senator	x
Capps, John	CLA Senator	x	Olles, Deana	COS Senator	x
Chiavaroli, Julius	ALT GIS Senator		Olson, Rob	ALT GCCIS Senator	
Chung, Sorim	ALT SCB Senator	x	O'Neil, Jennifer	ALT CET Senator	
Crawford, Denton	CAD Senator	x	Osgood, Robert	ALT CHST Senator	
Cromer, Michael	ALT COS Senator		Puchades, Ivan	KGCOE Senator	x
Cui, Feng	ALT COS Senator		Ray, Amit/ICC Rep	CLA Senator	x
David, Prabu	Provost	x	Ross, Annemarie	NTID Senator	x
Davis, Stacey	ALT NTID Senator	x	Shaaban, Muhammad	ALT KGCOE Senator	
Deese, Frank	CAD Senator	x	Sheffield, Jr. Clarence	ALT SOIS Senator	
Dell, Betsy	CET Senator	x	Song, Qian	SCB Senator	x
DiRisio, Keli	CAD Senator	x	Staff Council Rep	Kathy Ehrlich-Scheffer	x
Eddingsaas, Nathan/RSC Rep	COS Senator	x	Student Government Rep	Alex Shuron	x

Faber, Joshua	COS Senator	x	Thomas, Bolaji	CHST Senator	x
Fillip, Carol	ALT CAD Senator		Tobin, Karen	NTID Senator	
Ghazle, Hamad	Operations Officer/CHST Senator	x	Tsouri, Gill	KGCOE Senator	x
Ghoneim, Hany	ALT KGCOE Senator		Ulin, Robert	CLA Senator	x
Hardin, Jessica	ALT CLA Senator	x	Van Aardt, Jan	ALT COS Senator	
Hazelwood, David	NTID Senator	x	Warp, Melissa	ALT CAD Senator	
Hsieh, Jerrie	ALT SCB Senator	x	Weeden, Elissa	GCCIS Senator	x
Jadamba, Basca	COS Senator	x	White, Phil	ALT GCCIS Senator	
Johnson, Dan	CET Senator	x	Williams, Eric	GIS Senator	x
Johnson, Scott	GCCIS Senator	x	Worrell, Tracy	ALT CLA Senator	
Kincheloe, Pamela	NTID Senator	x	Zanibbi, Richard	GCCIS Senator	x
Kiser, Larry	GCCIS Senator	x	Zlochower, Yosef	COS Senator	x
Krutz, Daniel	ALT GCCIS Senator				
Kuhl, Michael	KGCOE Senator	x			

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

Interpreters: Nic Crouse-Dickerson and Jennifer Mura

Presenters: Lisa Chase, Heidi Nickisher, Clyde Hull and Scott Johnson