Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, April 11, 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: (Scott Johnson) **Seconded: (John Capps)** **Approved by Acclamation**
Agenda Item No. 3: Approval of Minutes; Approval of Minutes; K. Barone (12:16)

Thanks, Atia. Having received no suggestions to edit the draft minutes I move that the March 28th and April 4th minutes be approved.

Seconded: John Capps
Approved by Acclamation

[March 28, 2024 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes](#)
[April 4, 2024 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes](#)

Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; A. Newman (1:16)

A. Newman: First and foremost, I would like to wish everyone who is celebrating the occasion, an Eid Mubarak, because the month of Ramadan just ended on Tuesday, which means Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday are Eids for all Muslims who are celebrating. If you have Muslim students, please be aware of that, and cognizant that this is a very celebratory time.
Our communications, officer Stephen, is still away, so our treasurer, KeriBarone is stepping in to record the minutes, which is why she made the motion to approve the previously circulated minutes as well.
Yesterday we attended the celebration for teaching and scholarship. It was a very uplifting and an inspirational event. I really enjoyed getting to see our faculty being recognized and wanted to congratulate the award winners for the Eisenhart and all of our teaching awards and scholarship awards, and to thank our faculty and our senators, who attended as well.
 Today I re amplified an email to our senators. But this is the second time I've done it. Initially I sent an email to all of our faculty. So I've sent the second email [survey?] only to our Senators. And I would like to remind and encourage all of you to encourage your colleagues to participate

because we definitely need a lot of feedback when choosing a new software for faculty scholarship tracking.
We also need a volunteer to represent the Faculty Senate in the Staff Council meetings. I don't think there are very many left at the end of this year. But we would appreciate the support if you are available. The meetings are on zoom, and they run from 2:00pm on Thursdays to 3 or 3:30.
We have also just received news that the AI detection feature turnitin is officially being turned off this semester after finals week. So if you hear about it, or if you feel your college needs to know about this, please do make this an announcement. Additionally, we've heard from CTL, that there is some sort of rumor or conjecture about Courseleaf being set to replace myCourses. I have it on authority that this is not the case. It will not replace myCourses. It is being used in an additional sense. I don't know exactly what additional elements are being brought in through Courseleaf. However, if anyone has any questions I can connect you, or you can reach out to Neil Hair who can clarify for you

B. Thomas: Is there an alternative in place of Turnitin?

A.Newmann: I do not think there is an alternative in place for turnitin yet. Mostly because from what I understand most AI detection software are very buggy and do not have a very high rate of reliability. So for the moment, I think we've just turned off that feature. And if you would like, we can find out if they're looking for an alternative for turn it in

---

Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; Jeremy Zehr - Staff Council (12:24)

J Zehr: Our last meeting was on Thursday where we welcomed Milagros Conception and William Zimmerman to talk about the revisions to rit travel per diem. We discussed, the records management policy as well as the all new Staff career architecture project being headed up by Anes Wahl and Jo Ellen Pinkham and David Clock looking forward to the last round of of meetings with Staff council. We had elections in blocks 2, 4, and 6, and I believe the polls have been closed, and they have informed the winners.

Agenda Item No. 6: Student Government Update; A. Shuron (12:26)

A Shuron: At our last meeting we had a presentation about the AI task force, and we also had a vote passed to remove the Faculty Senate and Staff Council reps as voting members of student government. This is just to keep in line with all the shared governance groups. It's just ex official members, and within the next couple of meetings will be appointing the Cabinet positions and committee chair positions and any other vacant senators from elections.

Agenda Item No. 7: Revision of University Writing Committee Policies D01.0 and D01.5 VOTE; G. Wainwright (12:27) *Presentation linked below*

G. Wainwright: I was in Senate two weeks ago or so to present these. And so I want to do a quick review for everyone. There were some questions about a couple of the slides, and I've made some modifications to them. And so I'll go quickly through the red lines for each of the 2 policies and then vote on them independently. And so this is the

D1.0 policy, which is about curriculum development, and so on. And there were questions about whether or not the University writing committee is a standing committee or not, so I've taken that language out. I know we'll be having subsequent discussions about B.20, so we'll leave that for now.

