

Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, April 25, 2024

12:15 – 1:50 PM

Bamboo Rooms - Campus Center 2610/2650

Attendance: See Below

Agenda Item No. 1: Call to Order; A. Newman (12:20)
Meeting called to order.
Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; A. Newman (12:20)
A. Newman: The first order of the day is the approval of the agenda. Motion: J. Lanzafame Seconded: S. Johnson Approved by acclamation
Agenda Item No. 3: Communication Officer's Report/Approval of Minutes; S. Aldersley (12:21)
S. Aldersley: Good afternoon, everybody. It's good to be back. I want to thank Mark and Keri for having taken care of the minutes in my absence. I move that the minutes of April 18 th be approved. Second: H. Ghazle Approved by acclamation April 18, 2024 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; A. Newman (12:21)
A. Newman: I have a pretty short report. First, we have one more meeting on May 2 nd , the hold for May 9 th has been released. We will have a bigger lunch than usual for our last meeting. We're planning on sandwiches. If you have any special requests please let Tamaira know and we will do our best to accommodate you. Second, Imagine RIT is this Saturday. You might want to put that on your calendars. There's always a need for volunteers. Apparently this year we have the largest number of events ever, so it should be pretty interesting. Third, by way of update, the Strategic Planning committee is being convened and co-chaired by a Trustee and Enid Cardinale. I will represent the Senate on the committee. I assure you that we will be holding town halls and events to get feedback from all stakeholders, faculty, staff and students, so please stay

tuned, and be prepared to get the word out, so that we can get as much feedback as possible.

Fourth, as you know, on Tuesday, Dr. Munson announced that he will retire at the end of next academic year on Tuesday. For those of you who may be wondering, we did not know in advance. We have heard that they are planning to involve us in the search for his replacement and we have requested representation on the search committee.

Fifth, we want to make sure that E 36 is being followed, so rather than going college by college, I will ask simply which college did not have a faculty meeting.

B. Dell: Ours is on Monday.

A. Newman: Thank you. Finally, we are very happy to announce that we have completed the training for Grievance Committee members. It is something that is supposed to be done every year. In future, the Center for Faculty Development will do the training.

Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; J. Zehr (12:25)

J. Zehr: We had a visit from Kelly Kamish and we were excited to discuss DSO, compliance and ethics and how that would apply to us. We are gearing up for our annual Staff Council Appreciation picnic on May 14th, at the Polisseni Center. We've got lots of stuff going on that day. We're in the process of getting new representatives for Blocks 2, 4, and 6. At our last meeting, we were visited by Dr. Munson to discuss the strategic planning committee and he got some insight from us. Finally, on the staff architecture project, we have had many focus groups last week and staff were able to discuss job descriptions, so that's moving forward. Staff Council will partner with them throughout the process.

Agenda Item No. 6: Student Government Update; A. Shuron (N/A)

There was none.

Agenda Item No. 7: Ad Hoc Committee on Freedom of Expression and Academic Freedom Recommendations; M. Reed (12:27) *Presentation linked below*

I'm here today to present to you the final report of the ad hoc Academic Freedom and Freedom of Expression committee. We've been working all year and have had six meetings, three per semester. We've had a lot of good discussions. I want to present to you what we've done and our recommendations for next steps. This is the charge for our committee. I won't belabor this since I presented it in the fall when we talked before. We have some clarifying points to our charge, which I put in here for reference. We've reviewed existing policies, past COACHE results including the most recent ones, and discussed some past issues. The big thing since the last time I talked to you is that we've conducted a faculty survey and I'll tell you a little bit about how that came out. We spent a fair amount of time reviewing external resources, including the Chicago Statement and we will be making some recommendations there. So now

I'll tell you about the faculty survey.

Just as a reminder, this was our faculty survey. You'll notice that the first question was a yes/no quantitative question. Most of the survey was narrative response. So I can summarize a little bit about that but I'm going to focus on the key takeaways from the survey.

The first question asked, 'have you experienced or witnessed anything that you believed was a challenge or compromise to your academic freedom or someone else's academic freedom at RIT?' 22% of respondents said they had. We got a lot of narrative responses, so we got a sense of what kind of issues there were. Some of them were not actually academic freedom issues, but there was a belief that they were, for example, things like what courses faculty are being asked to teach. But there were definitely some responses of real academic freedom concern. One of the biggest takeaways that we got from this survey was that there is a very large number of faculty who would like to see more information, who would like RIT to talk more about academic freedom. We got a lot of responses that said this survey is the first time I've heard anything about academic freedom at RIT. So there was a desire for some training and more information on these issues. We'll also point out that there were a lot of very positive responses saying that academic freedom was a strength at RIT, and the COACHE survey results indicated that academic freedom was a pretty positive issue.

