

Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, September 26, 2024

12:15 - 1:50 PM

Zoom

Attendance: See Below

Agenda Item No. 1: Call To Order; A. Newman (12:17)

Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; A. Newman (12:18)

Moved: J. Lanzafame

Second: S. Aldersley

S. Johnson: We're in week 5, and we haven't approved any of the charges yet, and it seems like we're given less and less time to the charges. I know we're all interested in what the Provost has to say, but I'd like to move discussion of the charges above the Provost, so we can at least get those moving.

Second: S. Aldersley

M. Ruhling: I don't think we should change the agenda. We can use the orders of the day to move on when we need to.

A. Newman: We will vote on amending the agenda by moving the charges above the Provost

Motion passed 23:6:3

A. Newman: We will now vote on approving the amended agenda

Motion passed by acclamation

Agenda Item No. 3: Communications Officer's Report/Approval of Minutes; S. Aldersley (12:20)

Draft minutes of the meeting of 9/12 were approved by acclamation

Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; A. Newman (12:21)

The Executive Committee has been involved in a lot of conversations. One of the reasons why we created this new 'Sense of Senate' segment in the agenda was to create a space to discuss the key issues that the faculty are grappling with, that the Executive Committee is seeing through communication we are receiving directly from the faculty. So the Sense of Senate is an inaugural element addition to our agenda.

It can and should be removed whenever we have no time for it. However, we do want to increase the time that the Senate spends actually discussing matters that are very important to our faculty or issues that we see coming up. In order to be more proactive as a body, it makes sense for there to be something on our standing agendas where we actually see problems coming, so we can address them before they become really big issues.

The Strategic Planning Committee is putting out invitations for Zoom town halls. There are two so far and as a member of the Committee, I will be co-host. Please make sure to keep an eye out for the invitations. As Senators, I hope that you are making sure that your college faculty are being kept aware of and encouraged to sign up for such opportunities. One final reminder, October 4th is the deadline for submitting concept papers that are going to be reviewed by the Committee.

Housekeeping: I'm activating the 10/3 Senate meeting which was a hold, and canceling the meeting on 10/10.

M. Laver: A quick question about the strategic planning process. We have a new President coming in theoretically next year, maybe over the summer. I've been here for two Presidents and the pattern, I see is that we develop a strategic plan, and then a new president comes in and wants to change it. When President Munson came in, I thought he did a good job paring down the strategic plan. In terms of the timeline, is the new President coming in going to have a chance to weigh in on the strategic plan? Or are we going to have a similar pattern to the past where we get a strategic plan and then a new president, and then a revised strategic plan?

A. Newman: Excellent question. I understand the President's search is going pretty fast, and the goal is to announce the successful candidate by March of 2025. The actual strategic plan will not be complete until October, so we think that from March to October the new President will have an opportunity to provide input and really shape the plan. But at the same time, something that is important from a faculty perspective, is that the new President be someone who actually listens to and understands the sense of what RIT is right now, rather than implementing and enforcing an outside vision. So by doing the process this way, we hope the new President will come in and see this strategic plan, and essentially see the voices of our constituents reflected in it. We don't know how it's going to work, but that is the hope.

Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; Ross Hisert (12:28)

We have no major updates. Like Faculty Senate, we are still in the midst of getting everything started up and getting our committees filled up. One thing I did want to highlight was we are looking to once again increase staff council outreach around campus, and drum up a little bit of interest in shared governance. So as faculty with a lot of staff around you, if you have any staff members that may show even a slight interest, we would love to get a little bit of free publicity.

Agenda Item No. 6: Student Government Update; Joshua Anderson (12:30)

(From the Chat) This week was a busy week in SG. On Friday we had our SOIS senator appointment and the following pawprints got approved: Change the A/C threshold in the dorms so that they do not switch at 50 degrees Fahrenheit (charged to the Housing and Dining Chair) and Stop ticketing students for

parking on the grass (Charged to the FPAT Chair). We also had our SG retreat this weekend where we were able to bond as a team over Lasertag and learn about leadership from faculty.

