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

Thursday, November 7, 2024　　　　　12:15 - 1:50 PM　　　　　Slaughter Hall 2220-2240

Attendance: See Below

Agenda Item No. 1: Call to Order; S. Malachowsky (12:19)

S. Malachowsky: Atia is not able to be with us today, so as vice-chair, I will conduct the meeting.

Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; S. Malachowsky (12:20)

S. Malachowsky: Do I hear a motion to approve the agenda?

Moved: S. Aldersley
Seconded: M. Anselm

Approved by acclamation

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

S. Aldersley: There were no suggestions for edits or additions to the draft minutes, so I ask for a motion to approve them as written.

Moved: I. Puchades
Seconded: F. Dreese

Approved by acclamation

October 17, 2024 Meeting Minutes

Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; S. Malachowsky (12:22)

S. Malachowsky: The FSEC has continued to been meet with faculty in the individual colleges. We have followed a different format than last year instead joining faculty in existing college-wide meetings, which has been very interesting. I've been impressed by the participation of the college Senate cohorts. Otherwise, we're continuing to work on and meet with people particularly about the DSO and benchmarking. I'd like to thank our treasurer, Keri Barone, for taking on the design and distribution of

our DSO survey which has already received 486 responses. With regard to benchmarking, the FSEC has submitted a preliminary benchmarking proposal to the Provost, who has asked us to nominate two senators to serve on his benchmarking committee. We'd like to nominate Stephen, who worked on the proposal, and Sorim, who is also a member of the RABC, as our representatives. We'll vote separately and I move we first approve Stephen.

J. Lanzafame: Seconded

M. Ruhling: Do we know what the committee's charge is?

S. Aldersley: No, we don't know the formal charge. The Provost has simply told the Executive Committee the function of this committee is to come up with a replacement benchmark for the existing one. He has not mentioned any other purpose, and neither has he mentioned a timeline. We have asked that the committee complete its work expeditiously, hopefully by the end of the calendar year. The proposal we submitted is in the Faculty Senate drive and I encourage Senators to take a look at it before the next meeting. But I assume when the committee comes up with a proposal of its own, it will come back to Senate for our review.

M. Anselm: We're talking about salary benchmarking, correct?

S. Aldersley: Yes, we understand HR uses different benchmarks for different purposes, for example, to benchmark benefits, but this one is limited to salary.

M. Ruhling: I would like to see formal documentation before we vote.

Motion to approve S. Aldersley
Passed: 26:1:3

P. Padmanabhan: I was wondering if it might also be beneficial to nominate somebody from Advance who has worked on salaries in the past? Do we know who else is on the committee?

S. Aldersley: The Provost has indicated that in addition to a chair, there will also be two representatives from HR, one dean, one department chair, one additional faculty member, to be selected in collaboration with the Senate. It's often said that faculty governance moves slowly, which I think in general is appropriate, but in this particular case, I think it's important that this issue be resolved quickly, so that a new benchmark can be in place for the next merit cycle. If we delay too long, I'm afraid it won't be.

Motion to approve S. Chung
Seconded: K. Sweeney

Passed: 26:1:3

Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; G. Hogan (12:37)

We recently lost our administrative support and the position is currently posted. If you know of anyone that might be interested in supporting SC, please direct them to Career Zone. Otherwise, we're reviewing our bylaws for corrections and updates. And we're closely watching the staff architecture project.

Agenda Item No. 6: Student Government Update; J. Anderson (12:38)

We've made several changes to out by-laws, for example, replacing "female" with "woman," and renaming the Sustainability committee the Well-being committee. Then there's a PawPrint that seeks to prevent requiring students to pay for homework services for individual classes and to extend access to the Adobe Creative Cloud. We also approved all our by-laws.

Agenda Item No. 7: FAC Charges; C. Schlombs (12:40)

