CALL TO ORDER: 12:08 p.m.

COMMUNICATION OFFICER'S REPORT: Minutes of November 3, 2011 were approved unanimously.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT
The executive committee wished everyone well on grading and finals.

PROPOSALS

CALENDAR 2013-2014
President Destler was given the floor and distributed a memo today dated February 10, 2010, subject being “Change in RIT’s Academic Calendar from Quarters to Semesters”. The president reported that he did meet with the Academic Senate executive committee per calendar. The memo stated that there would be 30 weeks of instruction during the academic year, and this was intended as a guideline for conversion. The 14-week model was looked at, having one week longer summer session and flexible days during the year, having M/W/F to meet other goals. He said he was not supportive of this as there would be a loss of 10 instructional days, which is equivalent to two months of instruction. He said increased time does increase student learning outcomes. For today’s meeting he did encourage proposed models 1 and 2, given the difficulties of Option 0. All three models were discussed at the last senate meeting and are posted on the senate’s DML site: http://hdl.handle.net/1850/14255

Discussion and Q&A ensued.

Q: Is the 5-day period for finals necessary based on the number of finals?
   A: The ideal is one final per day.

Q: Could you do a 4-day period?
   A: J. Loffredo: The exam schedule published before courses are done. It is difficult given some of the issues and we’ve done well on 4.5 days. We could work at it.
   Provost: None of our comparison class institutions have less than 5 days.

L. Lawley: We have not addressed students not being able to take a full load over the summer given the co-op model. This affects graduation and could we remove the mini-semester and have a full summer?
   A: The President said we don’t really gain that in 14 weeks, and we will have to make this a part of student advising. The mini-semester does shorten the summer but there are significant advantages to having a mini-semester and is worth the effort to try it. In the mini-semester faculty are expected to be working, but if asked to teach they will be “on load” or an ‘overpay’ for faculty and have less to teach later. Additionally, there are currently very few students who take a full load in the summer (where you could take 4 courses not 5). Some units have created curricula well above the 120/123 credit hours – up to 130. This is what is driving the issue, not the 10-week summer. Some faculty have creative curricula and are pushing 130 semester hours and faculty put their own limits on students.

Comment: L. Lawley: Given that we have designed that curriculum, and the Institute has agreed to this curriculum, and they are comparable to the current degrees, is it not in fact the case that this will make it more difficult for students who take co-op during the academic year and then need to take summer courses
that it will take longer?
Response: President Destler said he imagines that could be true. Currently very few students take a full load during the summer. The could take a course online or during the mini-mester. It’s up to the students as there are different models.

Q: M. Richmond: During the mini-mester doesn’t that add additional support with regard to faculty need and have the colleges been told how much extra support would be needed?
A: President Destler said revenue generated during the mini-mester would go to the department and there would be no loss.

Q: B. Barbato: Regarding academic rigor, have you talked to faculty about this over the last two years?
A: President Destler said he discussed this with the executive committee.

Q: C. Hull: My proposed shorter semester with longer class sessions has not been addressed yet. Should you have five more minutes per course?
A: The president said it got more complicated and caused a lot of chaos as we looked at this. More classes in shorter duration are better. There is a fairly substantial body of educational literature that indicate more classes of shorter duration are more effective, but there are obviously exceptions to this based on immersion.

Comment: C. Hull said a lot of faculty have exercises that express longer than 50 minutes.
Response: The President said he is not dictating how long classes have to be.

Q: O. Palacio: The model presented at the last senate meeting regarding dividing classes M/W, T/Th, F – how would that work with any of these models? He said this is a concern with his college as they do critiquing and are we going to break up classes into three modules? The M/W model is not relevant to us; we at CIAS need the flexibility to schedule studio/critique classes on three hour blocks, not divided into sections such as M/W, MWF or T/Th.
A: President Destler said he is not prescribing the class scheduling model. I would have assumed this would have occurred during the curricular re-design process.
Response: The Provost said he has asked the registrar to start modeling various individual models and how they could integrate, but that is a separate discussion from the overall calendar. You have my commitment to bring back different models on this.

Q: Are there any models of universities/colleges that have a 16-week semester and a mini-mester?
A: Maryland has it.