Agenda Item No. 7: CTL Update; N. Hair (12:31)

I want to give you a number of updates in terms of some of the things that CTL has been working on behind the scenes. If you recall we go to our faculty with a technology survey to see how they're using the current technologies, what's working for them and what's not working for them. So this morning we sent out a request for participation. The last time we sent this survey out was two years ago when we had a record number of respondents. There were 412 responses, and I want to thank Atia and this Senate for encouraging faculty to participate. This survey is important because it is a gauge of faculty satisfaction with MyCourses as a learning management system. Two years ago there was overwhelming support: 74% of the 412 were either extremely satisfied or satisfied with it and 24% of respondents were strongly opposed to changing it. So we made the decision, with the help of the Executive Committee of Senate last year to renew the contract with Desire To Learn (DTL). But as one last safety check, we want to make sure that we are aware of any potential problems that faculty might have with MyCourses and its component parts. Responses this time will help inform our contract renewal length. We currently have two options - a 2-year renewal term, or a 5-year renewal term. The latter provides us with a number of preferential price benefits and also continues to demonstrate to DTL that RIT is a terrific partner. We have very good connections with their senior leaders and that provides us with access to a number of innovative and forthcoming platforms. So I would strongly encourage your constituents to complete that survey. In addition to informing us where we go next with the learning management system, we use this survey to assess our additional portfolio of academic technologies. It also helps us identify supplemental needs and technologies for teaching support. Basically, we use the recommendations that we get from our faculty to guide future CTL investigations and if we don't hear from you that places us in a bit of a quandary in terms of where we should start thinking. We have two new academic technologies that are coming up. We learned from our last survey that faculty were concerned about grading efficiencies, teaching at scale grading at scale. So we deployed a pilot called Grade Scope, which is an application that allows you to quickly scale up your grading and that is now available to everybody across campus, regardless of class size. The second one is Honorlock which uses AI to produce a proctored service that works within MyCourses. This was a recommendation that came from your ASSA standing committee last year and we've also noted a number of changes from the Department of Education that require us to become more robust in our assessment of student identities. This is a Federal requirement. It's also likely to be an issue that will be raised by Middle States accreditors when they visit us. So we're happy to offer both of these technologies for faculty, and of course, all of the training that goes along with them. Atia mentioned S-Rate Committee updates. So if you remember, pre-Covid, a group was charged to look at the use of student rating evaluation data. They strongly recommended that we move beyond just the numbers to look at qualitative comments, and all of the augmented ways in which faculty can demonstrate continued professional development, instead of relying solely on those numbers. Another reason for not relying on those numbers is since Covid, fewer students are now completing those surveys and that taints the data even further. So, working with Joe Loffredo and Laverne, we have been looking at ways in which we can train administrators to more effectively evaluate faculty to go beyond the numbers,

and, secondly, to also train faculty in the creation of teaching narratives. We've heard loud and clear from promotion and tenure committees that faculty tend to struggle when it comes to creating narratives about their teaching, how they teach and how they are continuing to improve their teaching. So CTL is working to update training opportunities for faculty to help build better narratives. That's coming this year. We've also got a number of sessions with department chairs and the Council of Chairs about moving beyond the numbers.

We're also working closely with Chris Collison, the AI Hub director. We have two symposiums on AI and teaching and learning. One is taking place next Friday. We've got a group of really dedicated faculty that are coming together and show how they're using AI effectively to expedite their work and make interactions with their students more flourishing.

SHED collaborations took place over the summer. We heard loud and clear that there were some concerns with some of the ways in which the teaching spaces were operating. We went to town on those concerns, and we're still inviting feedback and comments about ways in which we can enhance both Wallace classrooms and those in the SHED. Please feel free to reach out to Sandy Connelly directly if you have ideas. We have raised the whiteboards, and we've made a number of changes to the layouts, so they are more in tune with faculty expectations.

A few quick updates. You may not be aware that we have Faculty Fellows from across the disciplines who are available for anyone to get in touch with, if they need counseling, if they would like in-class observations, or if they've got a teaching problem that they just want to get a third party's view on. We have some of the best teachers in our Fellows program. Please do use this resource. It's confidential, and it's strictly peer-to-peer.