Moving forward being a little more clear about the ICC assigning responsibilities and then elaborating on who is informed when we approve course proposals. The third change is identifying some more of the relationships between the writing committee and the writing program, and how we each support them with respect to students and faculty. And again, the next one is talking more about how university writing program is staying current with pedagogy rather than researching pedagogy. F again elaborating more on who the UWC is going to partner with when it comes to the writing across the curriculum assessment, and the last revision was to incorporate the opportunity for the writing committee to support the University Writing Program director when course substitution requests are coming forward.

When it comes to the submission process, we added some language that has the college curriculum committees just sort of checking off to make sure that the elements that are required by Appendix B are actually incorporated, and that there is an appendix B attached to it. And again, some clarification as to the process through which communications between the college curriculum committee and the University Writing Committee are made. And so those are the changes for policy D.10, and so I'd like to make a motion for the Senate to approve these policy changes.

A.Newman: Alright there's a motion on the floor Any discussion? Alright, seeing none. This is the time when we will start a vote. So for everyone, please change your to from host and panelists to everyone, so that your vote goes to the entire community. And all those in favor of this motion. Please say yes. All those against? Any abstentions?
We'll let Hamad do the count and Gretchen, please continue with your presentation.

G.Wainwright: Thank you. The second policy that we had brought forward for discussion was the policy number D1.5, which is the university writing policy. And again, some of these are out and out changes, and some are just clarifications. So we made some clarifications initially to the understanding that your programmatic courses in your field of specialty. At the request of some folks from NTID, we added some language here about four-year undergraduate bachelor's degree programs, rather than just saying undergraduate programs. Because there are some programs coming from NTID that are not four year bachelor's degree programs, and they do not currently have to meet this writing requirement. Elaborated on what a programmatic course should be, engaging students in writing in their disciplines. Wanted to again clarify that collaborative writing can be included within some of these writing courses. If individual contributions are identified and evaluated. Talking more about providing feedback for formal writing not necessary for informal writing assignments. And probably the biggest change of all was to allow for 2 credit and one credit hour courses within the Writing Intensive program. So currently, 3 credit hour courses require 20% of the grade is based on individual formal writing. o we extrapolated that to say that 2 credit hour courses would require 30% of the grade based on writing and one credit hour courses would require 60% of the grade based on individual formal writing assignments.   And so at this point I again, would like to make a motion to have the Senate approve these policy changes to policy. D. 1.5.

A. Newman: Excellent. There's a motion on the floor. Do we have any any discussion?

S.Johnson: So you mentioned four year programs. Aren't some five year programs? I know CS is five years and not four years depending on co-op.

G. Wainwright: Right. Does anyone have any suggestions how to amend that?

A.Newman: Scott, do you have any language that you would like to…?

S.Johnson: You could change it to four and five year programs because we don't know what they plan on doing for their bachelors if they plan on it being less than four years or more than five years. But yeah, CS is a five year program. So we would not be held to this policy if we changed it this way.

A.Newman: That's a really good point

G.Wainwright: Thank you. I hadn't hadn't realized that. Of course I'm in a five year program and didn't even think of that myself. Or if there's other language. Again, the intent was to not incorporate some of the associates degree programs.

S. Johnson: Leave it as bachelors. I think that should be enough. Remove the four year and just say Bachelor's programs.

A.Newman: Okay, let's take a look. Hold on, are there any more comments?

G. Wainwright: So we would change this to just say..

A.Newman: Yes, undergraduate

G.Wainwright: Bachelor's degree programs

A.Newman: yeah, it would basically strike that out

G.Wainwright: that's perfectly acceptable

A.Newman: Yes, that's good. For the red line slide, are you able to edit that right now in real time?

G.Wainwright: Yeah, let me see here.

A. Newman: Alright, so if you accep that amendment, we now have the amended motion on the floor. Is there any further discussion about these changes? Seeing no discussion. I will assume everyone is ready to vote. So we are up for a second vote of the day. Hamad, are you ready to go for a vote right now? Awesome great. So once again, make sure, please to switch your you know, posting to everyone and all those in favor. Please say yes. Nays. Any abstentions?

