

Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, September 12, 2024

12:15 - 1:50 PM

Slaughter Hall 2220-2240

Attendance: See Below

Agenda Item No. 1: Welcome/Introductions; A. Newman (12:16)

Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; A. Newman (12:16)

Approved by acclamation

Agenda Item No. 3: Communications Officer's Report/Approval of Minutes; S. Aldersley (12:17)

Approved by acclamation

Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; A. Newman (12:18)

A. Newman: Today is the President's address to the University at 3:00 pm. in Ingle Auditorium. I will be speaking. The standing committee luncheon is next week. Please encourage committee members to RSVP. We are having a Senate retreat in December at the Tait Preserve. This is going to be a senator only event, because we want to discuss the status of shared governance at RIT.

The Executive Committee recently met with the AVP who heads DSO and Chris Licata about concerns with the flex plan. We established that the change was not well communicated to faculty. We came to an agreement that there will be at least one annual meeting with faculty and the DSO where we will have a postmortem on the year and discuss any future implementations and tools. Details to come.

Last week we discussed ABB+, and how it might be implemented. There were many questions and I'd now like to ask the Provost to address some of those.

Provost Presentation (Not on agenda); P. David (12:22)

P. David: I'm sorry I wasn't here last week. I was in San Jose at Adobe headquarters and the upshot of my visit is that Adobe has named us a "creative campus," which means everyone will have access to Adobe Express and a large number of faculty will have access to Adobe creative cloud. The point we made was

RIT wants to be at the cutting edge of generative AI.

Today, I want to talk a little bit about some important things happening on campus. You know the Presidential search is going on. There is very little role for us to play except for the committee. Make sure you submit your nominations and look at the description. You won't hear very much about it because it's a confidential process, which is typical at most universities.

There are two other things in which we can have a big role. One is the Strategic Plan. There is a website to which faculty can submit concept papers and participate in a survey.

I also want to mention the Middle States re-accreditation. One aspect of that concerns general education credit. Please think about this in the weeks to come and work with the committee that's already been empowered to think about it. I'll come back to you with some updates.

Now I'd like to talk about ABB. On this chart you can see degrees granted. Over the last five years, the total number has declined. The number of faculty has remained steady with some loss in TT ranks offset by gains in NTT. In terms of degrees granted, GCCIS has grown dramatically while some of the other colleges have shrunk. GCCIS accounts for 26% of degrees but only 17% of the instructional budget. So we have a fundamental structural problem which is the primary reason for ABB.

In addition to degrees granted another reasonable metric for faculty productivity is credit hours generated. Here GCCIS accounts for just 18% of the total. That's because of courses offered in COS and COLA and other colleges. We have to come up with a standard model that works for the whole university, particularly GCCIS and other severely underfunded colleges. This was handed to me when I first arrived here. We need a transparent resource allocation model so that some additional resources will go to colleges with enrollment growth. These will not all be new resources, some have to come from colleges with enrollment declines. This was the ABB model that was proposed. Two key variables were to drive the process: 1) credit hours generated and 2) degrees conferred. The formula was very simple. A college's allocation would be based on calculation of a standard average cost per credit hour. Likewise, how much does it cost for the university to grant a degree? That becomes a second piece of the allocation. You multiply the two out and come up with a single number. You repeat the process for masters degree programs, so you get an undergrad allocation and a masters degree allocation. The PhD. allocation is not driven by formulas.

B. Thomas: How will you count courses with labs?

P. David: People are going to say 'wait a second, 'how is cost per credit the same for everybody?' It doesn't make sense for a number of reasons. For example, chemistry labs cost a lot of money, compared to say, a computer science lab where students have their own laptops. Another thing is salary. To hire an assistant professor in Finance, for example, it may take an offer of \$160,000 or \$170,000, whereas in Philosophy, it may be \$100,000 less. So cost per student is driven also by faculty salaries, as well as lab costs and other kinds of costs that are specific to different colleges. So that leaves us with a challenge and we have two years to solve it, to come up with coefficients that are different for each college.