We have a summer institute planned for 2025. One of the tracks will be to prepare faculty to build their teaching narratives. We have a couple of pilots we're working on now with a number of colleges looking at a voluntary teaching certificate program which will allow faculty to demonstrate they're continuing to be effective teachers. Provost Learning Innovation Grants (PLIG) will be announced in November.

These awards make up to \$5,000 available for faculty to work over the summer, perhaps for summer salary, or for paying students. The areas of focus have not yet been finally determined, but AI and active learning will likely be two of them, as will teaching in technology, art, and design. So keep an eye out for the PLIG call. Finally, if you know someone who's really effective with their teaching, using any innovative techniques, then please encourage them to apply for the Provost Innovative Teaching award which will go out on Monday.

[CTL Update Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 9: Standing Committee Charges; A. Newman (12:41)

A. Newman: We will now review proposed language for the charges introduced and discussed at the 9/12 meeting. Starting with Charge #1, there were a lot of questions about pay, equity and benchmarking and compensation in general. Based on that and in light of the original language, the executive committee recommends the following charge be given to the RABC:

Review the appropriateness of the existing faculty salary benchmark group and the 50th percentile target in light of RIT's aspiration of becoming an RI institution. Propose a strategy to address broad faculty dissatisfaction with compensation as evinced in the recent COACHE survey.

S. Aldersley: Move to approve Charge #1 as written.

S. Johnson: Seconded

I. Puchades: Could we add to the proposed language a way for faculty to formally dispute their compensation. One of our constituents brought up that there isn't a formal avenue for a faculty member who doesn't agree with their evaluation to appeal,

E. Williams: I see two issues related to the benchmarks in this charge. One is the question of whether RIT is paying a fair salary within a given discipline. The other is that there seems to be this idea that faculty in all disciplines should have the same salary if they have the same rank. Those are two very different issues. Is the proposed language to investigate both of those or only one or the other? Either way, it should be made clear in the charge.

R. Olson: I think there's one other issue related to benchmarks as well, and that is, it's all well and good to create benchmarks against other institutions and against industry, but it's a separate question as to whether or not we're actually living up to those benchmarks. I think it would be very interesting to add some kind of analysis to determine the extent to which faculty are actually being paid in line with benchmarks. So what percentage of faculty are above the benchmarks for their unit and what percentage are below?

S. Aldersley: To respond to Ivan's point, E.4 already has an appeal process for when faculty are dissatisfied with their salary. I don't know whether it works, but it is in the policy. And with regard to Eric's point, I remember a discussion back in the 80's where somebody was complaining about the fact that a faculty member in the English Department is not paid the same as one in the Accounting Department. I think that's the way the world is, and I don't think any committee is going to be able to change it. That's just my personal point of view on that. With regard to Rob's point, what HR would say, I believe, is that each faculty member can compute their compa-ratio to see where they are relative to the 50th percentile of the benchmark group. I believe they say if you are below the 85th percentile, you've got a good case for appealing. That's the way that I understand they address that now, but maybe it's not the best way to do it. So you could add language to this charge to suggest that the compa-ratio targets should be reviewed and recommendations made for changing it.

R. Olson: Stephen, I think you're getting my suggestion a little bit wrong. I'm not necessarily interested in my particular compa-ratio. What I'm interested in are the statistics for the institution. What percentage of faculty are at or above our benchmarks. So just to give you some anecdotal information, in GCCIS, we have our own internal benchmarks for what faculty should be paid. Whether we should have is a separate question. But in looking at the positions that we're hiring for at the moment, we're hiring entirely below those benchmarks, and, as far as I'm aware, most faculty in GCCIS also fall below the benchmarks. So looking at what the benchmarks are is only part of the problem. It's a separate question as to whether or not the benchmarks are actually reflective of what the institution is doing.

S. Aldersley: Maybe Dr. David is going to address this but one of his slides at the Town hall last Friday did give the percentage of faculty who are above or below the benchmarks at the university level. I don't know whether the same data are available at the college level. I agree that it would be useful to see statistics for each college individually.

M. Ruhling: Is there anything in the language that addresses large swings in the benchmarking from one year to the next? This has come up in our college, and I think that's something that needs to be part of this discussion as well.