Motion 1: 31-0-1
Motion 2: 37-0-1

[Revision of University Writing Policies D01.0 and D01.5 VOTE](#)

G.Wainwright: Thank you. Atia, before I start I want to recognize the committee representatives from the University Writing Committee. These folks are not only tireless in supporting, writing, and attending meetings, and dealing with me every week, but they're also just wonderful, friendly and collegial people to work with, and I have really enjoyed working with them over the years. So I do want to thank them and acknowledge them. I want to start out by talking about some of the standing charges and how we have worked with them this year. And essentially, we have a charge that we're continuing to perform their responsibilities that are outlined in policy D.01. Facilitating the writing policy, acting as liaison between academic units, defining those priorities for professional and curricular support. Staying current with research. And again, we just voted to amend these slightly, serving an advisor role with faculty, assess the writing across the curriculum program, and reporting to the ICC on our work. First and foremost, I want to talk about the writing intensive course approvals that we went through this year. So far we have received 31 course outlines to review this annual year for this academic year.7 of those courses were approved as they were submitted, the remainder required some amount of revision, and then re review before they were subsequently approved.
17 of the 31 course outlines that we reviewed were simply updates to Appendix B.
We had undertaken an effort to find those courses which had in a sense been grandfathered in when we converted from quarters to semesters, and didn't have the appendix which outlined the pedagogy that was necessary for implementing the writing policy.

So all these 5 were approved as submitted, but the remaining 12 required updates, and again resubmissions for review. So they would be consistent with the writing policy, even though they were previously approved as writing intensive courses.So we're, pleased that we are catching some of these courses, and improving their pedagogy as we move forward.

As far as our website is concerned, many faculty, we're finding, turn to the website when they're looking for either information on how to teach the course or developing a new course as Writing Intensive and it briefly describes the course requirements and how we go through the approval process. But we're continuing to look at that website to provide more detailed information, in support of faculty, because we believe that they ought to be getting their information from that website. We see ourselves as representatives supporting and supplementing that information. But the basics of how to go about it, what we include and don't include, and things like that ought to be on that website. So we have a list of things we want to update and change and we're continuing to work on that.

Moving forward to our continuing charges. We'd like to have writing intensive courses sort of reapproved, or at least reexamined, by the originating colleges about every five to ten years. And we really are in support of this periodic recertification of courses. The fact that 70% of the approved courses that were already writing intensive needed modifications before they could be reapproved, shows that it is important that we have these periodic reviews, but we also understand and fully admit that this is not practical to do until we have a curriculum management system in place. So I think we're going to continue to carry this along just to keep it in the back pocket, and really not try to do much until that curriculum management system is up and working.

Our second charge was to look at our grading policies and determine whether or not we wanted to essentially make all of our writing courses 3 credits or open up the door for them to be 1, 2

credits, and that is policy B.1.5, which (I'm assuming) the Senate just approved but we just did vote on that, and that will give us much greater curricular flexibility as we go forward.

Our third charge was a self-charge working with University Writing Program to develop workshops and training for faculty. We conducted a faculty survey for those that taught Writing Intensive courses last academic year, and we found that almost half of faculty were interested in learning more about feedback strategies which tends to be some of the most time-consuming assessment work on their part. About a third are interested in learning more about drafting, and so on, and most folks prefer in person mode for learning workshops and training activities.

We are continuing to work with the University Writing Program. They now have a writing across the curriculum coordinator in place to assist us and faculty when it comes to delivering these trainings. They've already conducted several workshops based on the input that we've provided. Writing across the curriculum coordinators meet with Deans trying to get their input and what they're looking for. And we're continuing to move forward to try and roll out additional training and seminars. In conjunction with the writing program our self charge was related to collaborating with the writing program, the DEIC and others to talk about implicit and explicit linguistic bias.

And this is kind of a long ongoing discussion that we continue to have within our committee, and it has to do a lot with assessing things such grammar, sentence structure, spelling, and so on. And some of these assessments aren't supportive of those students that are linguistically diverse. And so we talk quite a bit about this when we get new members into our committee every year.