R. Zanibbi: The University of Washington was actually the school that RABC looked at for this model originally, and the nice thing about their model is that it has 4 variables. And it's much simpler to have four variables than hundreds of hours of meetings. Does the University of Washington, which did this very effectively, have published materials of how they arrived at a cost per credit hour. I think there may be models that we could take from other places without the need to reinvent the wheel.

P. David: That's the kind of research we need to do. I think you would agree that one coefficient for all colleges wouldn't make sense. But the University of Washington would be a terrific place to start.

H. Ghazle: Point of Order. We have an agenda. Should we continue with this discussion & revise the agenda? What does the floor wish?

M. Laver: – I move that we cut off our provost.

A. Newman: We can continue this discussion in New Business.

E. Williams: The vote depends on if there's going to be more discussion on this or not. This is huge. If there is going to be more opportunity to discuss it, then sure, we can move on. If there's not, then we should continue now.

A. Newman: We can absolutely ask the Provost to come back.

P. David. I am willing to come back as many times as necessary to get this right.

B. Thomas: Can this be on the agenda for the 26th meeting?

Prabu. I'd like a few more chunks of time as well to talk about a few other things.

A. Newman: We will approve Michael's motion by acclamation and continue with our agenda.

Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; Staff Council Representative (12:35)

We've had one full meeting, and we are busy getting our committees put together.

Agenda Item No. 6: Student Government Update; SG Representative (12:36)

Josh: Paw Prints asked Parking & Transportation for the removal of a dangerous tree. Another request to them was to extend buses to Rustic Village. There is an Arts Fair scheduled for First Friday that was charged to the CAD Senator. We have voted on our Housing and Dining chair and the SOIS Senator position is vacant.

Agenda Item No. 7: The Ombuds Office; J. Johnston and A. Meyer (12:37)

The theme of the Ombuds office is: "Never the Wrong Place to go." Our services are available to anyone on campus and we are totally confidential, with the only exception being if there is a potential for harm.

We do not act as an advocate, rather our role is to listen, give options, and try and bring people together. We can also do anonymous fact finding. Participation is voluntary. We report to the president. We identify and report on trends. The number of people who approach us have grown every year for the past eight years. We are available during non-business hours. Any notes we take cannot be part of any RIT formal process and they are shredded once a case is closed.

[Ombuds Office Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 8: Standing Committee Charges; A. Newman (12:45)

A. Newman: We will now continue to consider potential standing committee charges. Senators can see the language in the folder for today's meeting on the drive. At the last meeting, we ended by considering charge #10. Charge #11 is to consider what the appropriate minimum number of tenure committee members ought to be. The rationale is that there are 7 people on a committee, and the policy requires a two-thirds majority in favor. So this is a math problem more than anything.

K. Sweeney: The word 'minimum' is in the policy, so it doesn't matter how many people are actually part of the committee, as long as that minimum threshold has hit. I don't see what relevance this has for us unless we want to change the policy, but that's an entirely different charge than this.

S. Malachowsky: Tenure is a significant event in someone's life and I've seen people personally very frustrated by the ambiguity in that number, so I do think that greater clarity would probably benefit a lot of people.

H. Ghazle: There was a presentation this morning on tenure and promotion. I'd like to see that presentation repeated here at Senate.

A. Newman: #12 is for the FAC and concerns a section of E.8 regarding the process of term adjustments or removal of chairs.

Thomas: I don't know what this charge is about.

A. Newman: This is suggesting there should be a better explanation for what formal consultation with the faculty means while providing some precision to the term 'extraordinary circumstances'. The rationale argues that without clarification and specification of the conditions for a change in the chair's term, there is insufficient limitation on the dean's discretionary powers.

M. Ruhling: Is the question here, the definition of "formal" meeting?

A. Newman: This is simply a question of refining definitions. The question of evaluation is going to come up in the next charge, #13, to implement an annual upwards evaluation of deans and associate deans and possibly also provost and president.