H. Ghazle: A point of order. If you would like to add to the charge, please suggest specific modifications so we can go ahead and include it in the charge.

A.Newman: Seeing no suggested modifications and since the original language has been moved and seconded, we will go ahead and vote.

Motion to refer Charge #1 to the RABC.

Passed: 36/2/0

Charge #2. Proposed Language: Develop and propose a university research policy to establish standards for evaluating research that meets university criteria rather than college-level criteria. This includes winning grants, publishing interdisciplinary work with faculty in other colleges and universities.

S. Johnson: Move to approve Charge #2 as written

S. Aldersley: Seconded

R. Zanibbi: So this isn't intended to replace existing scholarship evaluation. This is just trying to address interdisciplinary issues?

A. Newman: And university level criteria, because the strategic plan outlines particular goals they want to achieve, and therefore, if there is a policy that says this is an important thing that should be taken into account, then it can be a supplementary thing to individual college policy.

E. Williams: What is meant by policy here? My point is what would be the outcome of this? If you say the word policy, are they going to try and make a new E5.0? Or is the intent that there be a university-wide tenure standard that includes specifications on research.

H. Ghazle: That's a good question, Eric. There are policies that we have already at RIT that deal with research, but this charge is not specific to one policy.

A.Newman: I think it might have far-reaching ramifications. But there is a call for an element of standardization. It seeks to establish an incentive for faculty to pursue interdisciplinary research and more cutting edge research, which might be otherwise hampered by a single college's unilateral goals.

M. Anselm: I don't like the word 'rather' in this charge, right? Because it almost sounds like it's replacing college level criteria. I'd like to see it the way you just described it, more of a supplement to a college level criteria. I think I mentioned this at the last meeting. I didn't like the example of the journal *Nature*. There are so many different kinds of journals but that seems like the absolute upper echelon. I don't know who wrote this, but I'd like it to be written in such a way that it's clear that this is more of a supplemental document that would maybe inform the Deans and unit heads as to what the University is looking for. Something in addition to college level criteria.

P. David: What is the intent of this charge? What problem are we trying to solve here? The reason I'm asking is instead of writing guidance at the college level, we look for national and international recognition within the discipline. It's very different for somebody who publishes in *Nature* versus somebody who does museum exhibits. To have a global document that's going to please everyone is almost an impossible task. Is this really worth it?

A. Newman: Generally we don't make public the names of the faculty who submit charges, unless they want to come and discuss their rationale. However, from the rationale we received it seems like some college guidelines and evaluations don't support interdisciplinary research. If one college sets up a criterion whereby you must only be published in XYZ disciplinary journals, then a lot of other work becomes not helpful, and it's counter to the notion of interdisciplinary research. So a global or universal guidance that actually says, even if you have your internal guidelines for what counts as disciplinary research, here are additional guidelines to help evaluate research that is outside of the scope of your particular discipline but which nevertheless may also have international, national or regional reach.

H. Ghazle: Point of order. Maybe we should allow our colleagues a chance to present their opinions and then respond at a different time.

R. Zanibbi: I share Dr. David's concern. It's very difficult to find any procedure or measure to span all the design, art and science and engineering disciplines that we have. As somebody who does interdisciplinary work, I'm not sure this would be helpful. And if there are colleges that are not appropriately rewarding research that has impact, especially if it's been peer reviewed or of high quality, I don't know that tenure committees need a lot of convincing that those things have value. So I'm not entirely sure what we do here. I remember being on the Research and Scholarship Committee, and we saw the myriad ways in which people are evaluated and valued for their scholarship. It really differs by college, even department. So I'm not sure something formal will help, maybe an informal discussion with the Provost's office that produces a memo or guidance, and then regularly repeating such a statement might be helpful. But I'm not sure about formalizing this in a policy. This will be more than a long conversation, and I've had that conversation on several committees, and the final result was always unsatisfying. So I agree with Dr. David's comment.

S. Aldersley: In the interest of time, I move that we proceed to a vote.

P. Padmanabhan: I think the second part of the sentence is really confusing. It seems like it's just grants and interdisciplinary work. I think we want something broad, not prescriptive. And I agree that this is more like an enforcement thing that maybe the Deans and the colleges should discuss as well.

