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1. Determine whether revisions to Policy D7: Foreign Travel Programs are necessary, and if so, work with the appropriate offices on campus to suggest such revisions.

2. In conjunction with Graduate Council and ICC, review Policy D2 and D12 with an eye to:
   a. clarifying language related to amount of credit able to be transferred from a completed associate degree
   b. clarifying language related to amount of credit able to be transferred from a completed associate degree
   c. examining whether there should be a threshold for the number of minimum credits that should be taken at RIT in order for an RIT degree to be awarded.

1. Determine if there is any faculty input into the evaluation of the admissions office. Included in this would be more transparency in how students are selected for admission, and how the promotional materials are developed, especially in light of RIT strengths in the area of design.
4. Propose modifications of D8 and D18 in light of last year’s experience in implementation. Specifically look to better coordinate both policies and to clean up processes that have shown to be problematic in practice.

5. Exercise oversight of the Honors Program, particularly in light of the new “core curriculum” being implemented this year, and report back to Senate towards the end of the year.

6. Following – up on the comments of the recent Honors program external reviewer Dr. Spurrier that Honors Admissions being soley determined by EMCS “is a marked departure from other colleges and universities,” examine whether this should continue, is broader input from faculty and administration needed, and is the current procedure satisfactory?

7. The AAC will take up the creation of an affiliation agreement which will determine the composition and rules of engagement for faculty who wish to work in one of the RIT Research Centers of Excellence.
   - RIT has designated research centers of excellence that must meet certain performance metrics in order to receive a portion of overhead return to meet their operating needs.
   - Performance metrics are based upon the performance of the faculty who are affiliated with the center.
   - We need to clarify who is affiliated with these centers, what will be required of an affiliate and what are their rights and privileges and their duties and responsibilities.
   - There is not a uniformed standard across campus and would like the committee to take charge of developing one.
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1. D.07 Foreign Travel Policies

AAC Committee Charge:

*Determine whether revisions to Policy D7: Foreign Travel Programs are necessary, and if so, work with the appropriate offices on campus to suggest such revisions.*

Sub–committee: William Evans, Raluca Felea (in consultation with Jim Myers, Associate Provost for International Education and Global Programs)
D07.0 FOREIGN TRAVEL PROGRAMS

The purpose of this policy is to devise a framework that will permit an orderly development of foreign travel programs. Proper academic planning regarding credit to be granted, if any, and the extent of the university’s liability must be clarified before any faculty or active students conduct a foreign travel program.

A. Faculty or students contemplating leading a group which will involve receiving academic credit must consult the dean of their respective college. If the travel does not involve receiving academic credit, the vice president for Student Affairs must be consulted. Six months in advance of date of departure would be a minimum lead time for necessary planning.

B. The dean of the college will review the feasibility of the academic program with respect to such factors as course content and whether credit is to be granted. If credit for the trip is deemed feasible, the dean will follow university policy and procedure regarding necessary approvals through established curriculum committees or through independent study procedure as appropriate.

C. The dean will also assign someone in the college responsibility for coordination of academic details.

D. Planning for all travel programs will need to be communicated to the University’s offices of the Registrar and of Finance and Administration in order to establish proper records, financial accounts, tuition charges and contractual arrangements.

E. Documents for promotion of programs should be cleared in advance with the appropriate dean, and shall set forth as clearly as practicable the responsibilities of the university, of the student and of third parties.

Responsible Office:

Effective Date:
Approved September 9, 1970

Policy History:
Edited August 2010
D07.0 FOREIGN TRAVEL PROGRAMS

The purpose of this policy is to devise a framework that will permit development of high quality international education and learning abroad programs. Proper academic planning regarding credit to be granted, if any, and the extent of the university’s potential liability must be clarified before any faculty or active students conduct a learning abroad program.

A. Faculty or students contemplating leading a group which will involve receiving academic credit or travel associated with international research, or travel associated with a credit-bearing course, must consult the dean of their respective college, or their designated representatives, and the Office of International Education and Global Programs. If the travel does not involve receiving academic credit, the vice president for Student Affairs must be consulted. Six months in advance of departure would be a minimum lead time for necessary planning.

B. The dean of the college, or their designated representatives, will review the feasibility of the academic program with respect to each factor as course content and whether credit is to be granted. If credit for the trip is deemed feasible, the dean will either approve or disapprove through established curriculum committees or through independent study procedure as appropriate, and then refer the program to the Office of International Education and Global Programs for review for consistency with university policy and program planning procedures.