Q. Song: If there is an annual upward evaluation of chairs, I'm not aware of it in the College of Business.

L. McQuiller: Policy E.8 does have provisions for faculty input as well as a comprehensive evaluation of all chairs, but that's every three years. Annual evaluations do occur by the dean and I know some colleges have very specific evaluation processes, for example COLA has a formal evaluation process that's actually led by a committee in the college. But what other colleges are doing in terms of annual evaluation and seeking input from faculty or staff on chair performance, I am not aware of that.

S. Chung: Just to add to Qian's comment about SCB, I'm also not aware of any evaluation process of administrative leadership positions, although I am very aware of the processes for general faculty.

P. David: Every chair gets an annual evaluation from the dean and every dean gets an annual evaluation from the provost. In general what happens is there is a midterm review. For example, after the second year, there will be a review where information is solicited via a Qualtrics survey. Most places don't do an annual Qualtrics survey of their leaders because one year is not enough time. That's the general process, but nothing limits you from expressing concern if your department chair is not doing what they're supposed to do.

S. Malachowsky: I do think this warrants looking at. In GCCIS, we do have an opportunity to provide survey feedback but often there is no looping back from that. Usually what happens is that about six months later, the department chair says, 'here's the results of my survey that you filled out,' when maybe the dean should be doing that. It's unsatisfying because it's literally the chair saying what they need to fix about themselves, or what's good or bad. In other words, it doesn't come full circle from the dean.

E. Williams: I've participated in a five year evaluation of deans for GIS and it's a very involved process. There is a whole committee and surveys and design of questions. It is so labor intensive that in its current form at least, it doesn't lend itself to an annual review.

H. Ghazle: I agree with Eric. Last year, I chaired the committee to evaluate a dean in a different college and it was really a very cumbersome process where you are not only asking for faculty input, you also ask for input from alumni, national councils, students, staff. It's very involved. That's a five-year thing. Coming back to the question of this charge: we do department chair evaluations every three years. The question is, should we be evaluating all of our leaders on an annual basis?

R. Olson: Two observations: It's my understanding that according to existing policy, the results of the upward surveys do not have to be relayed. Second, there's no reason the sort of labor intensive five-year review process for administration would have to be the same as an annual evaluation.

R. Zanibbi: Do these 5-year evaluations of deans involve associate deans or is it strictly the dean?

H. Ghazle: Yes, they do.

R. Zanibbi: So the rationale is incorrect.

J. Capps: It would be a good idea to see what other colleges do. As Laverne mentioned, in COLA we have an annual assessment that looks at things like facilities and computer support, etc. But it also includes sections on the dean and the associate deans in terms of things that they're doing well and things that they could do better. I think it's of some use and it doesn't seem to be overly burdensome and the results are shared college wide.

C. Kray: Just piggybacking on what John said. We have a template loaded in Qualtrics, so we're able to

reuse it every year and we always give faculty the opportunity to tweak the questions if they want to do that. One thing that has frustrated me about that survey is that the results are shared within the college only and they don't go up to the provost. And it seems to me like that might be helpful.

S. Chung: Are there standard evaluation criteria used in these policies? I would think they should be different depending on the college.

H. Ghazle: The evaluation of deans is a summative evaluation and follows a standard process. The committee doesn't give an opinion, it's role is simply fact-finding.

M. Laver: I'd like to suggest we have a 10 minute rule in Senate for talking about charges. Our role is not to discuss the issue raised in a charge. We're discussing whether to give it to a committee to discuss the issue.

A. Newma: Moving on to #14, the reason why we're bringing this back is because we already have a committee talking about academic dishonesty and the role AI plays. This is more to add a supportive element, particularly because there is a similar charge about online cheating. So this charge is going to help us figure out proposed guidelines for the amount and type of coursework that can come from sources vulnerable to AI cheating. It feels a little bit more directed. The previous charge was very much based on finding out what AI cheating looks like.

