

Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, April 4, 2024

12:15 – 1:50 PM

Slaughter Hall 2240/2230

Attendance: See Below

Agenda Item No. 1: Call to Order; A. Newman (12:18)
Meeting called to order.
Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; A. Newman (12:19)
Motion : Richard Zanibbi Seconded: Scott Johnson No objections and approved.
Agenda Item No. 3: Communication Officer's Report/Approval of Minutes; Senate Exec. Comm. (12:19)
Tabled to when Stephen returns.
Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; A. Newman (12:19)
<p>Martin covering 2 our treasurer covering one. April 8th is an important date to discuss. For the day of the Eclipse, faculty are at liberty to choose between canceling or switching modalities for their courses. However, you must TELL LOCAL STAFF AND STUDENTS what you will decide to do. We are expecting a large number of people to visit Rochester. Everyone needs to be well informed for their own safety and comfort.</p> <p>The senate has identified 3 representatives for our Middle states working groups. Kerry Baron for the steering committee, Ivan Puchades for academic governance, Bruce Hartpence part of resource committee Student Success and Workload Compliance working groups still looking for senate representatives.</p> <p>B2 process update: redline document and clean document in B2 group folder on google drive. Tamaira will send the link to the FS. Finding cascading edits that need to be made with change of officers.</p>

Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; E. Redman (12:23)
<p>ECLIPSE ISSUES Presidential award for staff last week. It was a wonderful event, thanks for attending.</p> <p>Today's meeting bill zimmer about benefits. Career architecture project and how staff are being engaged.</p> <p>General elections are being closed soon.</p>

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

Announced results of the new administration last Friday. A. Shuron is the new president!

Bylaw updates soon.

Agenda Item No. 7: Faculty Associates Updates; H Nickisher and M. Hirudayaraj (12:28)

Faculty associates are introducing themselves. There are a lot of faculty that don't know we exist and what we do. The intent of this presentation is to introduce FS to this group.

Provide leadership to our faculty. Come talk to them about any issues without fear of going to chair or dean on issues. Needs of NTT faculty.

ADVANCE provides programs for women faculty, and Malar is a representative for women faculty on campus.

They are meeting with colleges one on one to discuss the needs of the various colleges. Questions?

Joe L: Visited my college, frequently we don't associate with other colleges. Can we facilitate across colleges?

A: We did a meet and greet 2 weeks ago and we are planning a year end celebration at the end of Spring semester. Look for e-mail. Point is well taken. More needs to be done.

Robert U: Disparaging pay between female and male or rank. More male "Full". Faculty of color is still not well represented.

A: We are knowledgeable of these issues and a study was done in regard to rank. Malar wants to follow up with the Dean's and see what has been done. We also need to know from FS what challenges should ADVANCE focus on? With focus on policy, sometimes good governance is not quick governance. It takes time to fix these issues.

Martin A.: Are there representations from each college?

A: No, it's just 3 people. Crew committee has representatives from each college.

Betsy: salary discussion on Zoom will be tomorrow at 1pm.

A: May 3rd there is a promotion package workshop.

ATIA: Faculty women's caucus needs support so it would be great to get some leadership.

Provost: There is strong support and desire from BOT to be equitable in STEM. Infuse those values on the strategic plan. Involves advocates and be looking for moments to be proactive and intentional for developing the strategic plan.

Hamad G: Surveys have been conducted for many years. Can your group share that information with FS? Inform the findings.

H. Nickisher: This year there have not been any surveys. They have been involved with review of the COACHE data, and what relates to our constituents. For NTT data was reviewed specifically. No new data to share right now.

Agenda Item No. 8: Policy C22.0 (Records Management) Update; E. Thompson (12:39) *Presentation linked below*

Records management is fascinating! I think you should read it!

Proposed changes and to decommission it. D5 has a policy for decommissioning. Since the last review the office has encountered some challenges with the terminology on some specific issues. Other policies supersede this document. Also issues with departments or divisions. It's up to those decisions to maintain those documents.

Decommissioning requires a process of review:

Certain regulations require maintaining documents for certain timeframes.

Other policies D15, C11, C8.1

Instead as an administrative policy, and not a governance policy will allow us to not need permission to go to FS.

Even notes in class under some definitions are records that need to be kept.

Ivan P. Administration will be keeping changes up. Faculty will not be informed? Is that why?

A: Not to avoid these conversations. There are still many existing policies that will not be removed. Some things could be tweaked without changing the definition of terms. Administrative policies.

Nathan E: No other policies will be changed?