When we took the survey last year, we did find that about 80% of the faculty that responded, were assessing grammar, punctuation, and spelling.

And there is a book out there called Bad Ideas About Writing that talks explicitly about this. Interestingly, though only 75% of faculty listed drafting and revision as a feedback and revision method, even though our writing policy requires it. About half of the students, based on their proficiency with what's referred to as standard American, English.

As we move forward, we want to continue to develop our website and talk about how these biases can negatively impact students. But more importantly, when we're focusing so much on things like grammar and spelling, we're missing the opportunity to work more deeply with students on a lot of the cognitive processes that go into writing. Things like critical thinking. How do you make a cohesive and summative argument to somebody? And things like that that we all need as part of our professional degrees moving forward. And so we're going to continue to work both through the University Writing Program, through our website and with faculty as necessary to try to discuss and address this issue.

Self-charge five was to more clearly identify the roles between the writing program and the writing committee, and that also was contained within.

I think it was D1.0 that we also just voted on some proposed charges that we have for next year. Obviously, we'd like to continue to collaborate with the writing program on developing additional workshops, training opportunities for faculty. If senators have faculty that have specific requirements or needs, please reach out to either the writing committee or the writing program with those.

We want to continue to collaborate with others within the university looking at some of these impacts of implicit and explicit language bias. As we get more and more students from diverse backgrounds, and international students, it's more important for us to be understanding and consistent as to how we address these issues.

And lastly, we want to explore alternatives for implementing the writing committees' responsibilities. If the writing committee is no longer going to be an ongoing subcommittee of ICC, and that's pending the vote, of course, on changes to B2.0 so, we'll have to see how we work with other committees and the Senate moving forward next year and beyond. I believe that is all I have to report. So I entertain any questions or or comments. Or any volunteers to join our committee.

[Revision of University Writing Committee Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 9: Global Education Committee Presentation; R. Lagiewski (12:50) *Presentation linked below*

R.Lagiewski: My thanks to everybody on the committee, we have representatives from all of our global campuses and from all the colleges here at RIT. We've met seven times, I believe as a larger group, and I know we have some subcommittee members meeting on some of the work. So I want to thank Julius, who's here, I see on the screen today, Linda, from our Kosovo campus, John from the College of Health Sciences and Jay who has been leading up some of those subcommittees. It's been a lot of work that we've been working on. So again, I want to recognize the members and thank them for working through all of our tough time zone, early morning meetings or late Friday meetings, or really late afternoon meetings depending on where you are. So most of our work has been on self-charges. We had one legacy charge, which I'll mention at the end. One of the things that was discussed last year and carried over a little bit was to maybe reflect. This encouragement of RIT global engagement to specifically address across global campuses. So a very minor thing, but not something we've put forward yet, but something that was discussed

Self-charge, two. There's been an idea floating around since I've been on the committee to possibly have more of a formal representation with the global campuses on this committee. So we have Co-chairs this year. And so that's something that we'll discuss and see if that's practical moving into next academic year.
Where we spent most of our time is in this arena self-charge 3. So, what traditionally has happened over the years is our charges obviously have either come from Senate, RIT global. Or, often as the liaison representatives from our global campuses will bring questions, ideas, concerns of a whole range of topics to the committee. They see that we are on the Senate as a standing committee, and so sometimes these questions can be easily answered, because there's expertise of the makeup of this committee, sometimes it takes a little looking into sometimes we're probably not the right body that they should be reaching out to. So one of the things we've been working on is trying to create a resource guide that would be useful for this committee and for the representatives on the global campuses to be able to, if they have a question concerning how they form a committee, how we might look at evaluating service depending on rank, that this would provide them a starting point to answer some of those questions. So I spent a lot of time on this, and with the genesis of this concept another concept evolved which I'll touch upon in a few slides.

Traditionally, this committee has two external public activities. One has been a global convergence conference. This has sometimes been in person, sometimes online, due to covid but this is really to bring about sharing of information across campuses. Sometimes this is sharing best practices on collaborating globally, on research, conducting and running study abroad trips.

A lot of heavy lifting of this global Convergence Conference occurs in the RIT Global office. With Lindsey Mcgrath and Jim Myers area.