Motion to refer Charge #2 to the RSC

Passed: 19/18/1

Charge #3 Proposed Language: The Faculty Senate recommends that the Provost's Office develop a policy and strategy for keeping Emeritus Faculty engaged with the scholarly life of the university and provide real privileges for members.

A.Newman: Senate is not the place to make decisions as to where and how emeritus faculty are treated. However, the Executive Committee does think this charge has value.

M. Anselm: Move to approve Charge #3 as written

S. Aldersley: Seconded

Motion to refer Charge #3 to the Provost's Office

Passed: 36/2/1

Charge #4 Proposed Language: Amend policy D05.0.II to revise references to the intercession and consider revising the policy to either one or two academic terms NOT including summer.

S. Johnson: Move to approve Charge #4 as written

K. Barone: Seconded

Motion to refer Charge #4 to the AAC.

Passed: 35/0/0

Charge #5 Proposed Language: Explore and develop best practices for departments to determine workload models, evaluation, and compensation for faculty engaged in study abroad programming.

S. Aldersley: Move to approve Charge #5 as written

S. Johnson: Seconded

Motion to refer Charge #5 to the GLEC.

Passed: 35/0/0

Charge #6 Proposed Motion: Senate recommends to the Provost that he request RIT Enrollment explore ways to increase our Latin American student population.

A.Newman: This was something that we discussed on the Senate floor last week and everyone seemed to agree that this was not something that the Senate would do.

S. Johnson: I think it was mentioned at the University Council that the ALANA population was actually up this year. In any case, I think they're already exploring this, so I don't know if there's really a need for this to be passed on.

R, Zanibbi: Is registration not part of the Registrar's role rather than the Provost's? I'm not entirely clear on how the Provost would be responsible for this.

A.Newman: The request would not go directly from the Senate. We would request the Provost to make the request on our behalf.

Motion to refer Charge #6 to the Provost's office for further action

Passed: 30/2/2

Charge #7 Proposed Language: Investigate and propose ways to give faculty greater agency in the administration of computer privileges. Identify the types of administrative access that shall be available to faculty in all situations.

A.Newman: This has been a concern for quite a while and because the ASSA Committee deals with computers and technology, the Executive Committee decided to recommend assigning this charge to them. Are there any reactions?

S. Johnson: I got a new laptop just recently, and I've been down to my Systems office seven times to get new software installed because it needed admin rights. I couldn't even install my laser pointer because I needed additional admin rights and some of my software that I use in class requires admin access to do debugging, etc. and I couldn't even do that in class without going down to the Admin's office, and all they do is they just type in their username and password and say, Here you go! And I walked away.

C. Newman: For clarification, is this asking the university to create policy recommendations on this?

A.Newman: The idea would be either for a proposal to come to the Senate, or the committee might make a recommendation to edit and adjust an existing policy somewhere, if there is one.

C. Newman: So we're asking them to give a list of things we think faculty should be able to do by themselves when installing new software?

A.Newman: Yes.

R. Olson: I appreciate the workload aspect but I would also suggest that as a part of this, we consider the overall cost in looking at how security is balanced against usability. It's usually a cost benefit decision. So I would recommend that the language include analyzing the cost associated with the time spent both by faculty and staff.

A.Newman: So something like 'investigate and propose ways to give faculty greater agency in the administration of computer privileges to reduce faculty, effort, and time spent on managing administrative access.'

P. Padmanabhan: I can't go to class and not have my software working, and I can't spend three hours in

between classes, either, especially if I have back-to-back classes.

J. Capps: I think there's another issue here, too, which is that the administration made these changes, as far as I know, without any type of faculty involvement or consideration of the effect on faculty, which is part of what was so shocking about this. I'd propose adding some language about involving faculty when changes are proposed.

A. Newman: That is really problematic. And it looks like it's being updated already and procedures for updating faculty computer access in the future. So it looks like there needs to be some rewriting of our proposed language.

