

Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, September 5, 2024

12:15 - 1:50 PM

Slaughter Hall 2220-2240

Attendance: See Below

Agenda Item No. 1: Approval of Agenda; A. Newman (12:15)

The agenda was approved by acclamation

Agenda Item No. 2: Communications Officer's Report/Approval of Minutes; S. Aldersley (12:16)

The draft minutes of the meeting of August 29th were approved without change and by acclamation.

Agenda Item No. 3: Executive Committee Report; A. Newman (TIME)

A. Newman welcomed Senators back to the new academic year. For the first time the Executive Committee was given a small stipend for working on its various responsibilities over the summer. She noted that the luncheon for Standing Committee members has been scheduled for September 19<sup>th</sup>. The RIT Board of Trustees meeting on June 19-20<sup>th</sup> included segments on the success of RIT athletic teams and a discussion of new ways to enhance the student experience. There are currently approximately 90 facilities projects running, including classroom upgrades and dorm renovations. In a meeting with the Executive Committee, Dr. Watters recognized the need to create a streamlined method of maintaining facilities that will allow faculty and staff to request support more easily. We also learned that RIT is anticipating being somewhat below the FTE enrollment goal. Ryne Rafaelle confirmed during convocation that RIT has officially hit the long-standing goal of \$100M in research funding. The provost has introduced a revised budgeting model within Academic Affairs dubbed "ABB plus." The general push is for finding efficiencies, particularly by sunseting duplicative programs. The provost has identified compensation, workload and tenure & promotion clarity as some of his main priorities. For our part, we are going to put forward recommendations for "high-demand" service obligations that should be noted by Deans and Chairs when measuring faculty effort.

The Strategic Planning process began earlier in the summer. As a member of the committee, I will be amplifying surveys and would like to hear anything you feel I should bring up in the committee. group. Please make sure to encourage your constituents to take the survey that has recently been sent out. Senators can find the report on the outcome of the previous strategic plan in the drive in the 24/25 folder.

B. Thomas: Did you say the provost is implementing an ABB model? As a unilateral decision. Is it the

version that Ellen suggested?

A. Newman: From what I understand, he established a group to review and discuss the report of last year's technical working group (TWG) that was working with Ellen, and they proposed a gentler version of what the TWG called "ABB-Lite." It's been named ABB+ and there will be some reallocations among the colleges. He will also be asking the colleges to give back 1% of their budgets for a strategic spending pool.

B. Thomas: Shouldn't Senate have a say if this is going through?

J. Capps: Can we find out what ABB+ looks like? Has it been shared with the Deans?

L. McQuiller: It has not come before the deans. It's been mentioned but not yet implemented.

A. Newman: We will invite Provost to come and present on ABB

J. Lanzafame: Our dean did announce it at our opening meeting. If you recall when Ellen was leaving she didn't want to announce it but I thought it was a done deal back then.

A. Newman: It sounds like it's not yet in full implementation mode.

Agenda Item No. 4: Staff Council Update; Staff Council Representative (12:28)

No representative of Staff Council present

Agenda Item No. 5: Student Government, Joshua Anderson (12:28)

No agenda items as of the last meeting of SG.

Agenda Item No. 6: RIT Foodshare Presentation; S. Ogof and B. St. Jean (12:29)

Foodshare was started nine years ago by an informal group in the COLA Department of Communication with the goal of reducing food waste on campus. The program has since expanded within the Center for Leadership and Civic Engagement to include food insecurity within the RIT population. The program seeks to create a culture of sharing and food waste reduction and meet some of the basic needs of community members for food and clothing. It's a very lofty goal. In 2018, the program incorporated Bern's Closet, which was started as a pop-up event by Bernadette Lynch and now offers clothing for community members, for example for Career Fair. Our primary location is at Riverknoll and we now have a second location in Ellingson Hall. We are a no-questions asked resource for students, staff and faculty at RIT. We depend on donations like food drives on campus, partnerships with RIT offices and student clubs and units who volunteer to sponsor, for example, a pasta shelf. We work with Dining

Services to implement ways to reduce food waste. We're always looking for more sources of support and we're presenting today to ask that you help spread the word. We operate six days a week and have from 40-50 users/day.

C. Kray: Do you have a flyer to share with us for my office door?

I. Puchades: I have heard from some minority students that using a food share organization carries some stigma. Maybe RIT should work to reduce prices in our dining facilities.

B. St. Jean: We've worked really hard to try and combat the stigma by making both locations community spaces, comfortable places where you can stop in and get a cup of coffee.