So we have a few recommendations. The first one is that based on this survey outcome, we believe that RIT should develop some kind of training module with information about academic freedom. There was debate in our committee as to whether that training should be mandatory or something that was just available, so we're not willing to recommend that it should be mandatory. The idea would be to give it as part of the new faculty orientation, and then ideally, periodically after that, so that faculty are aware of what academic freedom is and what the current issues are that they should be concerned about.

The other big recommendation is that we think RIT should have some kind of permanent group, a working group or standing committee on academic freedom. Right now we don't have such a thing. On another slide, and I'll talk about what we think the primary tasks of such a group would be. The main thing, though, is that it should be educational, informational and also policy-based.

Our other main recommendation is that we do believe that RIT should adopt the freedom of expression resolution based on the Chicago Statement. If that is adopted by the faculty, then we would need to incorporate that language into Policy E02.0, the Principles of Academic Freedom document.

Here's what our committee would propose as the main activities of this working group. If this group had a representative from every college, that representative could maybe attend college faculty meetings, maybe once a year, and present information on academic freedom issues. Also, this body could serve as a sounding board for faculty who think they may have a concern which might be an academic freedom issue. The group could be a place where a faculty member could go and get advice.

The other big thing is if we do adopt the Chicago Statement, we need to make sure that all of our policies are consistent with it. An important point is that because we already have a faculty grievance committee, we are not recommending that this working group serve in that capacity.

Let me say a little bit about policy documents. Part of our charge was to look at E02.0 and C11, the Policy on Freedom of Speech and Expression. That policy is actually not owned by Faculty Senate. It's owned by the Office of Legal Affairs. It was just recently reviewed and reaffirmed last August. So one of the things that we think this proposed working group would do, if we adopted the Chicago Statement, would be to work with the Office of Legal Affairs to update C11.

Our recommendation is to adopt the Chicago Statement in full. It's a model resolution where you can just fill in your institution name. So the language that I'm going to show to you is that full statement. We think this is important because there are over a hundred universities that have adopted this statement, and it's a strong statement on freedom of expression and we would like RIT to be part of that group. So we didn't change any of the language. We did make some recommended changes in the current E.02 where

we quote AAUP's 1940 statement.

Now let me jump to the document. I've provided two versions. The first is a red line statement, so you can see the exact changes, and the second is the statement without the red lines. It might be best to look at the red line version. This is basically taking our E02 and adding in what we are calling the RIT-specific articulation of the Chicago Statement, so it has our name in it. So this is the language in that statement, and then here you can see the changes to E02. The most significant change is to a line that we had a fair amount of discussion about, where previously it said 'faculty should not introduce controversial material, which has no relation to their subject.' We thought this sentence is very much up to interpretation of what a controversial subject is, and whether it's related. We thought that the previous sentence that faculty 'are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subjects and material relating directly to them' is a strong enough statement, and so we recommend removing the sentence about introducing controversial material.

Questions?

R. Zanibbi: Do you have any concrete examples of where people felt there was a legitimate concern about academic freedom, or patterns, that you could share?

M. Reed: Yes, there were some examples where there was certain material that had been in courses, that maybe students found objectionable and then faculty were encouraged, maybe slightly pressured, to remove that material from the course. There were a lot of things that talked about sensitivity of certain subjects, and whether or not they should be in the classroom. So I think that was the biggest area. Others on the committee, please pipe up if you would like to add anything.

S. Malachowsky: In that vein, I was wondering if any of the survey respondents talked about Title IX, anything in the classroom that could potentially collide with some of the tenets of Title IX?

C: I don't recall anyone specifically mentioning Title IX, but there were quite a lot of comments related to DEI initiatives and things that would not be allowed to be discussed in the current climate of cancel culture. There was a lot of mention of that, being concerned about being able to talk about some of those things in class, but I don't recall anything specifically about Title IX.

F. Dreese: I don't remember Title IX being brought up.

B. Thomas: I have one big question. Is Senate going to vote because I really would not want us to have to do any other training every year to add to what we have to do now. I don't know exactly what you want us to do.

A. Newman: I think the first step is going to be about discussing what these recommendations are and breaking them down into actionable items. Part of the original charge was for us to take this to University Council. So this is going to have to be a discussion. However, particularly if the freedom expression resolution were to be adopted by RIT, it would first have to be approved by Senate and then taken to University Council. So there's a couple of steps left to this. As to the working group or standing committee on academic freedom, that is our choice, but if we wanted to include it as a standing committee, it would be a change to our charter, which would be something that Senate would have to approve, and then go to the entire faculty for their vote. So there's that element. And of course, if RIT approves it, then we would have to update the relevant policies. The four recommendations kind of go in four different directions. Right now, we want to just understand where everyone is on this.