C. The dean will also assign someone in the college responsibility for coordination of academic details.

D. Office of International Education and Global Programs will coordinate all travel programs and will be responsible for the University’s offices of the Registrar and of Finance and Administration to establish proper records, financial accounts, tuition charges and contractual arrangements.

Responsible Office:
Effective Date:
Policy History:
Edited August 2010

D07.0 INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND LEARNING ABROAD

The purpose of this policy is to devise a framework that will permit development of high quality international education and learning abroad programs. Proper academic planning regarding credit to be granted, if any, and the extent of the university’s potential liability must be clarified before any faculty or active students conduct a learning abroad program.

Academic responsibilities with the dean

A. Faculty or students contemplating leading a group which will involve receiving academic credit or travel associated with international research, or travel associated with a credit-bearing course, must consult the dean of their respective college, or their designated representatives, and the Office of International Education and Global Programs. If the travel does not involve receiving academic credit, the vice president for Student Affairs must be consulted. Six months in advance of departure would be a minimum lead time for necessary planning.

B. The dean of the college, or their designated representatives, will review the feasibility of the academic program with respect to each factor as course content and whether credit is to be granted. If credit for the trip is deemed feasible, the dean will either approve or disapprove through established curriculum committees or through independent study procedure as appropriate, and then refer the program to the Office of International Education and Global Programs for review for consistency with university policy and program planning procedures.

C. The dean will also assign someone in the college responsibility for coordination of academic details.

Logistic responsibilities with the Office of International Education and Global Programs

D. Office of International Education and Global Programs will coordinate all travel programs and will communicate with the University’s offices of the Registrar and of Finance and Administration to establish proper records, financial accounts, tuition charges and contractual arrangements.
D07.0 INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND LEARNING ABROAD

The purpose of this policy is to devise a framework that will permit development of high quality international education and learning abroad programs. Proper academic planning regarding credit to be granted, if any, and the extent of the university's potential liability must be clarified before any faculty or active students conduct a learning abroad program.

Academic responsibilities with the dean

A. Faculty or students contemplating leading a group which will involve receiving academic credit; or, travel associated with international research; or, travel associated with a credit bearing course, must consult the dean of their respective college, or their designated representatives, and the Office of International Education and Global Programs. If the travel does not involve receiving academic credit, the vice president for Student Affairs must be consulted. Six months in advance of date of departure would be a minimum lead time for necessary planning.

B. The dean of the college, or their designated representatives, will review the feasibility of the academic program with respect to such factors as course content and whether credit is to be granted. If credit for the trip is deemed feasible, the dean will attain necessary approvals through established curriculum committees, or through independent study procedure as appropriate, and then refer the program to the Office of International Education and Global Programs for review for consistency with university policy and program planning procedures.

C. The dean will also assign someone in the college responsibility for coordination of academic details.

Logistic responsibilities with the Office of International Education and Global Programs

D. Office of International Education and Global Programs will coordinate all travel programs and will communicate with the University's offices of the Registrar and of Finance and Administration to establish proper records, financial accounts, tuition charges and contractual arrangements.

E. Documents for promotion of programs should be cleared in advance with the Office of International Education and Global programs in conjunction with the appropriate dean, and shall set forth as clearly as practicable the responsibilities of the university, of the student and of third parties.

Responsible Office:
Effective Date:
Approved September 9, 1970
Policy History:
Edited August 2010
3. Admissions Office

AAC Committee Charge:

*Determine if there is any faculty input into the evaluation of the admissions office. Included in this would be more transparency in how students are selected for admission, and how the promotional materials are developed, especially in light of RIT strengths in the area of design.*

Sub-committee: P. Venkataraman, Hossein Shahmohammad, Joyce Hertzson (in consultation with Ed Lincoln)
• Invited Ed Lincoln to meet with the full committee

Presentation on the current procedures for undergraduate admissions
5. + 6. Honors Program

AAC Committee Charge:

5. *Exercise oversight of the Honors Program, particularly in light of the new “core curriculum” being implemented this year, and report back to Senate towards the end of the year.*

6. *Following – up on the comments of the recent Honors program external reviewer Dr. Spurrier that Honors Admissions being solely determined by EMCS “is a marked departure from other colleges and universities,” examine whether this should continue, is broader input from faculty and administration needed, and is the current procedure satisfactory?*