S. Ogof: We also hold different events so that we're visible on campus as more than just a food pantry. We do understand the stigma issue and we're always thinking about how to combat it.

S. Johnson: Is it possible for you to set up some kind of delivery system through on-line orders? That might eliminate some of the stigma. Logistics? Would we be something that would combat stigma.

B. St. Jean: We've heard that idea before. Maybe as we grow - it's all about capacity-building

[RIT Foodshare Presentation](#)

#### Agenda Item No.7: Senate At Large Position Nominations/Elections; H. Ghazle (12:44)

H. Ghazle presented a list of still-to-be-filled slots on various committees.

Senator ?: Is there a place where I can go and see what these committees are responsible for?

A. Newman: Yes. The Academic Charter (B.2) gives that information.

S. Johnson: Can we get an idea when committees meet?

A. Newman: I have asked the committees to convene and elect their chairs but haven't heard back from them all yet. A quick reminder that at-large reps don't have to be senators, so please consider asking your colleagues to volunteer. However, we do need two Senators to step up as volunteers to attend Staff Council and Student Government.

#### Agenda Item No.8: Standing Committee Charges; A. Newman (12:50)

A. Newman: You can find this document in the 9/5 meeting folder under the title 'New Charges for Academic Year 24/25'. As you know, at the end of May, we send out a survey inviting faculty to submit

charges for the new academic year and it stays open until the 1st of September. The first year I was on the Executive Committee, we received something like 250 proposed charges. It's not been much different since then, until this year when we got less than a hundred submissions. We're interpreting that as a positive thing and indicative of faculty being more satisfied than in the recent past. After combining related charges, we have whittled down the number to 17 which we've put into three separate groups: a general group, with all sorts of topics; an employment and evaluation group and an AI-related group. The reduction to 17 is partly due to the fact that a lot of the proposed charges applied to individual colleges rather than the University as a whole and a lot of others are already being worked on from last year. Note that we have not yet assigned them to any particular committee, but I'm happy to report that it looks like our standing committees will have less work to do this year, that is, unless they have a lot of hold-over charges from last year. What you will see in the folder is the original language as proposed. And again, we are not voting on whether to accept these charges at this meeting.

The first charge in the general group has to do with examining models of pay equity across units in relation to time and rank. The rationale says the recent RABC report was alarming, particularly for faculty in service colleges, who may earn as much at tenure and full professor as assistant professors at the beginning of their careers at RIT in other colleges. This ties in with the recent conversation about benchmarking and I'm curious to hear what our senators think of this as a potential charge.

J. Lanzafame: The fundamental policy statement that compensation should be based on years of service and performance I think you'll find runs counter to almost every other institution in the country. For example, medical school professors are always getting paid more. Compensation is based on replacement costs for the faculty, not performance and service.

E. Williams: What is this process about? In my experience, a charge may be edited but it is rarely rejected. We look at factors like is the committee super busy? Is the problem important? Is it something the committee can do anything about? One perspective is – someone is concerned enough about this that we should give it to a committee and let them work it out. I'm not saying what perspective to take, I'm just raising the question.

S. Malachowsky: I think that probably the most significant part of this charge is investigating how other institutions handle this but I agree with the general sentiment that it's a wicked problem in many ways.

I. Puchades: I believe there were a few more suggested charges related to compensation. Are we going to roll them all together, or are they going to be discussed separately?

A. Newman: We received 20 or 25 more proposed charges along these lines, some of which were very harshly worded. Certainly, pay equity, and how compensation is managed, are very much at the top of everyone's mind. RABC has been working on closely related charges for the past couple of years. I don't know whether this is going to go anywhere but there is surely value in having more information. The more information we have, the better we can advocate for faculty. It doesn't mean we will be successful but if we can write a policy that threads the needle, we might be able to have some success in this area. In any case, it's worth a conversation. But Eric's point is well-taken. It may or not be a waste of RABC's time to work on this charge.

I. Puchades: My suggestion would be to create an overarching charge. COACHE indicated compensation is a major dissatisfaction. Whether this is the final language, or we amend it, I think it's worth the effort. The provost just sent out an e-mail saying they've looked at benchmarking and some people are being paid lower. That didn't seem right to me.