S. Malachowsky: One of the biggest dangers here is a false positive. I have personally witnessed situations where students were accused of AI-based cheating and I didn't see enough evidence to indicate either direction. It's part of the reason why I didn't like the AI detector that was built into the turn-it-in system. I knew that thing was broken from the beginning. I think we need to talk also about burden of proof or at least have some guidelines in terms of accusing somebody of using a tool, that even the people that invented the tool don't understand exactly how it works.

R.Olsen: Another element when we think about AI cheating detection that I want to raise is in relation to something that was proposed sometime last academic year by the DSO. There was a discussion of using video monitoring software which is also notorious for false positives. It's probably something that if we're going to investigate that, we should also probably loop that into the discussion.

Frank D: We just talked about this on the University Writing Committee. Going after people is a real concern. A lot of work needs to be done on re-designing assignments. One of the things I've done when I suspect plagiarism is I ask the student about the meaning of the elements in the script that they've supposedly written.

E. Williams: This seems like a really important issue. Maybe it needs its own committee.

A. Newman: I think we can ask Chris Collison, the new director of the AI Task Force, to come and present to Senate, but let's finish the last three charges and then turn the floor back over to the Provost. #15 asks Senate to think about developing an AI Bill of Rights for faculty as other universities have done, to ensure that faculty bodies have input into institutional decisions about purchasing and

implementation of any automated and or generative system that affects the educational mission. I agree. I think faculty should be protected from abuse of data practices, and student rights need to be respected too. We have to figure out how and when we can use AI and avoid pressuring educators into adopting new systems. That means developing a process to prevent chairs from rewarding someone for using AI and punishing someone for not doing so. We need to remember that there's got to be room for both in the educational system. The Executive Committee is interested in the concept of creating a standing committee that specifically deals with AI issues.

#16 calls for the identification of a set of courses associated with the creation of a new minor in AI allowing for a stem track and a non stem track. The rationale is that an AI minor will give students a grounding in fundamental concepts within AI machine learning approaches and systems.

17 calls for the creation of a generative AI policy for RIT and an update to the code of conduct for students in alignment with this policy.

R.Zanibbi: Regarding the minor in AI, I think this was mentioned in the last Senate meeting. My understanding is Senate's role regarding curriculum is approval and vetting and not creation. I'm in Computer Science and we do some AI and we're not entirely sure what that would look like or why it's being proposed.

N.Eddingsaas: I agree. Chris Collison is the one who should be putting together the curriculum or having someone within his committee do so.

I. Puchades: EE has a major on AI machine learning. We're already doing this across the campus. Students should be guided towards those classes that are already being offered.

P. David: These are all important topics. Why don't we bracket all the AI-related items for a substantive discussion. The Senate would absolutely be involved. There are a lot of experts on the faculty, but we also need administrators. I'm currently working with Joan Graham and others to create an AI Council, technical folks, people with an ethics background, people with industry experience, students, faculty, and HR representatives. Once that body is in place, we can tackle some of these issues. Also, the Center for Teaching and Learning could actually take on some of the plagiarism topics as well.

R. Zanibbi: What policies do we have that govern the use, selection and data collection of course materials for instructors? I feel like some of the points raised earlier about ownership and surveilling of faculty materials already exists in a different form. We're not actually talking about a totally radical change here. There may be policies that these already fit under.

A. Newman: We have a number of relevant policies: a code of conduct; information security policy; a code of conduct for computer use which would come into play; a privacy policy. We also have the policy on records management, which was brought to us by the Office of Legal Affairs, wanting us to change its status from being a shared governance policy to an exclusively administrative policy. The Senate last year didn't vote on that and the Office of Legal Affairs wants to bring it back. The question for us is do we want to keep something within the shared governance sphere or allow it to be moved into the administrative space? I think it might be a good thing for Senators to think similarly about AI-related policy in the context of governance policies.

E. Williams: I'm having a hard time understanding what the issues are regarding the AI Bill of Rights. Is our faculty being made to use an AI tool? I don't know. I know I want my data to be private, but I don't know that AI is changing RIT's perspective on releasing my data. I think some more discussion at this point would help me and maybe some other people understand what's at stake here.