I. Puchades: I wonder if how we teach our labs falls under academic freedom. Our college has some lab-intensive courses and we are told by our department head that TAs should be running those labs and that we don't want faculty spending a lot of time in labs. But faculty feel that our students get a better experience if we are present in the lab. So can I go back to my department head and say this is an academic freedom issue?

P. David: This is a very good topic. I think there are two dimensions to this. One is standard academic freedom and then there is an added layer of political expression which may not accord with the majority view. *Inaudible*. So that's one big issue. The second one is how faculty present themselves on social media. People might say this is my own account, I can say anything I want, however, when that faculty member comes into the classroom, students have seen what has been posted. *Inaudible* We don't want to wade into that space because there are no winners there. So there are three or four different dimensions to this. We want to protect faculty freedom but we want to go about it in a way that doesn't add to controversy

G. Tsouri: *Inaudible*

C. Reed: I'd ask everyone to read the Chicago Statement carefully before we start trying to change it because it's a pretty strong statement that does place restrictions, right here in this paragraph 'RIT may restrict expression if it violates the law, defame a particular person that constitutes a general threat or harassment' so there's a fair amount in the statement already. The other thing I would point out is there is this language here talking about public speech. The original question that was asked about labs, there's this phrase here that talks about full freedom in teaching, but I think everyone would agree that we are still given our teaching assignments by our department, so I'd say that's a gray area.

H. Ghazle: If I may go back to your point, you have your plan of work, so that's where the negotiation has to start. I mean other policies would dictate what to teach, what not to teach, very often during annual reviews, that's where the negotiation takes place. You know, 'I would like to take this lab, rather than a TA. Is that possible?'

A. Newman: Thank you so much. If there are any further questions or comments, would it be okay for Senators to reach out to you directly?

[Ad Hoc Committee on Freedom of Expression and Academic Freedom Recommendations Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 8: E06.0.II.D.5.b - Teaching Letters for NTT Promotion; A. McGowan (12:51)
Presentation linked below

A. McGowan: I'm representing my subcommittee. The language of the original charge read that promotion packets for NTT should include a letter from coordinators of any multi-section courses that they taught, even if the coordinator's rank is the same as the candidate for promotion and the specified rationale was 'restricting input to letters from faculty above the candidate's current rank prevents the most important feedback from the faculty who must often teach with the candidate in large coordinated courses.' The subcommittee felt this was a little narrow so we reconfigured the charge to investigate an

expansion to the list of faculty eligible to provide letters of support for NTT promotion candidates. Lecturers are evaluated solely on their teaching performance while Senior Lecturers are evaluated additionally on their service. Often the faculty who are most qualified to evaluate the teaching performance are those who are actively teaching with the candidates, possibly coordinating the section that the candidate is teaching. The current language in E6 prevents pre-tenured professors as well as lecturers of equal or lesser rank to the candidate from providing feedback on the promotion. Our work focused on reaching out as representatives to our colleges. We spoke with several current and former members of non-tenure track promotion committees. We observed from these comments that some of the letters, not all of them of course, from faculty senior in rank, may be devoid of substantive content because of their lack of interaction with the candidate. This was a more common comment coming from larger academic units where faculty offices may be spread over several buildings, and/or the teaching assignments are stratified by rank. We even heard of cases where these letters may refer to the candidate by the wrong name, further evidence that there is sometimes not a lot of interaction between those who are evaluating and voting on the candidate's promotion and the candidate.

We found it was pretty common around all of the colleges that the Dean's office is responsible for producing the list of letter-writers from whom the promotion committee should solicit input. Thanks to Dean Wang, we obtained feedback from the Council of Deans and the majority of responses indicated that it would be an undue burden to ask the Dean's Office, specifically in the case of coordinators of multi-section courses because it's not information that's readily accessible. Usually that would be at the department or academic unit level. So we said, OK, let's not place the burden on the Dean's Office, or the department chair, let's give the candidate the option of including such a list in their portfolio.

The language was agreed upon in FAC after full discussion and passed on April 17th. The location of the policy is in a very narrow paragraph of E6.0.II.D.5.b. The black language here is the existing policy. We did not suggest any change to that. I'll read it quickly here: "For promotion in the lecturer ranks, solicit letters of recommendation for or against promotion from the candidate's department head, and from the tenured faculty members and NTT teaching faculty senior in rank from within the candidate's department." The language that FAC is recommending for addition to policy is in red here: "Additionally, the candidate they provide as a section in their portfolio a list of faculty members of any regular faculty rank with whom they most closely interacted during the evaluation period. This may include but is not limited to coordinators of multi-sectional courses, co-instructors, or any faculty member who is not included in the solicitation above. If provided by the candidate the chair of the Promotion Committee shall solicit feedback in the same manner as described above."