Additionally with that group often there is a summit on global governance where usually there's a group that will attend one of the global campuses to discuss that particular activity. So the discussion is to create a cycle we were running the convergence every year. The global convergence sometimes happened every year. There wasn't really a set. So right now, we're working on a set with RIT global to publish in the next 5 years. Here's the cycle of doing those two activities that often filter through support from this committee.

Charge 6 had two parts to it out of the efforts that went into all the subcommittee work on creating a resource guide for the global campuses, there was a lot of discussion around, what are the unique challenges, what are the unique endeavors going on in the global campuses, so with dialogue, with RIT, Global, with all that content, we came to the conclusion that it would be important to have a semester by semester localization report. So this would be RIT, global sharing with all the colleges, deans, directors, department chairs an update on. Here's sort of the status of RIT Kosovo as a fall 202…here's the status of spring 2025, Dubai sort of a one-page executive summary.

So that if you're a new department chair, a new dean, or just a faculty member, who wants to know what we offer in our program abroad and what's going on there. So much content came out of this dialogue. So that'd be something that we might help update. But we've generally created the content for those first reports.

But that would be something that would be annually managed through RIT global. They already share some statistics. Now, terms of study abroad and exchanges, and so forth. But this would cover things such as new visa issues for students, new proposed curriculum programs, just anything that would be important for the leadership here on the Rochester campus to get a sense of what's going on in that global campus related to this idea of deeper dialog and connection between the global campuses and Rochester.

We had a legacy charge that started probably 2 academic years ago to propose to the Deans a set of guidelines where we would ask each of the academic units to produce a set of guidelines around curriculum and their colleges governance some of their strategy. Basically to make sure that one, they were informing their global degree programs on sort of the unique processes, procedures and practices in the college in which their degree is being certified from but also just make them aware that constant communication between the two programs has value for both sides. So that legacy charge was recently presented to the Provost Council, sharing that with the Deans. That gives you kind of a brief overview of what we've been working on for the last 2 academic periods.

I'll take any questions or thoughts.

A.Newman: I was going to say, the Global Education Committee definitely has sort of a lot of work to do, just keeping up with all of the time zones and stuff, as well, you know. So I really appreciate the hard work that you've done. Can you give us a little bit of an update on how the presentation went to the Provost Council.

R. Lagiewski: Sure, I think the larger answer is that probably two years ago the intent was to bring forward a policy that we we're going to ask the Deans to support and during that time, because of all the nuances between the different colleges the suggestion was, there's probably too many differences between accreditation how colleges are organized and so forth, that guidelines would be better. So we created those guidelines. The overall sense I got now was this idea that if a college creates guidelines, are we really getting to a stage at RIT where we're going to probably ask for policies you know, as the programs mature and develop. So that was one of

the questions that was echoed there. I think, also. which is the same in the global campuses. I think how resource capacity is also an issue. So some colleges have somebody who's dedicated to already having a relationship with the global campuses that they offer their degree in.

A.Newman: Right, so.

R. Lagiewski: We've already been doing a lot of this already. Other colleges may not have some some resource that's so dedicated. So I think that's always a question. When you ask college to to do some work is, who's going to maintain this? Who's going to keep this resources updated. Thirdly. Some colleges that don't deliver programs and some colleges that do. You know, reassess the importance of having this. you know, inclusive sharing of information to make sure.it both, both sides know what they're doing. And keeping each other informed, cause it's easy to sometimes do things in Rochester, and forget that it has, impacts globally degrees that are offered somewhere else. So I think that was a value.I know that my dean in the College of Business has already talked to our associate Dean about doing the request, you know, creating the guidelines. But our next step is to send out, a thank you and look for response and support

A.Newman: Excellent. Okay, thank you so much. It sounds like we're making some pretty good progress. And as our programs, as you said, mature, it's going to probably bring us into the arena of writing some sort of policy, even if it's a if it's a policy to require policies. Julius?