A. Newman: I think the question is whenever you're looking at a new technology, you want to create the safeguards before the abuse happens.

R. Olsen. I can answer Eric's question with two very specific examples. First I use AI in some of my programming classes. I decided to do so as an instructional design tool so that I don't really have to worry about AI cheating, just let students use it and then design activities around that. And I've had a number of students approach me saying they don't want to use AI because they consider it unethical. So that is a reasonable thing that needs to be addressed. Also Charge #15 has something that relates to evaluating faculty on their use or otherwise of AI. To give a concrete example of that, I have seen entire department meetings on how to use and why you should be using AI.

I. Puchades: Faculty in KGCOE proposed a couple of charges that I haven't seen in the list. One relates to having HR publish how they do their benchmarking related to salaries. And the second one is whether there should be a formal appeal process when there is disagreement on salary. I think there is already an informal process, but we're suggesting here that should be more formalized.

H. Ghazle. My recommendation is that you send those proposed charges to the Executive Committee and say you would like them to be added for Senate consideration.

I. Puchades: I can do that. From a previous discussion there was the idea of having an overarching charge looking at salary.

[Standing Committee Charges](#)

Agenda Item No. 9: New Business; A. Newman (1:05)

P. David: So what comes under ABB? What does it account for? It accounts for the recurring operational budget within Academic Affairs. It does not include such things as discretionary money, overhead from grants, first year PhD stipends or lab fees. Where I've settled on is to limit this mainly to salaries of faculty. The devil is always in the details and this is where things are going to get tricky. There are two colleges that deserve attention. One is GCCIS where there must be a rapid ramp up of resources. The other college that is not mentioned here that is also in a fair amount of trouble is CHST. Their problem is that when they were stood up, plenty of promises were made for faculty lines, but all of that is running out of a soft account. So we have a responsibility to move resources to that college. We don't have any over-resourced colleges, but we do have two severely under-resourced colleges. CHST is a different conversation. For GCCIS, based on the formula, this is what you see. So rapid ramp up. But as you rapidly ramp up, you can't cut budgets elsewhere. So the ramp down in the other colleges has to be gradual and that's the challenge that central administration has been managing. Even during COVID, we didn't let go of faculty. So the point here, you will see budget reductions, but please don't interpret that as elimination of positions. That is not what is going to happen, but somehow we have to magically get to this ramp up and a budget reduction for some colleges. Here is the plan on how we will go about doing that. I have been telling folks, including the executive committee, that parts of ABB have been

implemented. Not all of it. Instead of ABB, I think what we need is an ABB+ or hybrid ABB that will have three components. What we have to start with is GCCIS has to get incremental resources as quickly as possible. Over the last two cycles, any new money that came into Academic Affairs went to GCCIS. But we still have a long way to go. By the way, the Provost's Office is nothing but a pass through operation. Everything we get is allocated to the colleges and the deans. All the money goes out, which means we have no money for any sort of risks or strategic initiatives. When they proposed the ABB budget the technical working group said there has to be some money that comes to the provost. So the second component beginning in the fall of 2025, I'm asking all colleges to give back 1% of their budget to the Provost's Office, and then, during the budget process, from that 1%, they can ask for resources for various projects. That is one way of doing a little bit of strategic reallocation. We still have two years of the hold harmless period, meaning that adjustments under the ABB formula will begin in the fall of 2026. Here's the timeline. The risk and strategic 1% withhold starting in FY 26, the ABB formula in FY 27 and I'm hoping to get to a reasonable equilibrium by AY32.

So what can colleges do? Increase credit hour production by recruiting students. That requires marketing dollars, I understand, but that's something colleges can do. Creating efficiencies, for example by sunseting programs. We have 72 graduate programs, only about 12 of which actually have double digit students. So we have a lot of inefficiency and there's a lot of good work that we can do by integrating programs and pulling them together. I know getting rid of anything is hard and I don't want to be the one driving it from top down. I appreciate ideas that come from the departments and the colleges. Finally, colleges can develop competitive ideas to receive a bigger share of the budget. If everybody's contributing 1%, everyone's not going to get the same 1% back. Some may get 1.5, others may get 0.5. So compete, come up with clever ideas to get as much of that back.