We're bringing forward three proposals which those of you who were Senators last year will remember I already introduced in April. The first is to reorient the POW around a meeting between the faculty member and the academic unit head. The second is to create a longer review cycle for highest ranked faculty, and the third is to reduce the annual review catergories from five to three. All three reflect the goals of promoting trust in faculty and supporting faculty to reach their highest potential. We've been working on these proposals for the last three or four years and we're asking that Senate vote on each one separately. There'll also be a fourth vote we'll ask for regarding certain updates that we think should be made to the policy, such as changing chair to academic unit head, for example. Today's motion refers to the first proposal only. You've received a policy document with different color codes, and what I'm talking about today are only the pink color coded changes in the policy document. In my April presentation I described a survey the committee sent out to assess faculty reaction to the three proposals and in the FAC final report, we presented the results of that survey for each of the colleges. In addition, prior to sending the survey, FAC members oversaw a consultation process in each college and your college FAC representative can summarize the results for you if you so desire. We've consulted with the Deans, we've consulted with HR and we've consulted with Legal.
The proposal seeks a reorientation of the POW process to focus on the meeting between a faculty member and the academic unit head. This is not a radical change because the meeting is actually already in policy, but we believe
the meeting needs to emphasize faculty development as central in the POW process. We're proposing the following steps in the process: 1) the faculty member writes and submits their self evaluation; 2) the academic unit head provides the faculty member with an annual evaluation; 3) the faculty member drafts a plan of work; 4) a meeting between the unit head and the faculty member takes places, where the the performance, evaluation, and the plan of work are all discussed; 5) after the meeting, the documents are finalized and signed by the parties. The intent here is to emphasize the professional development aspect. We have found that faculty are very much in favor of this proposal and we've put together a few slides which I'll walk through. Our original thinking was that the faculty member would develop their POW during the meeting, but in response to the feedback we received we've amended that to drafting the document prior to the meeting, but not signed off on until afterwards. The question has arisen as to

whether this process will overburden unit heads, to which we respond, the meeting is already in policy but does not necessarily emphasize professional development which should really be a fundamental leadership responsibility for unit heads. And if they are overburdened, maybe there is administrative work which they can be relieved of. Also, should our second proposal about longer review cycles for highest ranked faculty be approved, this would relieve some of the burden on chairs.

S. Malachowsky: I'd like to suggest a friendly amendment. I think it would be better to say "their POW" instead of "his or her POW."

Motion to accept the amendment
Approved by acclamation

C. Schlombs: We will go through our other proposals to make the language consistent.

Motion to approve the proposed policy language regarding reorientation of the Plan of Work to focus on meeting between faculty member and academic unit head (marked pink in circulated policy document).

Passed: 34:0:0

FAC Presentation

Policy E07.0 Edits

Agenda Item No. 8: AAC Charge; B. Herring (12:53)

The AAC's charge was to look at policy D5.0, subsection 2, which deals with Incomplete Grades. The proposed language is to remove references to the intercession and to exclude summer from one of the possible terms to complete an Incomplete. The general rationale is that a lot of faculty aren't under contract during the summer, so if there are a lot of incompletes it can be a large amount of work during a time when faculty are not being paid. However, if you exclude summer, it means that a student would have a full year to complete an incomplete which we felt was excessive, not least because that impacts graduation dates and because it would mean a large amount of time between when students learn the material, and when they complete the course. As a result, we decided to make the recommendation that the incomplete period be only one term, not including summer. The existing policy already allows that an extension of time may be granted at the instructor's discretion, and we're not suggesting changing that. The forms are the same, and both require sign-off by the department head and maybe the dean.

P. Padmanabhan: I find one term concerning because if the student is away from RIT on co-op, they shouldn't be expected to do academic work.

B. Herring: We felt that in special circumstances such as that there is already a plan in place where you can file for an extension.

S. Malachowsky: Can we change the word professor to instructor, which is the language that's used elsewhere?

P. Padmanabhan: It could amount to a lot of work for the entire college.

M. Laver: Is this a solution in search of a problem? Have we demonstrated that the current policy is not working for people? This is always up to the instructor and I'm in favor of maximum flexibility.

B. Herring: I assume that the person who brought the charge to the Senate thought it is a problem.

J. Lanzafame: I submitted this charge. I had five students in the spring all asking to complete the work in the summer. In terms of the deadline, it doesn't shorten the term, it just clarifies that summer is not an expectation.

Senator ?: *Inaudible*

R. Olson: *Inaudible*

B. Herring: We did not look into that. According to our research, other institutions have more restrictions on giving out Incompletes but that was not what we were charged to look at at this time.

K. Sweeney: This recommendation does not seem to change the flexibility inherent in the current policy.

T. Worrell: Was there any discussion as to how this might impact students who want to graduate in the summer?

B. Herring: We didn't explicitly address that scenario but there's nothing in here that would prevent an instructor from allowing completion of an incomplete during the summer.

J. Johnson: Has Student Government been given an opportunity to comment?

B. Herring: There are two students on the committee. They have not attended routinely but they have been included in e-mails and they have seen the red-line.

H. Ghazle: Point of order. There are a lot of questions on the floor. Maybe we should table this and send it back to the committee for them to take another look. Besides, there is no motion on the floor.

B. Herring: I did intend to make a motion.

H. Ghazle: In that case, I move to table.

2nd S. Aldersley

S. Malachowsky: Your committee is scheduled to come back later in the year. There is no motion to approve the changes, so to this point your presentation has been informational. As of now, there is a motion on the floor to table.