J.Chiavaroli: Yeah, I would add something to that. And Rick alluded to it. Since this has been a committee rather than task force. We've sensed a a maturity or maturation process going on with the global campuses. Their governance wasn't nearly as organized as ours for for many reasons. But they're tthey're really learning stuff from us as much as we're learning from them. And I guess I was impressed by the Deans sort of already recognizing that that they're as a body. These global campuses have some growing to do and organizing themselves and determining what's important, what's not important. So they're really appreciative of the of the fact that they are guidelines now, and that maybe at some time in the future they could become policy. So it's a process. And I think they, they understood this and appreciated it.

A.Newman: Alright, that's great. Thank you so much. Are there any more comments or questions? Alright! Thank you so much for your presentation and for your hard work.

[Global Education Committee Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 10: Research and Scholarship Committee Presentation; N. Eddingsaas (1:03)
Presentation linked below

N Eddingsaas: Research and Scholarship committee had 9 different charges. So I'm going to try and highlight some aspects of each of them. Many of them are still ongoing.
Where there's been ability to I've put on in terms of outcomes as well as also in terms of actions that is going to be next on each of them. I'd like to just kind of highlight the members. We're a large group, but we have a lot to do. The charges were handled in subcommittees this year and so, if you have questions on some of the charges, I'll do my best to answer them. If I cannot, I will write down the information and get more detail from the subcommittees and then email you back when I have some information.

Charge 1: Update policy C05.0 - Human Subject

Last year the policy had been greatly modified with Heather Foti (Directory of Human Subjects Research) leading the effort.

Reviewing it this year it was discovered the edits were done on an old copy of the procedure so all edits needed to be migrated.

Meet with Heather and Denis and discussed where edits were needed.

Action: Nathan Eddingsaas is going to work with Heather over the summer to finalize the edits and the policy will be brought before faculty senate at the beginning of the fall

Heather and her office is over tasked so has been difficult to get edits done

We've discussed in terms of meeting multiple times to kind of hammer out the rest of the edits, so that at the very beginning of the fall semester we will be presented to the RSC. Followed by immediately to the full Senate. So expect to see revisions, and remember in terms of when you do see it. It's basically all red line. just so you're aware in terms of why it is. And this has to do with in terms of basically bringing into compliance where the way it's written, we basically are not. And if there are questions throughout, please just raise your hands so there's a lot of components to what we're doing on it today. So if you have any questions. Please do not hesitate to ask.

Charge 2: Consider an IOU/deferral system for first
PhD students' stipends and PhD tuition
Two components to this charge
Institute coverage of first year stipend
Who covers tuition for PhD students
Subcommittee met with Dean of graduate college Diana Slusarski and Ryne Raffaelle on both these topics
Outcome
Diana stated that full flexibility would not work as there is a fixed pool of funds, however if a student is fully funded by external funds in the first year, the institute paid stipend can be deferred provided sufficient communication and planning for when it would be
This is a bit vague, and you'll see in terms of at the end of charge. I'm going to say that it'd be worth digging into this more, deeper and getting it more formalized.
The second part dealt with tuition for PhD students
For many programs tuition is fully waived by the institute provided the student is in good academic standing and making sufficient progress toward degree
Currently practices vary widely across RIT if faculty are required to include funding for tuition onto grant proposals
The charge is twofold. First, to investigate the feasibility of imposing a uniform tuition inclusion requirement across all of RIT's colleges. Second, and related to the first charge, if tuition is to be included in external grant proposals then what fraction of RIT tuition should RIT faculty include in their proposals?
Ongoing discussions with Diana Slusarski and Ryne Raffaelle.
Alternate perspectives exist in upper administration about desirability of instating a policy requiring including inclusion of tuition funding on external grants.
No decision has been made, and not likely in the near future.
It is expected that at sometime in the future a least a fraction of tuition will need to be written into external grants, with administration suggesting possibly 30-35%.
Actions
Continue discussions with Graduate Dean to more formalize the process deferral of institutes coverage of stipend if first year is supported by external funding.
Obtain data from all PhD granting programs on how tuition is handled in their program and if it

is included on grant submissions.
Continue discussion with administration on how tuition is handled for PhD programs.