A. Newman: The second one is to 'adopt a university-wide research policy to establish standards for evaluating research that meet university criteria rather than college level criteria. This includes writing grants, publishing, interdisciplinary work with faculty in other colleges, and publishing in cross-disciplinary journals, such as *Nature*.' The rationale states that 'faculty in some colleges are rewarded with positive evaluations for achieving these things, but in other colleges, they are not. Many research standards are best left to the discipline and the faculty publishing in it. But for University research priorities like these, University level guidance would help faculty pursue them and help administrators evaluate them.'

E. Williams: Is this true? Can someone provide evidence that it's a problem in some colleges?

A. Newman: Does anyone have any anecdotal evidence?

B. Thomas: What are we calling inter-disciplinary research? If you're working with somebody in a different college, does that get evaluated? I don't think so.

Martin A: I know the criteria are written differently in KGCOE and CET and evaluated in different ways. Establishing a university-wide policy is going to be very challenging. The fact that the journal *Nature*, which is one of the most difficult journals to get published in, is used as an example here is problematic. Any such policy would have to be framed in such a general way. I think there needs to be a top-down approach to make sure the deans are all on the same page and communicating clearly with their faculty.

B. Dell: I've spoken with faculty in different colleges. If they're doing research that pertains to DEI, or education research it's not always valued and those are areas that very much benefit from an interdisciplinary approach.

P. Padmanabhan: SCB is very prescriptive about what counts for tenure and what doesn't. Their criteria would automatically exclude a lot of interdisciplinary journals.

S. Malachowsky: We heard about this from a couple of different colleges during our college visits last year. I think part of the issue was the Provost had asked the Deans to give him their tenure and promotion policies and I think some of them saw that as an opportunity to re-write policy in this area. It is prescriptive, but there's also the problem of who's writing it? Who's in charge of it? How many different variations do you have within your school? So it's easier in some schools than others. But when it comes to day to day advice as to what you should be pursuing toward promotion, that's problematic.

K. Sweeney: You asked for anecdotal evidence. My interdisciplinary research was considered and ultimately helped me get tenure here. That was a discussion that we had before I was hired here. In my understanding, it may not necessarily carry the full weight of the business journals, but it may be a

discussion individuals need to have with their department chairs, but I can understand arguments for both sides on that. But it definitely wasn't uncouneted in my case.

C. Kray: I can say that in COLA, we don't require interdisciplinary work per se. It's encouraged, but it's not required for a tenure or annual review. And I would just suggest that there's really important work to be done in disciplines, too, and I would hate for that to be pushed aside just to make room for interdisciplinarity.

Hamad: We do have a policy at RIT regarding interdisciplinary research in centers. It's D1.8. It might be a good idea to look at that to see if there's anything there that relates to this proposed charge.

A. Newman: Our next potential charge pertains to emeritus faculty. Senate is asked to "explore creating a policy for emeritus faculty that includes recording who they are and giving them the opportunity to stay engaged with the scholarly life of the University. There's a recommendation for benchmarking these similar organizations at other universities, interviewing emeritus faculty, etc."

The rationale is that right now when you retire at RIT, some faculty are announced as emeritus then promptly forgotten about. The core concept is that we should maintain some sort of record of our emeritus faculty and find a way to keep them part of university life and maybe leverage their knowledge which would otherwise be lost.

B. Thomas: Is this really a charge?

J. Capps: Wouldn't this be something that Deans or the President's office would be better suited to investigate?

A. Newman: I agree. Again, we're bringing the proposed charges up differently from the way the process has run before, because we want to make transparent some of the logic and the rationale behind them.

T. Worrell: I know there have been a lot of requests from directors, chairs, and deans to do something just as simple as getting emeritus faculty on RIT's website. Some of them are very well known. They're doing wonderful things and we'd like people to know they're affiliated with us. But so far nothing's been done.

J. Lanzafame: FYI, there is an emeritus faculty policy, E6.1 which does make this the purview of Senate.

A. Adrian: In general, I think RIT is not particularly robust in the way we share our legacy. There are faculty recently retired in our department, and I wasn't even aware of the accolades they had that are really quite astonishing. So whether it lands in Senate or some other body, I do think it would be a huge benefit to have these people listed somewhere. Just for current students and faculty and prospective students to see who they are.

A. Newman: Agreed. Maybe this should have more of an administrative focus, but we could still revisit E6.1. We can come back to it. At this point, I'd like to request that Senators make sure to discuss these potential charges with your constituents to see whether there's an interest in these matters. If they want to add additional input, they're welcome to do so, because that will help us make these charges more

impactful.