A. Newman: Are there any questions? Are you going to make a motion right now?

A. McGowan: I move that Senate approve the proposed policy changes.

Approved: 34-0-2

[E06.0.II.D.5.b - Teaching Letters for NTT Promotion Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 9: E 23.0 and E23.1 (Dismissal of a Tenure-Track AND a Non-Tenure Track Faculty Member for Cause Policies) VOTES; C. Schlombs (12:59) *Presentation linked below*

C. Schlombs: Credit for this goes to the subcommittee which did the work. Kyle is at a conference this week, and that's the reason I am here today. Kyle received two main complexes of questions around this. One was the committee term. Right now the committee is formed on February 1st, and serves for 12 months, and the proposal here, based on your feedback, is that the committee should be constituted in the first week of the fall semester, and members serve 12 months. The advantages of this is that the committee terms for the Dismissal Review Committee would then better align with the other committee terms, on the basis of which committee members would be elected, for example, tenure committee chairs who would be elected or appointed for the tenure track review committee, or Senate members who would be appointed for the NTT review committee, so better alignment of the committee terms.

We did receive a recommendation that the committee only be constituted when a case arises. In the end we are making a recommendation against that, the main reason being that we feel it's important for a committee like this to be in place, for example, if a case arises during the summer, at a time when it would be very difficult to constitute a committee, and for a case like that we would want a committee in place. And that's why we feel it's important to constitute it, even though, based on experience of recent years, it seems that these committees do not need to meet to look at actual cases.

The second complex of questions, and there was some discussion back here on the Senate floor, concerns the NTT representation on the Dismissal Review Committee for 23.1, that is, for NTT faculty. It seems that views here are divided. We had initially brought forward a proposal that this remain as is, a committee with tenure track members only, and the argument for that is that tenure protects committee members to speak freely. We received comments not only here on the floor but also by e-mail that Senators felt that it was important to keep this to tenure track members, because they had seen cases where NTT faculty members seem to be bending towards requests because of their employment situations. However, on the Senate floor there were strong voices to include NTT representation on the committee, and the main reason here would be that we have broader perspective represented on the committee. And so we are proposing a compromise here, to increase the number of committee members from three to five and to have NTT representation, but to have the majority of committee members still be tenured.

The changed language has been pre-circulated. The second paragraph here is the language that goes with the committee term. And then here, this is the tenure track policy where we have only a minor recommendation that was presented last time to have the change in language here. And then for 23.1, the NTT Dismissal Committee, we have the same change for the committee term, and then, in addition to that, we have a language change in the first paragraph that goes to the composition of the committee to allow for the larger committee and the representation of NTT committee members.

This is the proposal, based on your feedback, so I would move that Senate approve the changes.

S. Malachowsky: I want to ask about Slide #8. I'm not sure it guarantees that there are NTT members on the committee. It just says there might be. It doesn't ensure that there will be NTT representation. It could be five tenure track or tenured members of the committee with zero NTT members and still meet the standard of this policy.

C. Schlombs: Yes, this is not mandatory language for the remaining two members.

B. Thomas: So why don't you offer a friendly amendment to the language?

A. Newman: It might be better to split the motion into 23 and 23.1.

C. Schlombs: So I move Senate approve the proposed changes for the Tenure Track Dismissal for Cause

policy, which is E23.

A. Newman: There's a motion on the floor. Is there any discussion?

P. David: One point where I have a concern is the reference to random selection. While that's generally fair, random selection *Inaudible*. Normally, it is good to have a bit of both. You could say, for example, three members will be selected randomly and two members will be appointed by the Provost or something like that. That gives a chance to get the right composition.

E. Williams: I'd like to return to this question of constituting the committee when there is a case, versus at the outset. Your argument for establishing it at the outset was that if a case came up during summer, it's better to have the committee ready. I think the actual situation is the opposite, because any faculty that's research-active, with grants, are getting summer salary and we're not permitted to do committee work. And so if I've been appointed in the fall, and then summer comes around and there's a case, I have to say, 'sorry, I'm out.' So I think it potentially causes problems. Also, the provost's point is that if you constitute each committee per case, then you can be sensitive to these issues of conflict of interest.

A. Newman: I will point out that this is made up of the chairs of the current college tenure committees, which, from my understanding, usually could mean over the summer anyways. So if somebody was unavailable, they wouldn't be able to chair the college tenure committee either.