E, Thompson: Yes

J. Lanzafame: C22 is shortened by 6 pages. It has a spreadsheet with "terms" so if the NYS changes a term it would need to be voted on by FS. SO C22 was changed to just say go to the NYS website.

A: That is a good point. By eliminating C22 it can be tailored to departments.

S. Malachowsky: How does this affect audit or review for our faculty? How are faculty informed? Does compliance and record keeping move to someone else from the Faculty?

A: No, the faculty will still be responsible. This change will allow the office to be more responsive to support faculty.

Michael L: B5 is the policies on policies. There is a section 5 on administrative policies. It currently states a process for communication, so the FS is a communication process.

Martin A.: Where will it be kept and displayed?

A: It is accessible to everyone and can be reviewed.

Richard Z.: A list of what records would be affected with this change?

A: All records would be affected. The C22 list is not 100% complete or explicit. The new Administrative policy would still have that list or retention schedules which include names of records.

Hamad: C22 includes some but really doesn't have an excel sheet. And the list is very incomplete. There is a link in section 6 at the bottom.

Sam: Will policy history be kept? That doesn't seem to be done for administrative policy.

A: Great suggestions to keep a change log or a record of previous versions.

ACTION: Incorporate either a visible way to keep track of changes.

Ivan P: IS this a done deal? Vote? I have never been told to keep records for certain time, eg. exams?

A: Yes we need a vote.

A2: Devotions departments are required to do so... Need to work with academic affairs to discuss that with the departments. His department is responsible for providing training.

Richard Z: Uncomfortable to vote without details on how this would change the current process.

Atia: not enough information to vote.

Michael K. I would like to see the redline document and a summary of what will be changed to the new policy vs the decommissioned one.

A: Yes, we will come back and provide

Atia: Senate generally requires the details to vote

Eric W: Since there is no text to review of what is replacing we can't vote.

Sam: We need a timeline. Post the vote there should be an idea of when the policy will be written.

A: The current C22 policy would become the Administrative policy?

Tamaira: Policy coordinator: When we decommission, we would still be able to see the policy. Example of C19. It gets identified on the website that it is transitioning to a new policy. You will be able to still find it on the website until a new document is available and a new link will be provided.

Atia: Overtime, so we will table the vote. Senators should discuss offline and come back with more questions when he comes back.

[Policy C22.0 \(Records Management\) Update Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 9: Proposed Changes to Policies E04.0 VOTE; L. Fernandes (1:05) *Presentation linked below*

Thanking committees who were involved.

Charge was to review since it was not looked at in over 5 years.

March 7th was the original presentation to FS.

- Differences in dates from hiring and provost definition of hiring.
- Can language be adjusted on appointment obligations
- Legal document vs policy

Approved by the FAC on April 1st, now here at FS for review.

Consulted with the office of legal affairs. RIT policy supersedes any employment contracts, so if there is a discrepancy between a contract and RIT employment dates, E4.0 would be followed.

Revised language has been shared with senators.

E04.0 governs policies on rank and contracts.

Changes have been made to end faculty obligation wording.

Reading day was not mentioned and is now mentioned.

Small changes to references to sister policy 4.1.

Motion: to approve the new language.

Sam: "Being available to students" definition.

A: That was not further defined in this document. Faculty members should have the freedom to interpret that. Too many definitions.

Wiggle room could be good or bad.

M. Laver: I like the policy

R. Zanibbi: Like the policy too. Can you explain the legal definition of a contract?

L. Fernandes: Since the contract references the policy. The policy governs the terms of the contract. The new language is now more clear on when the contract starts and ends. 5 business days after the end of grades being due. SO if you work beyond that you can be compensated.

Joe: I don't like the wording, since it could generate a second date. Arbitrate between dates. Reading day may end up on a Saturday.

Atia interjects: The President doesn't want to make any changes for the next few years to the calendar.

Rob O: Ambiguity being a week after? What about the week prior???

A: No feedback about the start. So that wasn't looked at?

Robert U.: 5 days after grades are due can be problematic. Travel after graduation could be an issue.

A: The dates should align with the provost's office. We can't change that. They need to follow the contract.

Bolaji: Better to use this language since commencement can move.

A: Agreed

Betsy D.: Does new faculty orientation affect this language?

A: "appointment period" was not addressed in policy before. New faculty should be communicated when the appointment period starts.

Vote results: Yay: 32 Nay: 1 Abstain: 3

[Proposed Changes to Policies E04.0 Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 10: Proposed Changes to Policies E23.0 and E23.1; K. Dunno (1:20) *Presentation linked below*

Information on the differences and similarities between these two policies and on faculty dismissal.