Q: E. Saber: He asked about the mini-mester and envisions this to being a catch-up for students (retakes) and is a good idea. If you were to offer a brand new course, doesn’t that have less rigor? The mini-mester seems to work for falling behind but not for new courses. Not sure if it addresses the issue of ME and similar curriculum with reduced summer offerings.
A: Good question. Not every course could be done this way, but some would be good candidates and sometimes even a better option. Language classes would be one example.

Q: E. Saber: Per faculty load, when a faculty member teaches in the mini-mester, there would be a need for additional resources, and has the University given departments additional revenue for this to compensate for the load?
A: The President said additional tuition will be additional resources to the department
Q: So additional teaching means additional resources?
A: Yes.

The Provost said one of the charges given to Lynn’s taskforce was to craft new financial models for the mini-mester and summer, benchmarked against all other institutions. He said he just got the report and will be taking it to the Deans and discuss this with the President and Dr. Watters to what is the process. A revenue sharing model with departments is the most effective way to get them to buy into a robust summer and the mini-mester.

Q: M. Laver: How feasible is it once the model is set to change the model once we set course and have begun implementation? Is it costly?
A: The President suggested that we make a good faith effort to implement this calendar for a 3-year period and assess whether it worked, whether my arguments carried the day, or if we need to adjust the mini-mester/summer. The Provost added, but not quarters, correct? The President responded, right!

Q: J. Voelkel: Speaking of the mini-mester, this is an entrepreneurial idea and is it reasonable that a 1 or 2 credit course could be offered in the mini-mester and possibly 2 credit courses in the summer?
A: The President said you could certainly explore those options and hopefully not too complicated. There are special topic courses you could offer during the mini-mester for those student interested.

Q: Voelkel: Was there consideration for doing 11+1 instead of 10+1 in the summer? The 14-week calendar is not enough time.

A: The President said they looked at the 14-week calendar. The 11+1 assumes a 14-week calendar but is not possible. He said he was not in favor of this as it sacrifices too much class time.

Q: Have you talked with KGCOE per what the affect would be for co-ops taken in the summer.

A: The President said they have had discussions with KGCOE and the opportunities may be different. Right now there are people that double block two co-ops (20 weeks), and they might double block with a co-op and even be there longer. Semesters would allow for 25 weeks. For co-op there would be a shorter block in the summer. The options are just different with some advantages and disadvantages.

Comment: J. Voelkl: After three years we do need to see what is working and I would urge you to use professional statisticians to look at that data.

Response: The President agreed with this.

C. Hull commented on the summer start and end times, and how much space is between this and the semesters? At Yale when he taught in the summer it was tight.

Response: The Provost said there will be a one-week break to accommodate academic changeover. He said they felt that they needed those kind of buffers for all that staff activity that occurs,

R. Hira said Maryland for their 2013-2014 calendar starts a week later, has 14 weeks plus finals and 71 instructional days.

Response: The President said he didn’t know what the calendar was presently, only what it used to be when he was there.

Q: J. Mozrall said in ME 15-20% of the credit hours are generated in the summer. You mentioned one viable option for students who have to take courses over the summer and can’t take a full load, could also take a course in intersession. Assuming they follow a 4-course model in the summer, would the cost of tuition, room and board in the intersession and summer equal one semester?

A: The President said he has not looked at this issue. This is kind of a self-made problem for me, since the programs are well above the NYS minimum of 120 credit hours.

J. Mozrall: In order to maintain the same level of rigor in the programs, the semester-based curricula were designed to have a similar number of credit hours as what is found in the quarter-based curricula. The current quarter-based ME curriculum is 195 credit hours and is moving to 129 credit hours under semesters. This is a comparable curricular design in terms of credit hours (195Q.Cr.)(2/3) = 130 SCr.).

President’s response: Yes and no.

The Provost said from the tuition perspective we need to understand different financial models and those decisions have not yet been made. We do want to be aggressive in driving credit hours into those opportunities.

J. Mozrall: I just want to make sure students following different tracks aren’t put at an economic disadvantage.

Provost: I think that is a determining principle.

Comment: President Destler said an interesting dynamic is at work which we need to understand. We are going from a 30-week academic year presently to a 30-week academic year with semesters, but we’re expecting a much higher utilization in the summer, which seems odd. The number of students taking courses in the summer is not high.