Charge 3: Review changes in the policies of Federal Agency an Philanthropic Entities that support academic research and scholarship regard to their potential impact on University policies and practices around research operations and facilities, research regulation and compliance, and infrastructure in support of scholarly activities. Subcommittee has made progress but we do not have it to a point where the results are ready to discuss.
Details on progress will be provided in written report but it will be ongoing
Action: Stephen Jacobs and Bilge Altay will continue to assemble

Charge 4. Charge 4: Investigate the necessity of the new policy re offsite work of graduate students on GRA/GTA position – These are not policy but their are restrictions in some places.
New "guidelines" have been published on the graduate college and the Student Employment Office website (see links in slide notes for links to PDFs, but to remind, they are not policy.)
"Guidelines for Graduate Students Working or Conducting Research:
 Remotely Information for Graduate Directors" and "Domestic Remote Work for Student Employees"
Both said these were guidelines and could not highlight any RIT policy.
One aspect was that this forbid foreign work in order to comply with local laws in terms of payment, but no matter the nuance, because nothing was put into policy, nothing is enforceable and therefore becomes the discretion of the faculty.
The subcommittee thinks this is worth going into this in greater detail to formalize this into policy. This is quite complex and worth pursuing in policy form versus guidelines, and the committee plans to continue.

Charge 5: Suggested guidelines for authorship
Suggested guidelines are under development using Harvard's guidelines as a template.
These will be guidelines, not policy.
Top suggestion is for each research group to craft authorship guidelines, publish them on their website (publicly or privately) on authorship expectations using the guidelines as a template. It is encouraged that these are discussed with all members of the research group and made available to external collaborators.
The guidelines will highlight steps that can be taken to resolve disputes.
When we do have the final edits, a draft will be shared with faculty senate and we propose that it will be posted to the graduate colleges website.

Charge 6: Collect data on teaching opportunities o graduate courses for female faculty
This effort started in 2021 with Advance as the lead. Focused on opportunities teaching in areas of faculty expertise. Data collected was made into a report and shared with to colleges deans in colleges with greatest discrepancy (as far as female to male opportunities) followed by other deans and RSC.
At that time it was requested the report not be shared widely, however RSC recommended broader sharing.
At that time, it was requested that additional information and action be taken, but after meeting with Advance, it is unclear what information was obtained since then or was done.
Advance is going to look into the background of not sharing the information more broadly and what actions have occurred and they will report back to RSC this semester. Committee is here to assist and Advance is leading.

Charge 7: Work with provost office to initiate the proc select a new faculty activity management

system

On November 2nd faculty senate approved the formation of a taskforce to find a faculty activity management system.

Provost is on board and has committed to pay for it.

The taskforce is made up of members from RSC, FAC, and DEIC with representatives from NTID and RIT library.

Members: John Tu, (chair) Ivan Puchades, (Chair) Matt Dye, Stephen Jacobs, Joseph Lanzafame, LaVerve McQuiller, Juan Noguera, Nicholas Paulus, and Yosef Zlochower

Several key requirements identified and survey sent. Atia re-sent the survey today and I encourage you to please reach out to your constituents.

The timeline is working well – surveys expected in and analyzed by the end of April.

Vendors expected on campus by the end of 2024

Implemented (expected) some time next year

Charge 8: Contact SRS to get an update on the grant management system from Novelution

Met with SRS and SPA about the new software for grant management from Novelution.

We have all used this software already - Conflict of Interest, starting in 2020.

This is phase Il - "implementation of an intuitive, web-based, mobile-friendly platform for sponsored research administration"

Provides single-platform that supports proposal preparation and routing, award negotiation and acceptance, project set-up, programmatic administration including reporting, and project close-out.

RAPID will still be around, but will be fully integrated and can be accessed here.

Does not include expenditure tracking, CAROL will still exist and will be stand-alone. This is something I have indicated interest in incorporating. Initially they were going to have early adopters already using the system but that has been pushed back a bit so that will begin May/June training….for the rest of the institute. The roll out for everyone on campus July 2024

In the slide notes, there is a link for guidelines for releasing salary information for SIS. It's worth doing so that it can help you instruct your budget. For this to work correctly, your email address on file with city has to be identical to the RIT email address or it will not integrate properly.