Outreach was done. And these policies are not frequently used so not much data can be found on what could be improved. Looking for FS feedback.

Four categories of comparison:

1. Committee wouldn't be formed unless a need arises. Descriptive language could be improved. NTT representative, vs. all members should be tenured.
2. E24 language could be borrowed for definition of academic year

E23 is defining what the committee formation should be. Dates don't align. Red line document provided for review. Now inline with E2 for duration being 1 calendar year duration. If a case is presented on March 30th does the committee say on?

E23.1, leaving tenured members in NTT reviews, same appointment period over one year. Starting and ending time would change when it would be established based upon need.

Sam: You are pulling in TT and tenured faculty, forbidding NTT faculty to be on the committee. Even though senators are NTT and the selection is "random".

A: NTT who is in FS would not be comfortable being on the

B. Thomas: If you have NTT on this committee they may be afraid of their jobs, confronting the provost. Having only Tenured faculty is more freedom. There should be language for conflict where a tenured committee chair could be selected.

K. Dunno: It is in the broader policy. This policy is just selecting members.

Y. Zlochower: What if you have a process that begins in March and then another in January? Two committees or do they continue?

K. Dunno: We liked there were dates but the dates didn't align well with semesters. Due to the rarity, we don't believe it would be an issue. In some cases it may be extended a little while.

Nathan: Academic year may make more sense for the dates.

A: Should we form it regardless of cases? We debated that as well, it has to do with this being a need based committee.

Hamad: Point of order: Taking too long. Just hear comments, with no answers.

Stacey: changed policy to make sure Dean's are not on FS.

Eric W.: Each case separately?

Richard Z: I agree, more than one committee. More evidence should be considered for not having people in their role as part of the decision.

Scott: What if there are no tenured members on FS???

Provost: Random choice seems fair, but sometimes it isn't fair. I don't see why NTT shouldn't be included.

[Proposed Changes to Policies E23.0 and E23.1 Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 11: Academic Affairs Committee Presentation; L. Buckley (1:39) *Presentation linked below*

A number of carryover charges including D8 revisions. So many changes can't compare to redline. Will do our best.

2 new charges.

Contact hours vs. credit hours. Courses that have indirect instruction, units have many models for how they are counted.

- Are there guidelines and are they equitable? YES! A piece of this was shown in slides.
- Are they followed? Difficult to track. Historically, the Provost should be assessing this. The committee is looking for data from each college for how it's followed.
 - Most colleges used a combination of methods. Only 2 use just credit hours.

Rational? Institutional Activity Report sums up the productivity of the faculty. Based on credit hours because that's what is billed. Half the colleges don't base work load by credit hours alone! By itself IAR is undercounting the time with students. Needs to be looked at, Provost David should consider review.

Add/Drop Policy: only 1 week without permission. Can't change the Add period. We have a system, by talking to the professor. To drop the students would be like 3 weeks. Data shows that some peer universities use 2 weeks. Cornell is much longer (~60 days). We can add more without damaging the student. Partner with Joe Larfado's office of non intended consequences with allowing this. Student status, finances? Many say Faculty should be included in this decision.

Course adoption should be done in time, so when students register they know the cost. Tigerpaw request. Not 1 week before classes starts. Pilot to ask departments to submit earlier. from 60% adoption rate to 80-90%. Not on SIS, but on akademos. They need to try to source materials first.

D8 discussion is being tabled.

[Academic Affairs Committee Presentation](#)

Agenda Item 12: New Business; A. Newman (N/A)
No time.
Agenda Item No. 13: Adjournment; A. Newman (1:54)

Attendance 4/4/2024

Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended	Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended
Abushagur, Mustafa	KGCOE Senator		Lanzafame, Joseph	COS Senator/LRPEC 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	x	Lee, James	ALT CET Senator	
Bamonto, Suzanne	CLA Senator		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/DEIC Rep	x
Capps, John	CLA Senator		Olles, Deana	COS Senator	x
Chiavaroli, Julius	ALT GIS Senator		Olson, Rob	ALT GCCIS Senator	x
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	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/UWC Rep	x	Sheffield, Jr. Clarence	ALT SOIS Senator	x
Dell, Betsy	CET Senator	x	Song, Qian	SCB Senator	x
DiRisio, Keli	CAD Senator		Staff Council Rep	Emily Redman	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	
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: DEIC, ICC, LRPEC, RSC, UWC

Interpreters: Nic Crouse-Dickerson and Jennifer Mura

Presenters: Heidi Nickisher, Malarvizhi Hirudayaraj, Evan Thompson, Leonie Fernandes, Kyle Dunno and Larry Buckley