The next charge concerns incomplete grades in Policy D05. This is exactly how it was written. And incidentally, the Charter includes a statement that says the Executive Committee cannot rewrite anybody's actual words. We have to put up the proposed language before we can edit anything. This policy, which still includes reference to intersession, is a little out of date, and apparently there is an epidemic of requests for incompletes.

S. Johnson: The policy is out of date so we need to work on this.

S. Malachowsky: This may be a question for Tamaira. I hope I don't put you on the spot but when was the last time this policy was reviewed?

A. Newman: We will probably have to assign the task of going through policies that need to be reviewed on the 5-year cycle to one committee. Oftentimes policies are reviewed only in part for specific reasons instead of being looked at as a whole and made internally consistent. For example, E6 is one of those policies which has been edited piecemeal and it's become almost like a jigsaw puzzle. I think the Senate is fast coming to a point where we're going to have to start really reexamining our policies as a whole. Charge #5 reads: "Survey RIT colleges to determine current practices to compensate faculty and staff who assist study abroad programs Then develop best practices to be applied consistently across the university."

I think this goes to the Global Education Committee. We're talking a lot about study abroad programs nowadays and there isn't a very clear framework for how they're managed. I'm not going to read the rationale but there's an example in there from CET where the assistant for one CET faculty-led study program is being compensated while an assistant in a second program is not, which is obviously a concern and points to the fact that things are not being managed evenly across the university.

B. Dell: There is not consistent practice in compensating directors either.

I. Puchades: Are these study abroad programs set up so there's a budget, and then people who want to participate can choose whether or not to participate?

B. Dell: There is a Phase One and a Phase Two proposal, but faculty may not be aware and if you don't know what is typical you may not ask for summer support. Having a policy or benchmark practices could help faculty negotiate what is fair.

B. Thomas: If the study abroad program is a funded study abroad program can faculty ask for additional compensation from the college.

B. Dell: *Inaudible*

M. Anselm: What they're pointing out in this charge is that in one study abroad program one person got paid and the other one was not. So within one college there seems to be no clear definition about this. It's not something that typically the global office gets involved in. It's something you need to negotiate and discuss with your department. If they're trying to incentivize professors to do these things so that

students get these opportunities, it may not be enough if you're spending two weeks in Germany, for example. It's a lot of work and a lot of stress. There should be some standard practices for compensation.

A. Newman: #6 reads: "RIT needs to actively recruit among the growing Latin American population in the US." I thought this would be something for the DEIC to explore this year as a potential charge.

N. Eddingsaas. – I don't see this as a charge. Recruitment is not in faculty purview especially at the undergraduate level. It's a black box. How can Faculty Senate be involved?

A. Newman: #7 reads: "Investigate the reduction of autonomy on RIT computers. It seems we can do nothing without administrator passwords." The rationale argues this is a reduction in faculty autonomy.

E. Williams: I've had some discussion with IT about this, and they said: 'It's our decision. Removing administrative access improves the security of RIT computers. So we get to do this.' So any decision on our side would have to be really strong. I tried to argue that there are student computers also on the network doing the same thing but they simply said, they're responsible for managing the risk. So from a legal perspective, there's a big distinction there.

*Most of the lengthy discussion that followed was inaudible on the recording.*

A. Newman: #8 reads, "Explore whether the faculty as a body want to just pursue interdisciplinary collaboration on sustainability or other issues. Consider implementing a multi-college first year curriculum on sustainability that would feed into multiple majors across colleges."

J. Capps: I'm not sure this falls under the Senate's purview.

A. Newman: Faculty own curriculum.

J. Capps: We approve curriculum.

H. Ghazle: Senate does have the ICC. In addition, we have curriculum committees in each college. That's where it comes into play and where faculty can play a role, so it does fall under the jurisdiction of faculty. Whether we should accept this as a charge is a different question.

Senator ?: This sounds similar to when a program is proposed by a college and they put together all the paperwork and then bring it to Senate for us to vote on, but it's not our job to come up with the program itself.

A. Kray: We review, we don't create.

A. Newman: The last of the general charges is to address existing wording in policies that exclude lecturers, senior lecturers and principal lecturers. This is presumably because some of these policies were written before lecturers played such a large role among faculty at RIT. This is reminiscent of the charge that referenced intersession, so perhaps we should combine them and create a standing charge which asks



all of our committees to start to actively take note of the language in the policies that fall under their jurisdiction.