M. Laver: This policy does not mandate anything. It's up to the instructor to negotiate with the student.

S. Malachowsky: Any objections to voting by acclamation?

A. Adrion: Yes, I object to tabling. I suggest we vote on the proposal as presented.

Vote on motion to table
Failed: 15:16:2

S. Malachowsky: Bruce, would you like to make your motion?

B. Herring: I move to accept the red-line changes

T. Worrell: Reopen for discussion?

S. Malachowsky: Any further discussion?

Motion to accept the red-line changes to Policy D05.0.II

Passed: 22:11:0

AAC D05.0 Presentation

Policy D05.0 Recommended Changes

Agenda Item No. 9: E33.1 and E06.0; H. Ghazle (1:13)

H. Ghazle: I am presenting on behalf of our executive committee. Let me begin with some history.. This policy came into play in 2021 when the Senate reviewed it and it became effective on the 23rd of August 2021. But it has come to our attention that there's some information missing from the policy on the website and in all the documentation. We don't know what happened but part of what we agreed to in 2021 is missing. The language that we see currently in the policy stops here, and all the information that's highlighted in yellow is missing. So the FSEC did a lot of work, looking in the minutes and we were able to retrieve the missing language which was approved by the previous Senate. If you go to the website, the section ends with the phrase, "You choose to be." So FSEC moves to add the language that was missing.

S. Malachowsky: Are there any questions or comments?

J. Lanzafame: I agree with everything you say about the links, but do we not want to keep that first

sentence to make it clear that the workload modification is for time other than the short term?

H. Ghazle: We thought about that and if you feel that's appropriate we have no objection.

M. Ruhling: That was my point, too, that that is actually a policy issue, not a procedural issue.

F. Dreese: I'm wondering whether the birth mother is still the proper nomenclature. Whether it shouldn't be birthing parent? I did have a student who was a trans-male who gave birth to two children.

H. Ghazle: That's a very good question, but if that's going to be needed, then we have to send it back to the FAC and wait for the 5-year cycle to be completed.

M. Ruhling: I move that we amend the original motion to remove the "removal."

Seconded: S. Johnson

C. Kray: *Inadudible*

H. Ghazle: One would need to go to HR for those sorts of questions.

The discussion was mostly inaudible at this point.

P. Padmanabhan: Where do people go to learn about this procedure?

H. Ghazle: Procedures are not in policy, because they change over time, which makes it very difficult for us to follow up on these changes.

P. Padmanabhan: But the POW was the procedure. You meet with the department head, that's procedure.

J. Lanzafame: You can remove the link and still tell the people to consult the New York State Paid Family Leave Act and HR. That would be informative.

S. Malachowsky HR does have a paternal and maternity leave section on their site.

L. Williams: This became an issue on FAC, and HR was included in those conversations to ensure this language was there, so faculty wouldn't have to go back and forth to understand what their rights were, especially in light of this modification policy. So I think if there are changes, the links are actually always current because they are updated.

S. Malachowsky: The HR policy does include all this information, links, phone numbers, etc. and they maintain that, so if your motion is to say 'contact HR', we could potentially include a hyperlink to that page within HR which should be relatively persistent, it's the parental maternity leave page within HR.

T. Brown: There are two links, both of which take you to different sections of the HR site.

Inaudible.

M. Ruhling: Point of order: we don't have the wording of the change for Christine's motion so we should work towards the wording of the change, second the motion and then continue discussion on it.

R. Zanibbi: The original motion was to vote on both changes. Can we split the motion and first vote on the motion to restore the missing language?

H. Ghazle: I'm willing to withdraw the motion and keep the current language as is as long as I have assurance that these things are updated by HR.

Inaudible..

S. Malachowsky: So the current version is to only take out the sentence that begins with: 'Claims should be open 30 days, and for information on other state leaves contact Prudential.' Everything else would remain as is.

Inaudible

M. Ruhling: In that case, I withdraw my motion

S. Malachowsky: So we'll vote on the language as it is.

Motion: to add the missing language and adopt the proposed change to Policy E33.1, as this is indicated in the red-line document

Passed: 31:0:1

Policy E33.1 Presentation

Policy E33.1 Edits

Agenda Item No. 10: Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) Reaccreditation; L. Buckley (1:32)

I want to give you a quick update on the re-accreditation process. Reaccreditation is something we do every 8 to 10 years. The steering committee is led by Chris Licata, myself and Risa Robinson and there are 15 other members representing various constituencies across campus, both staff & faculty. Our self study design was approved in August after Dr. McKitrick, Middle States VP for Field Relations, visited us. Recently a new VP was assigned to us, Bobby Nathan and we're moving ahead with the next phase of the Self Study. We want to be reflective about strengths and weaknesses. We need to highlight RIT's

distinctiveness, demonstrate compliance with the seven standards, examine three institutional priorities and discuss opportunities for improvement.