Response: J. Mozrall said students won’t be able to take a full load in the summer. President Destler said a lot of places have made co-op optional, which I am totally against. Yet I am interested in models such as taking courses online while on co-op etc.

Response: J. Mozrall said, in the case of alternative models, such as on-line courses, would students having to follow this path also not be put on an economic disadvantage?

The chair thanked President Destler and moved on to discuss further the calendar options.

The motion that was tabled at the 11/03/2011 Academic Senate meeting was put back on the table and it reads as follows:
“The Academic Senate recommends that the President and the Calendar Committee reconsider the assumption of equating academic rigor with calendar length and put on the table for consideration semester models that include a 70-day-instruction option.”

Discussion and Q&A.

-ln B. Barbato spoke in favor of the motion and said there has to be input from the faculty on the notion of academic rigor. This should have been discussed previously, but it cannot be ignored now and needs to be addressed. At some point a calendar requires trade-offs and choices. One of the choices that is here makes reading days and review a difficult undertaking. Reading days are just as important for academic rigor and this is a legitimate concern.

-ln L. Lawley: It’s been made clear that we won’t get a 70-day calendar, but I still feel it’s important to send the message that the consideration should have been done. She noted that the President and Provost both said that how we structure our classes in 73 or 75 days is up to us. She said she intends to vote for the 73-day option.

-ln M. Richmond: He said the courses he teaches meet four times a week for one full year for 30 weeks and he said he would not be able to prepare students for downstream course if the calendar is shortened.

-ln J. Voelkel: The president has stated that he will not support the other model (70 days) and can that go on record in the minutes.

-ln C. Hull: It was asked if we could entertain modifications of the proposal after the vote.

Question was called on the motion that was taken off the table at the last senate meeting. B. Barbato called for a secret handwritten ballot.

Motion carried with 15 Yes, 11 No, 4 Abstentions.

V. Serravallo moved to table the vote on the three calendar options and it was seconded by C. Lundgren. L. Lawley said we should not table but make a recommendation per these options. M. Kotlarchyk wished to add a friendly amendment to voting for the options that would read: “Given the options presented to us, we would be happy to entertain additional options.” Later he asked to remove this friendly amendment.

Motion to table the vote on the calendar options (Original, Option 1, Option 2) did not carry with 4 Yes, 26 No and 0 Abstentions.

It was pointed out by M. Laver that we have already had the discussion on the calendar options and called the question to vote on all three calendar options.

B. Barbato recommended a friendly amendment to the motion of endorsing one of the three options and it reads as follows: “…with the caveat that the academic senate does endorse the consideration of other calendar models.”

The Provost said he had an alternative motion and he said he could withdraw this and substitute it for the motion to vote for one of the three proposals with the caveat included (friendly amendment).

The vote carried unanimously with one abstention, to substitute the original motion for one of the three calendar proposals as amended.

Discussion.

-ln M-B. Cooper: The caveat puts all the calendars back in play.

-ln B. Barbato: The amendment is improving what is on the floor, but now we wish we had the choice of other proposals. We need to have the voice of the faculty heard.

-ln The Provost approved the friendly amendment.
A written ballot was taken to vote on one of the three calendar options, prioritizing them in the order they are preferred. The outcome of prioritizing the options was:

**Original Calendar - 14 votes**
**Option 1 – 4 votes**
**Option 2 -15 votes**

The Academic Senate endorses Option 2, 2013-2014 calendar, with the caveat that the Academic Senate does endorse the consideration of other calendar models.

**STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE CHARGE**
This agenda item was deferred due to time constraints.

- Develop a set of recommendations to the Senate in order to provide more clarity as to expectations for academic conduct, collegiality, and civility.

- Investigate whether or not faculty are provided with adequate resources to provide special accommodations to student populations needing such accommodations.

- Determine whether or not a deadline and statute of limitations should be established for grade disputes. Recommend policy changes where appropriate.

**CHARGE FOR SENATE TASKFORCE ON ONLINE STUDENT EVALUATIONS**
This agenda item was deferred due to time constraints.

OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT: 1:50 p.m.