B. Thomas: *Inaudible*

C. Schlombs: I assume that would even be the case if the community needed to be constituted during the semester and a faculty committee member needed to step back because of work, overload or similar questions, there would be a pool of alternates from which to draw and at least a majority of committee members could be assumed to be able to serve. We have discussed the question of constituting a committee when a case arises, we do believe that case-specific committees raise more questions with regards to bias and conflict of interest and so this policy would have to be rewritten significantly. Another question would be if we had more than one case in a year, would we constitute two committees. Who would then be able to serve? Could the ones that serve on the first committee still serve on the second committee? So doing that would just raise a whole lot of questions that we sought to avoid by constituting the committee at the beginning of the year, just in case a case would arise. We felt that was the better solution. But if there's a strong push from Senate we can go back to the drawing table.

H. Ghazle: My understanding right now is that we are just voting on those specific changes to the policy. The reason why I'm asking is that, when I go back to the entire policy, it contains information that's outdated, specifically where it talks about the Faculty Grievance Committee, where there is no longer a preliminary inquiry. There's such a lot of stuff about the Grievance Committee that we may need to start to look at that. Also information about the deans. The deans are no longer voting members of the Senate. I do agree with increasing the number from three to five members. I'm not going to talk here about everything that needs to be changed. I'd be more than happy to share that with the committee to ensure that it's taken care of in terms of the policy. That's not the issue here but I just want to make sure we make the distinction. If we are going to vote now, that does not mean that the entire policy does not need to be looked at.

C. Schlombs: I know that the subcommittee did some outreach here, including to the Executive

Committee, and I'm somewhat surprised that a minute before the vote, we are pointed to these issues. But if that is the case, then that should be looked at as well. So in the interest of time, perhaps I can withdraw the motion and we can bring this back next week. I would really appreciate it if there are any other comments that we receive those very soon.

P. David: I would appreciate it if the Committee would give the Provost some guidance on the random selection concept as discussed.

C. Schlombs: I will bring this back to the subcommittee for consideration. Based on the FAC discussion, the understanding was that these were basically the same processes with different words. I just took what I heard committee members say. My initial inclination is that if we write this policy, we want to do so independent of the office holder, so if we have appointment by the office holder, we do want to put in provisions to avoid conflict of interest and bias, so doing that would require some more additions to the policy and the committee had opted against that. But I can bring it back to the subcommittee.

[E 23.0 and E23.1 \(Dismissal of a Tenure-Track AND a Non-Tenure Track Faculty Member for Cause Policies\) Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 10: Faculty Affairs Committee Presentation; C. Schlombs (1:15) *Presentation linked below*

This is actually the FAC end of the year presentation. I want to give a shout out to the committee members and in particular, the subcommittee chairs, who have done a lot of the legwork and also to three members of the Long Range Planning Committee who joined FAC to help with the considerable workload. We had 13 charges, five of which have been completed, or are in the process of completion, two of which concern NTT faculty and I'm happy to entertain any questions on those later on. But what I want to focus on today are the ones that are highlighted in blue that pertain to the faculty survey, in particular regarding annual reviews and plans of work. I will give a very high level overview. In the pre-circulated presentation, you have details. In addition, in our final report, we provide survey responses by college, so that you can see how your own constituents responded. Faculty were in favor of FAC proposals related to annual reviews and plans of work. Faculty and administrators are split over the question of summer deadlines, and TT and NTT faculty diverged on the question of faculty rank. Before I turn to the proposals for annual review and plans of work, I want to emphasize, and this is very important to me, that we are making these proposals in the spirit of promoting trust in faculty. This is already grounded in the policy, however, we felt that in our daily practice and interaction we could strengthen that. And this is important. Management Theory tells us that in education our objective is to encourage creativity and innovation and doing so is very different from managing operations, for example, so we do need different processes and trust in faculty is essential.

Now to the survey responses. On each of these slides, we have the original question on the left, and then the chart of responses on the right. As you can see, the faculty responded in favor of the initiative to reduce the merit rating categories from five to three. We actually see that the number of responses in favor is twice the number of faculty who are against. If we count the faculty who are indifferent, we actually have over 70% of the faculty who would go along with this proposal. And for this question, as well as for all the questions with regard to annual review and plan of work, we see that faculty and administrators responded with the same trends. We see faculty being very much in favor of proposed