We have seven working groups, one for each of the standards, and an eighth group focusing on organizing our evidence, in total 59 faculty and staff in addition to the steering committee. The working groups have co-chairs established and they are currently working on collecting evidence. Then we have to work toward developing a narrative for each one of those standards. The groups are as follows:

#1 Mission & Goals (co-chairs: Enid Cardinal & Sophie Gublo-Jantzen); #2 Ethics & Integrity (co-chairs: Joe Johnston & Patrick Didas); #3 Design & Delivery of Student Learning Experience (co-chairs: Sarah Thompson & Christie Leone); #4 Support of Student Experience (co-chairs: Courtney Bringley & Catherine Mahrt-Washington); #5 Education Effectiveness Experience (co-chairs: Leah Bradley & Lauren Hall); #6 Planning, Resources & Institutional Improvement (co-chairs: Maya Temperley & Jennifer Maltby); #7 Governance, Leadership & Administration (co-chairs: Lisa Chase & Matthew Lynn); #8 Evidence Inventory (co-chairs: Nilay Sapio & Leah Bradley).

I want to talk a little bit about the new layer that was added this year, the three institutional priorities. We are required to develop questions or lines of inquiry associated with each of them. The first two, student success and research were unanimous choices of each of the governance bodies, with community well-being being the overwhelming choice for the third. We have established an affiliate group for each priority:. Megan Yaros is chairing the Student Success group, Diane Slusarski Research and Sara Engel, Community Well-Being.

We need to coordinate this effort with the development of the new Strategic Plan, and the arrival of a new President. We want to capitalize on our efforts where they overlap, so we will be sharing information. This slide shows the timeline we're looking at. We won't be finished with re-accreditation until over a year from now. In the spring of 2026, a team from Middle States will make a site visit after which the team makes a recommendation on reaccreditation.

J. Hardin: What are the impacts of the various grades we might get, like if we got a C instead of a B.

L. Buckley: That's a good question. There are levels of accreditation. And I'll let Chris talk about that.

S. Aldersley: I'm wondering which group is looking at the COACHE results from last fall, that we heard about in the spring? How are the COACHE results, which were not positive in many ways, being factored into the self study?

L. Buckley: There's at least one working group that is looking at them. Maybe more than one. So they are incorporating it. And, by the way, if you're ever suffering from insomnia, you can go to the Middle States site and see criteria for each standard. They are loaded with questions and examples of what we have to look at. We can't hide anything. It has to be addressed.

S. Aldersley: Which group is looking at it?

MSCHE Presentation

Agenda Item No. 11: New Business; S. Malachowsky (1:49)
S. Malachowsky: We're actually almost out of time. We have two minutes left for New Business if there is any. There was none.

Agenda Item No. 12: Adjournment; S. Malachowsky (1:49)

Attendance 11/7/2024

Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended	Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended
Adrion, Amy	ALT CAD Senator	X	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	Excused	Lee, James	ALT CET Senator	
Beck, Makini	ALT SOIS Senator		Malachowsky, Samuel	Vice Chair/ GCCIS Senator	X
Boedo, Stephen	ALT KGCOE Senator		McCalley, Carmody	ALT COS Senator	X
Brady, Kathleen	ALT NTID Senator	X	McLaren, Amy	CAD Senator	
Brown, Tamaira	Senate Coordinator	X	Newman, Atia	Chair/CAD Senator	Excused
Capps, John	CLA Senator	Excused	Newman, Christian	GCCIS Senator	
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	X
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	
David, Prabu	Provost	Excused	Reinicke, Bryan	ALT SCB Senator	
Davis, Stacey	NTID Senator	X	Ross, Annemarie	NTID Senator	Excused
Deese, Franklin	CAD Senator	X	Ruhling, Michael	CLA Senator	X
Dell, Betsy	CET Senator	Excused	Sanders, Cynthia	ALT NTID Senator	
DiRisio, Keli	CAD Senator	Excused	Shaaban, Muhammad	ALT KGCOE Senator	
Eddingsaas, Nathan	COS Senator		Song, Qian	SCB Senator	X
Fillip, Carol	ALT CAD Senator		Staff Council Rep	Hogan, Georgeanne	X
Ghazle, Hamad	Operations Officer/CHST Senator	X	Student Government Rep	Joshua Anderson	X

Ghoneim, Hany	ALT KGCOE Senator		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	
Kray, Christine	CLA Senator	X	Worrell, Tracy	ALT CLA Senator	X
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: N/A