H. Ghazle: Point of order. We have to approve the modifications.

A. Newman: So the question is, is there a motion to approve this language as modified.

M. Ruhling: Move to approve Charge #7 as amended.

C. Newman: Seconded

Amended motion: Investigate and propose ways to give faculty greater agency in the administration of computer privileges, to reduce faculty effort and time spent away from core job functions. Identify the types of administrative access that shall be available to faculty in all situations, and procedures for updating faculty computer access in the future.

Motion to refer Charge #7 as amended to the ASSA.

Passed: 33/0/2

A. Newman: Charge #8 as proposed reads: ***Explore whether the faculty as a body want to pursue interdisciplinary collaboration on sustainability or other issues. Consider implementing a multi-college first-year curriculum in sustainability that would feed into multiple majors across multiple colleges at RIT. Work with the administration to align the Senate and the administration goals.***

Based on the discussion in our last meeting, the Executive Committee agrees that this charge is outside the purview of the Faculty Senate, since when it comes to curriculum, the Senate's role is to approve, not propose or develop.

S. Aldersley: Move to approve Executive Committee's recommendation.

S. Johnson: Seconded

Motion not to take up Charge #8.

Passed: Acclamation

Charge #9 Proposed Language: Review policies that are due for their 5-year review and update in a manner more suitable to the RIT ecosystem, including the recognition of Lecturer ranks.

A. Newman: The Executive Committee recommends assigning this charge to the LRPEC along with the

broader charge of reviewing and updating all policies that are due for their 5 year review.

E. Williams: I was a member of the FAC when they were updating some of these policies. I remember the discussion was to not have lecturers serve on these committees, not as a lack of recognition or exclusion, but the thought was that this was extra work that shouldn't be assigned to them. Maybe now more lecturers want to be on committees but I don't know whether recognition is the right word.

A. Newman: I think this is more about how lecturers are addressed in policy overall, because some policies will actually not even take into account that there are senior lecturers and principal lecturers. If a tenured faculty member can serve, should not a senior, or principal lecturer have an equivalent privilege? The idea here would be to look through each policy that is due for review and see if it takes into account the fact that we have a much larger number of non tenure track faculty now than before, but also investigate the role of lecturers in policy in general.

C. Newman: A quick example would be the FEAD committee, which allows lecturers to receive awards, but not to serve on the committee. And so you have situations like that that could help address.

A. Newman: As a reminder, policies and committees are not interchangeable with each other. Some policies may not even mention lecturers which leaves them in a sort of gray area.

H. Ghazle: Point of order. Going back to Eric's comment, do you want to recommend a modification, or you're satisfied with the existing language?

E. Williams: I'm okay with 'recognition', but I would prefer including 'consideration of the roles of lecturer ranks'.

Y. Zlochower: Looking at the rationale as I understood it the idea is not exclude senior lecturers and principal lecturers. The new wording just says consideration of lecture rank. It seems like the spirit of the previous paragraph requires consideration of inclusion of lecturer ranks in these committees.

A. Newman: As a reminder, this isn't about particular committees. It's about reviewing policies that are due for a 5- year review and update them in a manner more suitable to the RIT ecosystem, including the consideration of lecturer ranks and roles. I think that addresses the inclusion or exclusion issue.

S. Johnson: Instead of using the word lecturer, can we use 'non tenure track'? There are other people besides lecturers who are non-tenure, like professors of practice.

Amended motion: Review policies that are due for their 5-year review and update them in a manner more suitable to the RIT ecosystem, which now includes Lecturer ranks and other faculty roles.

S. Aldersley: Move to approve Charge #9

K. Barone: Seconded

Motion to refer Charge #9 as amended to the LRPEC

Passed: 38/0/0

[Standing Committee Charges Document](#)

Agenda Item No. 8: Town Hall Follow Up and Benchmarking; P. David (1:32)

P. David: This has been a very productive session. Regarding AI, we talk a lot about US News & World Report rankings, but there is a more rigorous set of rankings that is done by computer science schools and GCCIS is ranked #32. We're tied with Duke, and just one position below the University of Chicago. So this is a very good and important point about our colleagues in GCCIS. We already have a lot of strengths here at RIT.