language that FAC already brought to you a year ago and we are planning to bring this back to Senate in the fall. I want to take a few minutes to talk a little bit about our rationale behind this proposal. Annual reviews were introduced at RIT, as we understand it, in the late nineties, and this is very much in line with trends in higher education. In general, the advantage of having an annual review process is that it's a transparent process which is geared towards faculty development. A big disadvantage is that it involves high workload for faculty and administrators, and we are wondering if this is just a paper tiger that really justifies the effort for the outcome. We also did a literature review last year and we found there is a surprisingly critical discussion amongst higher education administrators of annual review and merit processes. Some of the reasons include the fact that across academe, including RIT, we typically see comparatively low or no merit increases. Over the last ten years, we've seen 3%, and 0% in some years. In recent years we've seen merit below increases in the cost of living. This means, for example, for faculty who have a very successful year, high performance and book publication, a big grant, for example in a year with no merit increase, that often goes unrewarded despite the best of all intentions to make up for it. Also merit is a zero-sum game. I want to emphasize that merit ratings correlate, but do not determine salary increases. In other words, academic units can assign different merit increases for faculty in the same rating category. At RIT, we are told that most disputes are between outstanding and exceeds, and so, by eliminating that distinction, we hope that some of these disputes will also be eliminated. And of course, consideration of these questions is absolutely crucial as COACHE results have pointed out that compensation is very important to faculty at this point. I note that we have been in touch with RABC who have the charge in front of them on faculty compensation.

The second question concerns reorienting the plan of work around the meeting between the faculty member and the academic unit head. And here the faculty are more strongly in favor. In the faculty consultation preceding the faculty survey, we heard concerns that such a meeting could actually also lead to undue influence of academic unit tests on faculty members' plans of work, particularly for junior faculty. And so what we are bringing here is a slightly modified proposal from our original proposal where the meeting is central, but the faculty member would write the POW not at the beginning of the review process, but once they have received the evaluation from the academic unit head in response and in preparation of the meeting, and then the POW would be finalized after that meeting. Again, the rationale is to re-orient practice, to follow policy, and to mitigate the concern over undue influence.

Our third question is about longer review cycles for top-ranked faculty. Again, we see the faculty and administrators are in favor. We had detailed questions on this. Faculty feel that both the annual review and the plan of work should be included in longer review cycles and that is true regardless of how faculty responded to the previous question. All faculty are in favor of including both the annual review and the POW.

On the question of how merit increases should be determined, the responses are a little bit more split, and as a result, we see the need for more discussion and consultation, but we also are leaning towards emphasizing that these would be longer review cycles. This would not mean that there would be no review. We would propose that the merit increment be extended over the longer review cycle. The final question was: who should qualify? Here again faculty response was split and we see the need for more consultation and opinion polling here. FAC itself leans towards limiting this option to top rank faculty so this would be full professors and principal lecturers only, the reason being that it would lead to an incentive to be promoted to higher rank, which is in the institution's interest as well as the individuals faculty's. And doing so would avoid putting mid-rank faculty in a position where it might be more difficult to get on a path towards promotion if circumstances were to change.

We are currently in the process of working on policy language that we will bring back to Senate. If top rank faculty wish to opt for a longer review cycle, the length of that cycle would be agreed upon in writing at the beginning of the review cycle between faculty and the academic unit head.

So we are soliciting your input and we hope to bring these proposals back to you for approval in the fall. We're really asking for your feedback.

Let me briefly talk about the other two questions and then, if we still have time, I will take your questions.

Question Four concerns summer deadlines. Here we actually saw a statistically significant difference between faculty and administrators, where faculty dislike very strongly being asked to work over the summer. The subcommittee has done important work over the course of the semester in mapping out deadlines that fall into the summer, and to identify a college that could serve as a pilot college to implement changes.

The last question pertained to NTT faculty rank and here we find that there is split in the responses between TT and NTT faculty. FAC has only been able to consider this question since the E6 language was finalized in February, so we are still very early in our consideration of this charges. I will now take questions.

A. Newman: I would have liked to take questions, but we have one more presentation, and we are very behind on our schedule, so if senators have questions, please send them to Corinna directly.

S. Aldersley: I may have missed it, but how many faculty responded to your survey?

C. Schlombs: We had about a 50% response rate, 500 faculty. I think we have about 1120 full time faculty. We received about 450 complete responses by the deadline and a further 50 responses that tended to be incomplete afterwards. So the results that I presented are based on the 450 that we received by the deadline.