S. Malachowsky: I think it's interesting that lecturers in most of our policies are referred to by what they're not, as 'non tenure track'. I don't know if that would fall within the scope of this. There's two issues: how people are referred to, and whether lecturers should be on some of these committees, and there are certainly ones where they should not.

M. Anselm: I totally agree with this charge, but it's lacking specifics. Perhaps we could hire a student to do a word search to determine how big of an issue it is. I'd like to see more detail added.

Senator ?: *Inaudible*

E. Williams: I was on the FAC four or five years ago and there was an effort to decide on language and terms and then use them in all our policies but I don't know what happened to it.

A. Newman: The FAC has been looking at titles for a while and they have gone back and forth for a couple of years. There seems to be no good solution, or at least none of the solutions that have come up have been approved universally across campus. But the inclusion of lecturers, senior lecturers and principal lecturers in policy has never specifically been pursued.

S. Johnson: One example pertains to the FEAD grant. Lecturers can get the grant but cannot sit on the committee that determines the recipients. So there's places in policy that need to be reviewed where decisions are made for lecturers, but we can't participate in the process.

S. Malachowsky: I would encourage Senators to talk to your constituents at the college level, because there may be some examples of this that exist in the colleges that are not university-wide.

A. Newman: Next is our Employment and Evaluation section. We will just do a couple of these, because #12 is really long and we won't have time to get to it. The first one asks us to include in annual evaluations for lecturers, senior lecturers and associate professors a statement on progress toward promotion to the next level, akin to GCCIS's 'progress towards tenure' statement.. Since the Faculty Affairs Committee has been looking at the annual evaluation process we might ask them to add this for their consideration.

N. Eddingsaas: COS does this.

I. Puchades: Is there a university-wide form for evaluations?

A. Newman: The closest thing we have to it is the annual evaluation policy. I think that's E.7 which is something FAC is currently looking at to reduce the number of ratings from five to three.

I. Puchades: I remember there was some effort to put DEI language into the annual evaluations, but I'm not sure where that ended up.

A. Newman: That was something that Senate approved as a recommendation but not as a formal motion. My understanding is that the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion has taken it upon themselves to ask the Deans to ensure that it's something that's included.

H. Ghazle: If we go ahead and make changes to this policy, then we need to go back to the tenure policy as well. There is nothing in that that says there needs to be an annual statement about progress. Perhaps rather than change the policy, we can suggest that the Provost ask the Deans to include this in annual evaluations. It would be good because people need to know if they are progressing well towards promotion.

[Standing Committee Charges](#)

Agenda Item No. 9: New Business; A. Newman (1:46)

H. Ghazle returned to the list of vacant committee positions and asked that Senators connect with him or Tamaira if they are willing to fill any of the vacant slots.

S. Johnson: I want to remind us that it's part of your role as a Senator to serve on one of these committees so if you're not already on one, you should be signing up for one of these.

A. Newman: One final thing. I know that some faculty have to run right off to class after Senate, especially as we're right over here on the west edge of campus. We're wondering if it would be worthwhile for us to rent a couple of University golf carts for a Senate shuttle to get people back into the middle of town. If that is something you'd be interested in, so that you don't have to run quite so fast, please let us know.

Agenda Item No. 10: Adjournment; A. Newman (1:48)

Attendance 9/5/2024

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

Ghoneim, Hany	ALT KGOE Senator		Van Aardt, Jan	ALT COS Senator	
Hardin, Jessica	ALT CLA Senator		Warp, Melissa	ALT CAD Senator	
Hartpence, Bruce	ALT GCCIS Senator		White, Phil	ALT GCCIS Senator	X
Hazelwood, David	NTID Senator	X	Williams, Eric	GIS Senator	X
Jadamba, Basca	COS Senator	X	Worrell, Tracy	ALT CLA Senator	X
Johnson, Dan	CET Senator	X	Zanibbi, Richard	GCCIS Senator	Excused
Johnson, Scott	GCCIS Senator	X	Zlochower, Yosef	COS Senator	X
Kavin, Denise	ALT NTID Senator	X			
Kray, Christine	CLA Senator	X			
Krutz, Daniel	ALT GCCIS Senator				
Kuhl, Michael	KGOE Senator	X			
Lanzafame, Joseph	COS Senator	X			
Lapizco-Encinas, Blanca	KGOE Senator	X			
Laver, Michael	CLA Senator				

Interpreters: Nicole Crouse-Dickerson and Jennaca Saeva

Student Assistant: Nilay Vaidya

Presenters: Sinlaire Ogof and Bill St. Jean