M. Ruhling. The emergency in GCCIS seems to be driving the conversation. The only kind of metrics we saw was student credit hours generated in GCCIS. I'd be interested in seeing the same metrics for the other colleges. Finally, would RIT consider early retirement buyout as a possibility?

PD: I want to say yes, but I'd need to consult with HR.

M.Eddingsaas: I didn't see these slides in the shared drive. Secondly, GCCIS has been brought up a number of times. I happen to be in a department that's growing like crazy, but within the college there may be a department that is more severely underfunded than others. I'm assuming there'll be some consideration for that as well?

P. David: Absolutely. I apologize to our GCCIS colleagues for talking about you so much, but in general your college is the one that's driving this. That's where the biggest money has to go. But where it comes from, there's a lot of other ways to think about and there are departments that are growing in other colleges as well so we need to find the right balance. That's why I don't want this to be just a formula.

I.Puchades: I'd like to speak for the smaller programs that maybe are not growing right now. And as a case in point, we have a semiconductor engineering program which a few years ago had only two to three students. According to this model it could have been shut down, but now we're growing at a certain rate. I'm worried that we do have a lot of very niche programs that may not be growing, may not yet be popular at the time. It doesn't depend on the faculty, it depends on how RIT markets all these programs. Many times faculty have no say on how programs are being advertised. We've got to keep that in mind as

we're going through this change in budget allocation.

P. David: As you know there is a \$15 million marketing budget. I've argued we should allocate some of that for master's programs which actually do make money. These are good programs. We want to nurture them, particularly professional programs. The point here is not to just get rid of programs but to think through their strategic importance. This is the rule that I've given the deans and in general what I'd like to see happen on campus. Every master's program should have at least five years to get to a point where it can recruit at least 50 students or an average of ten per year. That to me shows that the program is viable. If you're not able to do that, then your program will be placed on notice. That doesn't mean we shut it down or deactivate it. It means that a greater effort has to be made in terms of marketing. Of course, you make students promises in the first year. You have to keep that program open for six to seven years to keep your promise. That's problematic.

R. Zanibbi: I want to ask about the overall structure of the funding here. Last year Senate had a discussion about why the percentage of revenue allocated to Academic Affairs was lower than what it had been pre COVID and possibly relative to other schools. One way to increase available resources might be to simply increase the allocation to Academic Affairs. For example, as part of that, instead of asking the colleges to return 1% to the Provost's Office, actually have Central give the Provost's Office discretionary funds. This seems to me like a saner operating procedure than your office having to tax colleges which seems to make the budgeting very complicated to me.

P. David: That is very true. There are two aspects to this. They have given us a bigger allocation this year than last year. I don't know about the total percentage allocation, but what we received last year was less. So I've been making those arguments and instead of taking an adversarial role, my goal here is to argue that Academic Affairs get the lion's share of the total operating budget. That's what we're here for. So I'll continue to make those arguments and perhaps we can have Dr. Watters come here and say what other universities are doing and ask him for his thoughts. As to the 1%, I want to make sure that the money is not going to stay with the provost, my goal would be that it gets redistributed back to the colleges.

R. Zanibbi: I understand that. I'm just saying the mechanism itself feels a little odd to me.

P. David: This is to force people and make them uncomfortable. No one wants to let go of anything.

S. Johnson: I don't think there's any shortage of discomfort.

B. Thomas: I'm happy with the way you showed the analysis for GCCIS. Do you have the same analysis for all the colleges?

P. David: The deans have the data, let me check with them. There are seven or eight more slides covering credit hours and other things.

B. Thomas: Will you be willing to share it with us? Because if we are presenting to our constituents, we would like to be able to present the data for all the colleges.

P. Padmanabhan: I think you talked a little bit about addressing labs and variations in salaries and you said you would come back to that, and, as a follow up, what is the current model and is there anything

from the current model that we can incorporate in this?