- Sub-committee: P. Venkataraman, William Evans, (in consultation with Dr. Danielle Smith, Director of Honors Program)
To follow up on these and other charges Ed Lincoln visited with the AAC and explained the process for the selection of Honors students and pointed out that the charge may be incorrect. (Edward A. Lincoln, Assistant Vice President, Division of Enrollment Management and Career Services)

The process for the selection of the Honors student (according to Joyce this may only apply to the Stem disciplines)

**Step 1.** UG Admissions reviews all applications (criteria: GPA, rank, SAT, rigor, honor, IB, AP, high school history, leadership, entrepreneurship) and flags honors students

Approximately
- 18,000 applications
- 10,280 admissions
- Sorted by college
- Sorted by records
- 839 (8%) selected for Honors, decided by Mr. Lincoln and Danielle Smith (Honor’s Program Director)
Step 2. Honors list sent to **Honors advocate** in each college.

- **Advocates** can review the list
- **Advocates can share the list with the faculty in the college and invite suggestions**
- *(This is where Faculty and College Administration currently participate by providing input and influencing selection)*
- (Not sure if this can lead to increase/decrease in the number of Honors student selected for the college)
- Advocates prepare invitation to students admitted to the Honors program

Step 3. **Advocates** contact students through “Phone Power”

Step 4. **Advocates** provide feedback

It appears that the each college can influence selection through the Honors advocate. The Honors advocate is part of the College administration?

Can we recommend the Honors advocate makes a formal effort to communicate the list and assessment of the selected students with the department heads and college faculty as a first step to meeting the charges?
After reviewing the previous assessment, the AAC made the following recommendations:

1. Advocates shall share the list with the faculty in the college and invite suggestions

2. AAC feels that there should be more involvement of faculty prior to the list being sent to the college advocates

3. There should be an annual conversation to set the criteria for Honors selection

4. The Honors Curriculum Committee can lead such a conversation and determine selection criteria based on College input.

5. The AAC would like for each college to have a similar percentage of Honors students.

The recommendations were sent to Dr. Smith, who met again with the AAC to discuss and consider the recommendations.
7. Research Centers of Excellence

AAC Committee Charge:

The AAC will take up the creation of an affiliation agreement which will determine the composition and rules of engagement for faculty who wish to work in one of the RIT Research Centers of Excellence.

- RIT has designated research centers of excellence that must meet certain performance metrics in order to receive a portion of overhead return to meet their operating needs.
- Performance metrics are based upon the performance of the faculty who are affiliated with the center.
- We need to clarify who is affiliated with these centers, what will be required of an affiliate and what are their rights and privileges and their duties and responsibilities.
- There is not a uniformed standard across campus and would like the committee to take charge of developing one.

• Sub-committee: Callie Babbitt, Benjamin Lawrance (in consultation with Dr. Ryne Raffaelle)
• Defined by a series of memos from the Provost
• “Overhead return policy” – get a share of recovered overhead
  What would normally go to Ryne’s office now goes to Centers, Office of Research receiving only 3%
• Seven Centers, MAGIC and CASTLE probationary, need to meet criteria:
  - Spend over ½ million/year
  - Have permanent staff
  - Shared research facilities

Issues:
• Centers rolled out differently and over time
• Some were marriages of convenience
• Some have charters
• Some had a falling-out
Challenges:

• New faculty wanting in. Problems with POWs and College relationships
• Problems with who gets credit
• Academic freedom issues when Deans refuse to work with Centers or to sign–off on grants
• Need to revise financial return policy
• Need affiliation agreement, which is difficult without a policy on research and research centers

Affiliation agreement written in lieu of a policy.
Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT)
Research Center of Excellence / Major Research Laboratory

Affiliation Agreement

Preamble. A RIT Designated Research Center/Laboratory is normally a program with a well-defined research focus, involving multiple externally-funded projects from multiple principal investigators (Pis) and support and/or research staff. Such research centers or laboratories are defined via RIT policy in terms of their research expenditures, as follows: “The minimum amount of annual expenditures recorded on externally-funded projects housed within the research center/lab, including capital, must average at least $5M per year in total expenditures for a period of at least the past two consecutive years” (http://www.rit.edu/research/srs/grantsmgmt/Recovered_FA_Return.htm). However, a need exists to formalize a policy that defines membership to such a research center or laboratory. This is necessary to (i) clarify a researcher’s involvement in context of their plan of work (POW) and thus enable a researcher to formally claim affiliation to such a Center/Laboratory, (ii) enable a Center/Laboratory to officially recognize and utilize researcher affiliations, and (iii) determine how the facilities and administration (F&A) overhead return to colleges, departments, center/laboratories, and PIs should be distributed.