Now I'd like to talk about a People First culture. A key question in the COACHE survey relates to workplace satisfaction: how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your department and with RIT? There is another group called the Cohort Group, which is slightly broader than the peer group, and we have data there as well. And we see there is a gap between us and our peers, a gap we need to address. If you look at it at the institutional level, you see a bigger gap. We want people to be enthusiastic and happy to be here. So we have some catching up to do. This is a main concern for us, which we should address. Using the COACHE data and the open-ended responses we've tried to identify themes and there are four or five that emerge. Respondents were asked to identify the top two reasons for dissatisfaction: compensation comes up as a big concern, then teaching load and, more generally, workload – too many service assignments. I couldn't agree more. The charges that we discussed today represent a heavy workload. I'm not saying we don't do it, but finding some smart ways to figure out governance responsibilities and service workloads would be a useful exercise down the road. Another concern is quality of leadership. Another is tenure and promotion clarity and another instructional research and infrastructure support in the classrooms, for example, the projectors are old, the bulbs are burned out, it's not clear where to go for help, there are not enough resources, space, staff support for pre and post awards, etc. All of these things are on my mind and I want to work with you to come up with a plan, starting this year with compensation. One of the charges you approved today is to look at compensation carefully, which involves a benchmark analysis. Whatever the Faculty Senate decides to do, I'll work with the group to make this a major priority for this year. The second priority for this year is teaching load. Some colleges already have a clearly articulated policy on teaching load, others don't. So the second focus this year will be to revisit teaching load, and come up with some guidance that would be helpful for the University.

People ask how the university does faculty compensation. It uses all R1 and R2 universities that report data CUPA (College and University Professional Association). As I mentioned in the Town Hall, two of our colleges have their own version of CUPA, based on their professional organizations. One is SCB and the other is GCCIS. Currently, the benchmark is the 50th percentile and each faculty compa-ratio is calculated as a deviation from this 50th percentile.

A. Newman: Even if we use all R1 and R2 universities, we should always be working from an aspirational perspective, and the faculty group that made this recommendation said that cost of living should be taken into account in the calculation.

P. David: Both good points. For now, the majority of our faculty fall between 85% and 105%. There were some radical shifts this time, especially in some job categories in COLA. One way to think about this, as you look at it, is we are meeting our benchmarks. Compared to last year, for some people it went up, and for some it did go down. The increases could be because we are doing better. Or it could be that the benchmarks change the percentage of people in each of these groupings. So this is a messy situation,

especially when you look at the gray bars and the orange bars. That's why I sent the note out earlier this year, that it is something that we should address. So what can we do about it? My first task is to work with the Faculty Senate, and the committee you create to study benchmarks, then, with input from RIT leadership as well, my goal is to recommend 100 schools from the CUPA survey that will serve as benchmark institutions, using criteria that Atia just mentioned. Are these the right schools? Are they aspirational schools, schools from urban areas that are comparable in cost of living to us? So that's part of that discussion. That's what that group will do. Then I'll work with HR to evaluate current salaries against the new benchmarks and create a new chart to show what percentage of our faculty are at, above and below benchmark, and if so by how much and I'll bring the results to the Faculty Senate. So those are the actions to fine tune compensation. Then teaching load. I'm going to start with two simple principles here. One is that a typical 3-credit course is 10% of a faculty member's overall workload. This is very common everywhere in America. So if a person's teaching 2 + 2 courses, 40% of their overall workload is attributed to teaching. That's the way we currently think about it and I don't think there is any reason to change it. It's a very standard approach. However, what is typical will vary by discipline. If it's a class in ceramics, or a class in organic chemistry, one is a lab, another is a studio, a lot of time is spent by faculty in these settings. Courses determined as high teaching workload can be given more than 10% credit. So if you're teaching a class with 150 students what percentage of a person's workload does that equate to? We need to have those kinds of discussions. All of that should factor into thinking about what is a typical course load and what kinds of adjustments are necessary.

I.Puchades: I would like to bring the conversation back to the ABB planning which we've been discussing in some of our college meetings. I'm picking up a lot of negative feelings about it, things like people saying this is going to pit departments against each other. Why send our students to take a programming course in a different college? We'll just teach it ourselves and get more credit hours. But it seems like this is going to happen, regardless of those conversations. I would like to see if we can remember what Senate's recommendation was regarding the implementation of the ABB, if anybody has any record of that.