P. David: The current model doesn't have any of that kind of thinking. It's just an historical allocation. With the new one, we're going to have to learn from our peers, but also we may have to do a little bit of invention on our own. As for lab allocations, they are immune from this 1%.

S. Malachowsky: My question relates to this slide specifically. Colleges have agency. In GCCIS, it's felt like a forced growth mode over the last 10 years or so. In many cases we had targeted numbers that we were looking to receive and those numbers were, I'm not going to say ignored, but the number that we got was not correlated with the number we wanted. We wanted to slow down the growth because of a lack of resources. It seems to me that there could also be the opposite problem where you want to grow, but there's a disconnect between the students we're sent from Admissions versus the ambitions and thoughts and hopes and dreams of the individual programs.

P. David: This is a complex problem. Say a program like Cybersecurity says we can take 100 students but 130 students want to get into the program. If the overall university doesn't have the enrollment and we don't take them, it's going to come back to haunt all of us. So GCCIS has really carried the university, and I'm sensitive to that, but we don't have the luxury of turning students away because the budget is so tight.

E. Williams: So the 1% per year, that's a temporary deal. The big action's going to come when ABB comes properly into effect, I imagine it's going to involve some serious re-distribution of resources. And so departments are going to be faced with either cutting programs and faculty, or growing the program as you suggested. But faculty are not marketers. And as I understand RIT's marketing it hasn't really been focused on degree level. It's really been about marketing RIT as an institution. So I'm wondering with the switch to ABB, is there going to be a serious restructuring of the way that marketing dollars are spent?

S. Aldersley: I'd like to pick up on Richard's point about the proportion of the total institutional budget that goes to Academic Affairs. We have a strategic plan coming up now. I'd like to see an element of that plan specify that a certain proportion of the budget go to Academic Affairs. So it's been hovering around 59-62%. I'd like to see the strategic plan designate at least 65% of the operating budget of the university for Academic Affairs. I think that would make a significant difference.

A. Newman: I think we should aim for 70%. Without Academic Affairs, RIT is not RIT.

R. Olson: Since the provost mentioned our program, to give you some idea about the numbers, we were at about 90 admits in 2020, about 130 in 2021, and then about 155 in 2022. I do have a technical question. When this slide says credit hour production, is that the number of credit hours offered or is that the number of credit hours consumed by students?

P. David: Consumed by students.

Q. Song: Some colleges have labs or PhD programs, some have large classes, smaller classes, some have more lecturers than tenured faculty. So I see many differences there. There are many factors involved. It seems some colleges could be at a disadvantage, especially if they have smaller classes or less students,

but high operational costs. I'm wondering if you're going to form a team to consider all the different factors?

P. David: We're not going to form a team, but we will analyze what would be the appropriate coefficient for these colleges.

S. Johnson: Has the provost office considered duplicative courses? I mean the math department teaches a discrete math course for computer science students. What's stopping the computer science department from creating their own version of that and stealing the resources from Math?

P. David: Curriculum committees are going to have to ensure some checks and balances are there to moderate that problem.

R. Zanibbi: I really appreciate the discussion. We've been waiting a long time to hear about this. Just two quick things regarding the word 'competitive'. Competitive has been held out as an opportunity for optimization in the institution for years. But I think when we're talking about allocating for programs as a whole, we actually need to operate as a team. I think that in terms of getting Senate to help the administration make this work, it'll be a lot more helpful if we take a more global view. And if we remember that ABB was always designed with contingencies to support small programs, and I want to make sure that's stated explicitly in the record of our conversation today.

P. David: Thank you so much. I'll be back. I have a big presentation on compensation with a slide deck that I can share with you.

S. Aldersley: Senators may have noticed that in the faculty senate newsletter that went out, there was a paragraph on benchmarking. That paragraph was based on a spreadsheet that the executive committee developed. Just to let you know that spreadsheet is now available to senators and to whomever you want to show it to. It's in the repeating documents folder in the faculty senate drive. So I invite you to take a look at it. It's a multi-year comparison at the 50 percentile of the benchmark for all colleges, all programs and all ranks. Pretty interesting data.