The following core principles are accepted:

a. A member of a Center/Laboratory is someone who (i) forms an integral part of that Center/Laboratory’s core activities and (ii) will make regular use of Center/Laboratory resources, e.g., labs, equipment, project management staff, etc.

b. Membership needs to be approved by the Center/Laboratory members and described in the center’s plan of work (POW), as approved by the researcher’s department head. This approach needs to support the concept of academic freedom by allowing a faculty member to associate with any Center/Laboratory towards increased collaboration.

c. A researcher can belong to more than one Center/Laboratory (primary membership), with a designated primary Center/Laboratory, only for Center/Laboratory overhead distribution purposes.

d. Any researcher can request a project affiliation with a Center/Laboratory on a per-project basis, irrespective of membership status, where such a person may use resources specific to that Center/Laboratory.

The following actions are required to better reflect fair access to Center/Laboratory resources and distribution of F&A overhead return:

1. Revise the proposal routing form (PRF) to reflect these changes:
a. A project could be affiliated with a Center/Laboratory, even if the researcher is not affiliated with that Center/Laboratory; this will be dictated by the resources needed to execute the project, i.e., the required resources might be specific to a Center/Laboratory. In that case, the Center/Lab Director will need to sign the PRF to acknowledge the use of their facilities.

2. Change the F&A distribution policy to reflect these changes:
   a. Centers/Laboratories can receive F&A distribution (20%) on any affiliated project, i.e., when a Center/Laboratory affiliation on the PRF is checked, irrespective of primary membership status.
   b. Such a distribution can be split across Centers/Laboratories, depending on how the relevant Center/Laboratory resources are used.

3. Establish a generic Research Center of Excellence / Major Research Laboratory affiliation agreement, which is the main purpose of this document (see below).
Generic Research Center of Excellence / Major Research Laboratory

Affiliation Agreement

I am choosing to formally affiliate with [Research Center]. I am aware that the [Insert Research Center / Major Laboratory name here] functions as a program with a well-defined research focus area, involving multiple externally-funded projects from multiple principal investigators (PIs) and support and/or research staff. Specifically, it works to provide both research support and coordination towards the common objectives that define the Center/Laboratory. Such Centers/Laboratories (i) are typically organic, i.e., they consist of like-minded researchers that share a common research theme or interest and (ii) are typically best positioned towards maximization of student benefit in terms of scholarly activities. The [Insert Research Center / Major Laboratory name here] seeks to engage a wide variety of faculty, staff, students, and partners to promote cross- and multi-disciplinary collaboration wherever and whenever possible. In choosing to affiliate, I acknowledge the following:

a. In choosing to affiliate, I agree that at least a portion of my scholarly activity is aligned with the work performed at [insert Research Center / Major Laboratory name here] and that I will coordinate with the other members of the Center/Laboratory to identify strategic projects, collaborations, and research activities that are mutually beneficial to both my academic career and Center/Laboratory advancement.

b. My affiliation and its associated description will be discussed with and approved by my department head, as part of my overall plan of work.

c. I acknowledge that I can only claim primary membership to one Center/Laboratory, as specified in my POW, with the associated overhead cost (F&A) redistribution implications. However, I can (i) belong to more than one Center/Laboratory and (ii) amend said overhead cost redistribution on a per-project basis, should that project make use of Center/Laboratory resources other than the primary Center/Laboratory with which I am affiliated. Such a per-project Center/Laboratory affiliation and overhead cost distribution will be reflected via the relevant Proposal Routing Form.

d. Finally, I acknowledge that my affiliation with [Insert Research Center / Major Laboratory name here] may be subject to review by the Center/Laboratory director and members and is adherent to the policies of the Center/Laboratory, should such policies exist. The Center/Laboratory or I can terminate my affiliation with due cause through written notice to the affiliate or Center Director and my department head, respectively.

Affiliate Faculty, [Research Center]  Chair, Department of XXX

Director, [Research Center]  Dean, College of XXX

Effective Date

The AAC received the previous agreement after we met for the last time this year. Expected to bring this to Senate as a temporary step on route to real policy development.