S.Aldersley: I'm not sure that there was ever a recommendation or vote in Senate regarding ABB. But there has been a lot of reporting all through last year and into this year about what the considerations are. As regards the working group put together by Provost Granberg, we did make a recommendation to her, but we did so with a lot of reservations. As you probably know, the budget at the university level is controlled by F&A, and there are a number of pots of money that in good times come into Academic Affairs that F&A can cut off at will, and the working group became very familiar with those categories so that when we made our recommendation to Ellen we pointed them out. We actually recommended that monies that are expended in Academic Affairs, for example, faculty travel, should not be held hostage by F&A – they should be part of the annual Academic Affairs budget. I don't know whether travel funds have ever all come back. But in any case, F&A controls the purse strings. In the end, we made a recommendation to Ellen along the lines that Provost David has described, including the notion that reallocations across colleges would be made. But we did have a lot of concerns about how it would work.

A. Newman: We are over time but I will let Rob have the final word.

R. Olson: I have a very quick question for the Provost. Do the CUPA numbers include extra pay, such as summer salary, or do they represent base salary?

P. David: I want to say it's base salary but we can verify that. I'd just like to add two points. First, about the research charge: it's a great idea but I think what we want the committee to do needs to be fine tuned. Otherwise, they may be going on a wild goose chase. Second, in response to Ivan's question: the goal is not to create a Hunger Games approach here with the winner taking all. That is not at all the plan. And with regard to interdisciplinary work, if students are taking classes in two departments, both will get credit.

We will put in place policies for bad actors who may try to play the system and create new courses to generate extra credit. There will be a review process before any new course is approved, and we will look at those pretty carefully. That's why I've been using a lot of soft language around ABB. It's not just a formula on top of a formula. We will overlay some principles and values and try to do this in a way that is humane and fair and just.

AN: Thank you so much, Dr. David. That's very reassuring. I know everyone is very concerned, obviously, about the state of our budget, and where and how funds are going to move or shift over the next few years. So we will continue to discuss this as we go, and on that note since we are over time, this meeting is adjourned.

[Provost Follow Up Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 10: Sense of the Senate: DSO; A. Newman

We did not get to this item, because time ran out

Agenda Item No. 11: New Business; A. Newman

We did not get to this item, because time ran out

Agenda Item No. 12: Adjournment; A. Newman (1:55)

AN: Thank you so much, Dr. David. That's very reassuring. I know everyone is very concerned, obviously, about the state of our budget, and where and how funds are going to move or shift over the next few years. So, we will continue to discuss this as we go, and on that note since we are over time, this meeting is adjourned.

Attendance 9/26/2024

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	
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		Malachowsky, Samuel	Treasurer/ GCCIS Senator	x
Boedo, Stephen	ALT KGCOE Senator	x	McCalley, Carmody	ALT COS Senator	x
Brady, Kathleen	ALT NTID Senator	Excused	McLaren, Amy	CAD Senator	x
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	x	Padmanabhan, Poornima	KGCOE Senator	x
Cromer, Michael	ALT COS Senator	x	Puchades, Ivan	KGCOE Senator	x
Cui, Feng	ALT COS Senator		Ray, Amit	CLA Senator	x
David, Prabu	Provost		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	x	Shaaban, Muhammad	ALT KGCOE Senator	
Eddingsaas, Nathan	COS Senator	Excused	Song, Qian	SCB Senator	x
Fillip, Carol	ALT CAD Senator		Staff Council Rep	Ross Hisert & Georgeanne Hogan	x
Ghazle, Hamad	Operations Officer/CHST Senator	x	Student Government Rep	Josh Anderson	x
Ghoneim, Hany	ALT KGCOE Senator	x	Sweeney, Kevin	ALT SCB Senator	x
Hardin, Jessica	ALT CLA Senator	x	Thomas, Bolaji	CHST Senator	
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: Jennaca Saeva and Donna O'Brien

Student Assistant: Nilay Vaidya

Presenters: Neil Harris and Prabu David