Agenda Item No. 10: Adjournment; A. Newman (1:43)

Attendance 9/12/2024

Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended	Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended
Adrion, Amy	ALT CAD Senator		Lanzafame, Joseph	COS Senator	X
Aldersley, Stephen	Communications Officer/ SOIS Senator	X	Lapizco-Encinas, Blanca	KGCOE Senator	X
Anselm, Martin	CET Senator	X	Laver, Michael	CLA Senator	X
Barone, Keri	Treasurer/CLA Senator	X	Lee, James	ALT CET Senator	
Beck, Makini	ALT SOIS Senator	X	Malachowsky, Samuel	Treasurer/ GCCIS Senator	X
Boedo, Stephen	ALT KGCOE Senator		McCalley, Carmody	ALT COS Senator	
Brady, Kathleen	ALT NTID Senator	X	McLaren, Amy	CAD Senator	
Brown, Tamaira	Senate Coordinator	X	Newman, Atia	Chair/CAD Senator	X
Capps, John	CLA Senator	X	Newman, Christian	GCCIS Senator	X
Chiavaroli, Julius	ALT GIS Senator		Olles, Deana	COS Senator	X
Chung, Sorim	SCB Senator	X	Olson, Rob	ALT GCCIS Senator	X
Cody, Jeremy	COS Senator	X	O'Neil, Jennifer	ALT CET Senator	
Coppenbarger, Matthew	COS Senator	X	Osgood, Robert	ALT CHST Senator	
Crawford, Denton	CAD Senator		Padmanabhan, Poornima	KGCOE Senator	X
Cromer, Michael	ALT COS Senator		Puchades, Ivan	KGCOE Senator	X
Cui, Feng	ALT COS Senator		Ray, Amit	CLA Senator	X
David, Prabu	Provost	X	Reinicke, Bryan	ALT SCB Senator	
Davis, Stacey	NTID Senator	X	Ross, Annemarie	NTID Senator	X
Deese, Franklin	CAD Senator	X	Ruhling, Michael	CLA Senator	X
Dell, Betsy	CET Senator	X	Sanders, Cynthia	ALT NTID Senator	
DiRisio, Keli	CAD Senator		Shaaban, Muhammad	ALT KGCOE Senator	
Eddingsaas, Nathan	COS Senator	X	Song, Qian	SCB Senator	X
Fillip, Carol	ALT CAD Senator		Staff Council Rep	Ross Hisert	X
Ghazle, Hamad	Operations Officer/CHST Senator	X	Student Government Rep	Josh Anderson	X
Ghoneim, Hany	ALT KGCOE Senator		Sweeney, Kevin	ALT SCB Senator	X
Hardin, Jessica	ALT CLA Senator		Thomas, Bolaji	CHST Senator	X
Hartpence, Bruce	ALT GCCIS Senator		Tobin, Karen	NTID Senator	X
Hazelwood, David	NTID Senator	X	Tsouri, Gill	KGCOE Senator	X

Jadamba, Basca	COS Senator	X	Van Aardt, Jan	ALT COS Senator	
Johnson, Dan	CET Senator	X	Warp, Melissa	ALT CAD Senator	
Johnson, Scott	GCCIS Senator	X	White, Phil	ALT GCCIS Senator	
Kavin, Denise	ALT NTID Senator		Williams, Eric	GIS Senator	X
Kray, Christine	CLA Senator	X	Worrell, Tracy	ALT CLA Senator	
Krutz, Daniel	ALT GCCIS Senator		Zanibbi, Richard	GCCIS Senator	X
Kuhl, Michael	KGCOE Senator	X	Zlochower, Yosef	COS Senator	X

Interpreters: Nicole Crouse-Dickerson and Jennaca Saeva

Student Assistant: Nilay Vaidya

Presenters: Prabu David, Joe Johnston and Ashley Meyer