Recommendations:
• Formation of a new Research Board to develop the policy
• Consider a Standing Committee of the Senate with representation from the Colleges
Propose modifications of D8 and D18 in light of last year’s experience in implementation. Specifically look to better coordinate both policies and to clean up processes that have shown to be problematic in practice.
To: Joyce Hertzson, Chair of Academic Affairs Committee  
From: Carol De Filippo  
Date: February 6, 2015  
Re: Progress Report on AAC Charge #4

AAC charge #4
Propose modifications of D8 and D18 in light of last year’s experience in implementation. Specifically look to better coordinate both policies and to cleanup processes that have shown to be problematic in practice.

I began with several areas of uncertainty:
1. Based on discussions during policy revision last year, I had expected a new charge to investigate reinstating language about faculty integrity that had been dropped from former D17. Rather, charge #4 is about coordinating and cleaning up D8 (student academic integrity) and D18 (student conduct process) if any overlap or glitches surfaced during the initial implementation last semester.
2. About D8: AAC had significant input during the revision of D8. It delineates a multi-step (and I would say tedious) process. The developers put forward a strong defense of their choices. I would not expect that any substantive changes would be entertained at this time.
3. **About D18**: Student Affairs applied their unique student focus to reworking this policy. I had an opportunity to offer recommendations prior to their bringing the final draft to Senate and noted a few major areas of concern and many other areas needing more careful wording. The *proposal presented to Senate incorporated no edits to the draft* and was approved as-is (perhaps because they had insufficient time or could not accommodate an alternative perspective).

I'm especially curious about an **Institute Appeals Board** that is described in part IX of D18. An IAB is referred to in other policies, as well, but the IAB in D18 appears to be relevant exclusively to Student Affairs issues, judging from its composition. Is that appropriate? This may be an area of interest for AAC to investigate. Is now the right time?

Through consultation with the liaison for charge #4, Chris Licata, I was referred to Heath Boice-Pardee to determine:
1. Is he (or others) currently re-examining these policies
2. Might we get an update on progress to date
3. Might AAC review any planned recommendations

Heath's response today was:
Chris is correct, however we have had some conflicts scheduling a time to meet. We are doing so and I can surely update you as we make progress. I am also happy to solicit your feedback as appropriate.
In the meantime, I am pursuing the issue that was left hanging last year: Faculty integrity. Following a suggestion from Chris, I am searching for information on how other institutions handle faculty integrity. Specifically, I'm collecting policy documents as I find them on the Internet, with attention to definition, premise, and process. Not every university addresses this issue. So far, among the 20 documents I have referenced, I noted 4 categories:

a. Those that elaborate on integrity only as it applies to student behavior (such as cheating and plagiarism), often while making a statement that academic integrity is a responsibility of all members of the university community!
b. Those that speak to expectations about faculty integrity but are silent on any process to be followed in cases of failure to meet expectations.
c. Those that specify expectations and process, usually with a focus on teaching and scholarship, to be handled through faculty and/or academic administrative channels.
d. Those that specify expectations and process, usually including federally prohibited behaviors (such as sexual harassment), to be handled through HR.

Policies that pertain to faculty variously apply only to the individual's behavior in teaching and with students, or may also extend to the individual's behavior regarding scholarship, the University, colleagues, and the community. Most policies reviewed thus far have separate documents pertaining to academic misconduct and issues involving discrimination and harassment.
Many policies begin with assertions about **academic freedoms** and "values," listing some combination of **ethics, integrity, honesty, respect, and fairness**. They then proceed to describe the faculty member's "**special responsibilities,**" each of which carries specific expectations and possibly unacceptable conduct.


From those ethical standards, lists of potential infraction are derived, as expressed in this quote from the policy of the University of California, a good example of many of the comprehensive policies I have read so far. [http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/_files/apm/apm-015.pdf](http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/_files/apm/apm-015.pdf)

**Types of Unacceptable Faculty Conduct.**
Derived from the Ethical Principles, these statements specify examples of types of unacceptable faculty behavior which are subject to University discipline **because, as stated in the introductory section to Part II, they are "not justified by the Ethical Principles'** and they 'significantly impair the University’s central functions as set forth in the Preamble.”
Special meeting 5/5/15

Invited guests: Heath Boise Pardee; Associate Vice-President of Student Affairs, Chair, Institute Appeals Board
Joe Johnston; Center for Student Conduct (in charge of D.18.)