[Faculty Affairs Committee Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 11: Intercollege Curriculum Committee Presentation; H. Nickisher (1:31)
Presentation linked below

H. Nickisher: A quick and very sincere shout out to all the members on this committee who have done a lot of good work. And most everybody will be returning in the fall. Attendance was often a hundred percent each week, depending on if someone had a conflict. All documents were shared electronically via e-mail, and also posted on MyCourses. We did finish all of our charges. According to our current mandate, ICC has two primary recurring responsibilities and we had three carryover charges. Our recommendations have already been presented to Senate, all of which you fortunately approved. Carry-over charge #1 was to investigate approaches and policy changes to reduce duplication in course development and we presented on that in February. Carry-over charge #2 was to consult with appropriate committees, including Grad Council and RABC, as well as administrators to investigate and develop policies to support effective curriculum management in the context of ABB budgeting. Grad. Council had the same charge and in their report last week they recommended that no action be taken and we concur. Our carry-over charge #3 was a self-charge and was to address an inconsistency in the minors policy. Senate approved our recommendation on that in December. Our new charge was also similar to one given Grad Council and that was to look at what has happened with new programs approved over the last five years. We were helped by Chris Licata, Brenda Thornton and Michael McGwin who supplied the relevant data which is tabulated on this chart which I think was circulated to everybody beforehand. If

there are any questions about this, please ask me later.

I would like to say a few words regarding B2 according to which the ICC is mandated to study undergraduate curricula proposals, and the proposed changes to B2, especially as this body agreed last week to table further discussion until next week. The Faculty Senate is set up to ensure faculty participation in shared governance at RIT. That commitment requires timely communications on issues and concerns and pending changes to the rules and regulations, by which RIT will transition from very good to great. However, recently, both the ensuing faculty participation, and timely communications seem to be a little lacking. Indeed, even the sharing of information among Senate members also seems a little casual as of late, as evidenced by Eric – who, according to the minutes of March 28th, called a point of order in relation to the discussion about B2. He said Senators did not receive a revised B2 in accordance with normal practice, and pointed out that typically every time the Senate revises a policy, there has been an accompanying marked up Word document. But there wasn't, and I think he also said this again last week. The ICC has already shared its own remarks about the proposed changes to B2. The ICC is the only standing committee in the Charter which has its subcommittees identified, the GEC, the UWC and the Honors Curriculum Committee, but is also expected to call upon Senate to fill positions on these committees. But these subcommittees are not discretionary. They provide the University with a consistent approach to the approval of specific curriculum and courses, the assessment of overarching learning outcomes and guidance on underlying conceptual frameworks, that serve as a base for program and curriculum design. Changes to B2 are of serious concern to the members and certainly the chairs of these curriculum committees. If the faculty feel that too much service is demanded, which may indeed may be true, I would argue, that the Senate might be conflating issues and coming to an incorrect conclusion, and therefore, an incorrect reaction with respect to university level service, particularly around curriculum, and especially when the curriculum is the purview of the faculty. It's like comparing apples and oranges. Reducing committees is not going to take away the amount of service or the feeling of being overburdened by service, because the issue isn't really related to service at the university level, but at the college and department level and, truth be told, at the end of the day, regardless of what service you do, at whatever level, all that many of us who do serve just want an acknowledgement like, 'thank you for your service.' The ICC would therefore like to ask the Provost to take on the service issue. The presentation and Town Hall discussion of the COACHE data is perhaps a start, but it needs to be a leadership commitment to ask the question, do I need a committee for this? Can I get what I need in a different way and still respect transparency and governance? The ICC would also like to ask the Senate to thoughtfully consider what's really at stake with these proposed changes, and more fully and respectfully engage participation of the membership of all standing committees. I seem to recall that Ivan also expressed surprise that there were members on the long planning committee saying 'what's going on?' So with that, back to your regularly scheduled programming and that's it, in a nutshell.

A. Newman: Do we have any comments or questions? Hearing none, is there any new business?

[Intercollege Curriculum Committee Presentation](#)

Agenda Item 12: New Business; A. Newman (1:43)

P. David: In response to Heidi's comments and the demands on faculty time, can we not decide what are the most important things we need to take on? Was this a normal agenda this year? To me this has seemed like a massive agenda. This many changes are very difficult for faculty to process and get their attention. Can we not collectively come together and decide on three or four things we want to do and not take on so many charges?

R. Zanibbi: *Inaudible* I appreciate Heidi's comment but I think the changes proposed for B2 . . . *inaudible*. One of the unfortunate artifacts of our structure is that it's very hard to get proper attention. I don't know where we are going to land, but I think this has been a very important discussion and I give the Executive credit. I don't know that this story is over but I am sympathetic to the fact that we need to do our jobs correctly. *Inaudible*.