Charge 9: Evaluate current merit scholarship and remission policy for research-based MS programs

No progress has been made and I don't see any for several reasons. The administration has decided that the graduate programs must be revenue producing.

A.Newman: Wow! You're right that thank you so much for that. That's a that was a very big presentation. Thank you. Do we have any questions or comments?

B.Thomas: Nathan, good job. I have a bunch of comments or questions. I just need some clarifications So there was a section on adding tuition to external grants that the time is coming. You probably will ask you for 30 to 35%. I assume that would be to colleges that have PI's, or colleges that have PHd programs, that wouldn't be the whole campus, correct?

N.Eddingsaas: Yes, so if you are putting on graduate students on to a grant. So you're budgeting for a grad student. If you're budgeting for that student, you're budgeting for a certain portion of their stipend in addition to tuition.

B.Thomas: So the second one has to do with the guidelines for authorship. I know we've fought about this in Senate last year. And then I think you had talked about each college writing their own guidelines on each program.

N.Eddingsaas: No. So there's going to be one set of guidelines that will be put on to the graduate colleges website in terms of then these are guidelines. And, as I stated in the presentation, the biggest suggestion would be to have each group, because in terms of each authorship is different in terms of how it is done, between these different disciplines, however, there are some overarching guidelines in terms of that that should be universal. So basically in terms of, if you look at what the guidelines are when they come out, entered there that that each group should write their own guidelines and have them published on a website or made available to at least to their the members of their research group and discuss with the research group, so that everyone is on the same page as far as what authorship need, as well as also discussing that with collaborators. And so, especially if these guidelines or metrics are written down, if there are disputes, it'll make it much easier to resolve any conflicts if they do arise. So this is more about just getting everyone to think about in terms of what does authorship mean, and making sure that the the PIs, as well as students and collaborators, understand what it means.

B.Thomas: So so looking at the software or the program that we want to use for recording research and all the various activities, the email that Atia sent out this morning has members of the task force tried out any of this software?

J Lanzafame: There's a limited number of vendors. And many of them were looked at on the previous I wanna call it incarnation of this committee, but of course it was a different committee. We're doing our due diligence in terms of whether there are new players. We have seen one presentation from one of them. But at this point you know, a lot of it comes down to. You know what the survey tells us in terms of what the faculty needs are and so we're still on timeline. I mean Ivan's here also. Who's chairing that committee? I don't know if he's got.

A.Newman: Do we have any other questions for Nathan?

[Research and Scholarship Committee Presentation](#)

Agenda Item 11: New Business; A. Newman (1:34)

A.Newman: No new Business.

Agenda Item No. 12: Adjournment; A. Newman (1:34)

A.Newman: Adjourn.

Attendance 4/11/2024

Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended	Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended
Abushagur, Mustafa	KGCOE Senator	Excused	Lanzafame, Joseph	COS Senator/LRPEC and ASSAC Rep	X
Adrion, Amy	ALT CAD Senator		Lapizco-Encinas, Blanca	KGCOE Senator	X
Aldersley, Stephen	Communications Officer/ SOIS Senator	Excused	Laver, Michael	CLA Senator	X
Anselm, Martin	CET Senator	Excused	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	X
Capps, John	CLA Senator	X	Olles, Deana	COS Senator	
Chiavaroli, Julius	ALT GIS Senator	X	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	X	Puchades, Ivan	KGCOE Senator	X
Cui, Feng	ALT COS Senator		Ray, Amit	CLA Senator/ICC Rep	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	Jeremy Zehr	X
Eddingsaas, Nathan	COS Senator/RSC Rep	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		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	
Johnson, Scott	GCCIS Senator	X	Worrell, Tracy	ALT CLA Senator	
Kincheloe, Pamela	NTID Senator	X	Zanibbi, Richard	GCCIS Senator	Excused
Kiser, Larry	GCCIS Senator	X	Zlochower, Yosef	COS Senator	X
Krutz, Daniel	ALT GCCIS Senator	X			
Kuhl, Michael	KGCOE Senator	X			

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

Interpreters: Jennifer Mura and Kirsten Borkowski

Presenters: Gretchen Wainwright, Rick Lagiewski and Nathan Eddingsaas