Topic: Institute Appeals Board

Issue:
Policy references to an Institute Appeals Board (IAB) regarding academic matters seem inappropriately located (in a policy on student affairs) and incompletely specified
• A policy library search will incorrectly bring up D18.VI
• D18.IXA
Topic: Institute Appeals Board

Guest: Heath Boice-Pardee, Division of Student Affairs, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs and Community Development; Joe Johnston, Center for Student Conduct

The issue:
Policy references to an Institute Appeals Board (IAB) regarding academic matters seem inappropriately located (in a policy on student affairs) and incompletely specified.
- A policy library search will incorrectly bring up D18.VI.
- D18.IX.A: Seems to establish the IAB within the Student Code of Conduct.
- D18.IX.D: Places selection and training of IAB members within Division of Student Affairs.
- D8.VI: Refers to Associate Vice President for Student Affairs in regards to Academic Integrity Committee Hearings.
- D8.VII: Refers to an Academic Appeals Sub-Committee of the Institute Appeals Board, but does not specify who selects members of the IAB for this subcommittee.
- C9 Parking Appeals Board and C11 Policy with Respect to Demonstrations on Campus also refer to the IAB.

Today's objective:
Approve a motion to charge AAC with investigating the intended nature of the Institute Appeals Board, its functions and composition in current policy, and implications for proposing policy revisions with regard to appeals in academic matters.
Topic: AAC Charge #4 re D8 and D18

The issue:
AAC charge #4 was to "propose modifications to D8 and D18 in light of last year's experience in implementation."

It has been noted that both policies refer to instances of repeat offenses (D8) or continued or further violations (D18), but neither policy mentions a mechanism for monitoring such occurrences. Work has been initiated, but is not yet completed, within the Division of Student Affairs to secure a system to keep track of offenses and violations.

Additionally, neither policy clearly articulates who can recommend expulsion from a program and/or the university as a result of egregious violation of student conduct or academic integrity.

Today's objective:
Review progress to date and, if deemed appropriate given the progress, approve a motion to:
• Delay further revision of D8 and D18, and as appropriate:
• Charge AAC with reassessing D8 and D18 in AY2015-2016, in consultation with the Division of Student Affairs, regarding further revisions, to reflect needs that have become apparent since new processes were implemented as of May 2013
Topic: Faculty Integrity

The issue:
In the policy revision process, the purpose of D17 was changed to focus exclusively on grade disputes. That change also led to a loss of any reference to faculty integrity.

Today's objective:
• Determine committee consensus regarding the value of reinstating language on faculty integrity and, as appropriate:
• Charge next year's AAC to determine the scope of a statement on faculty integrity and where such a statement should appear (e.g., policy/guideline, university/college, existing/new – see links via "Examples" file, attached).
Concerns raised to AAC during meeting 10/7/2014:
1 - Faculty have a perception that travel budgets are two low to accomplish the mission of RIT (i.e. move to research).
2 - Faculty have a perception that RIT reimbursement plan for per diem expenses is too low.

There are 2 issues:
Travel budget adequacy (an Institute budget issue; not an AAC issue)
Travel reimbursement rate/cap policy. (an issue AAC can evaluate).

Not an Issue:
Airfare, hotel, and transportation are reimbursed based on actual (but reasonable, sometimes pre-approved or pre-estimated) expenses.

Travel reimbursement Policy:
Faculty believe expense reports are pre-filtered and reduced and that faculty are not submitting actual MIE expenses due to knowledge of travel caps. “The expense reports are understated.”
$25 per DIEM – no documentation required.
$44 cap for non Metro cities.
$54 cap for Metro cities.
Hotel and airfare is currently reimbursed based on actual expenses.
The $44 and $54 caps were not benchmarked against peer institutions and are” lower than GSA.”
The Issue & Question:
Should RIT consider GSA rates for MIE caps as a more representative /realistic cap or should RIT eliminate caps and reimburse employees for actual documented MIE expenses?

Recommendations:
Benchmark peer institutions on policies, processes, and rates used by our peer Institutions for MIE.
Keep existing MIE caps in place until benchmark process is complete but allow Dean’s authority to exceed caps for reasonable documented expenses.

ACC developed and unanimously supported a resolution. Before implementation, Lyn Kelly presented to ACC, the result of which is the new Travel Policy, implemented April 1, 2015.