A. Newman: Thank you, Richard, for your opinion. Before we adjourn, I'd like to bring up a couple of things. First, we haven't been working in secret. I know a lot of people have been curious about why we have not gone to the individual committees and asked their opinion, but one of the reasons is that we know that there's been a lot of turnover in a lot of the committees. Another is that it's very difficult to ask people who are doing work to recommend canceling the work that they're doing. This was one of my personal decisions, where I thought it would be very strange to go to the chairs of the standing committees or to the standing committees as a whole, and say, we want to reduce how many committees there are, please volunteer to have your work be shut down. Also, I thought it was important to remember and remind everyone that these standing committees are not individual separate bodies. They are actually committees that are formed by the Senate and essentially the Senate is the body that controls how many committees we should have. The fact that we go to the university faculty, to our voting faculty is the reason for, you know, maintaining open communication. And it's the core of how we communicate. And the idea of discussing it first with our senators is to avoid having 1,100 chefs helping us write our charter. So in terms of what was open and what the value was of bringing in feedback, that was one thing. The other thing is, we actually explicitly announced in January to all of our Senators that the documents for B2 that were being edited were available. Anyone who cared to be involved in the conversation had an opportunity. After a month and a half of nobody editing the document we put out a straw poll, asking Senators to provide written feedback and alternative language. In the absence of responses, we moved forward. Admittedly, we thought that people were on board. It seems that there are still some areas and holdouts where people are concerned. But none of this has been done with any level of maliciousness or lack of care. In fact, we have looked very carefully at the charter from a multitude of different angles to address issues that have been coming to us for over 18 months.

R. Zanibbi: The point of Eric's concern was procedure and the absence of a red-line document. I don't think anybody feels there was a lack of transparency. The problem is that if there's a working procedure, to deviate from that for something that is this important. I think we have to keep that in mind.

A. Newman: That's perfectly fair. My assumption was that we didn't want to keep beating the same drum every single time, and that we thought that considering how important it is we assumed everyone would have looked at the documents. But you're right, we could have probably have reminded everyone one more time. On that note, are there any further comments?

J. Lanzafame: *Inaudible* My only real concern is fewer committees with the same amount of work is the same total service burden. Provost's David's point is if we would have the same number of charges with fewer faculty. *inaudible*

A. Newman: Maybe this is the question of how we proceed. Personally, I think if you have fewer committees, it's actually going to be hard to put 15 charges on them. There was a point in 2020 and 2021,

I think there was one committee that got something like 18 charges. There were some terrible numbers. And we've been constantly trying to lower them. But it's true, you can have a smaller number of committees, and then have people just be embarrassed to say here, put 30 charges on them. That's part of the psychology. You can't reasonably expect any Senate body to be unreasonable enough to say, there's five committees, let's give each of them 35 charges. For me personally that would be ridiculous. If we want we could add language that limits the number of charges but I feel like that would be too prescriptive. But some of it is we need to start learning how to trust each other to do the right thing. We need to consider that right now, we have 14 committees that are functional. We have new topics coming up every day where we need more energy. But we're burned out, with the same number of people on these other topics. So it just makes sense to reduce the number, make us more nimble, and allow future Senates to expand.

Agenda Item No. 13: Adjournment; A. Newman (1:48)

H. Ghazle: The weather is beautiful outside and I move to adjourn.

Attendance 4/25/2024

Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended	Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended
Abushagur, Mustafa	KGCOE Senator	Excused	Lanzafame, Joseph	COS Senator/LRPEC Rep	X
Adrion, Amy	ALT CAD Senator		Lapizco-Encinas, Blanca	KGCOE Senator	X
Aldersley, Stephen	Communications Officer/ SOIS Senator	X	Laver, Michael	CLA Senator	X
Anselm, Martin	CET Senator	X	Lee, James	ALT CET Senator	
Bamonto, Suzanne	CLA Senator	X	Liu, Manlu	SCB Senator	Excused
Barone, Keri	Treasurer/CLA Senator	X	Malachowsky, Samuel	Vice Chair/ GCCIS Senator	X
Boedo, Stephen	ALT KGCOE Senator		McCalley, Carmody	ALT COS Senator	
Brady, Kathleen	ALT NTID Senator		McLaren, Amy	CAD Senator	X
Brown, Tamaira	Senate Coordinator		Newman, Atia	Chair/CAD Senator	X
Butler, Janine	NTID Senator	X	Newman, Dina	COS Senator	
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	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	X	Student Government Rep	Alex Shuron	
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	X	Ulin, Robert	CLA Senator	X
Hardin, Jessica	ALT CLA Senator		Van Aardt, Jan	ALT COS Senator	
Hazelwood, David	NTID Senator		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		Zlochower, Yosef	COS Senator	X
Krutz, Daniel	ALT GCCIS Senator				
Kuhl, Michael	KGCOE Senator				

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

Interpreters: Nic Crouse-Dickerson and Jennifer Mura

Presenters: Mary Lynn Reed, Aaron McGowan, Corinna Schlombs and Heidi Nickisher