

1 **Approved Standing Committee Charges AY2016-17 (Long Version)**

2 **Academic Affairs**

3 **AA 1 Re-evaluate operational recommendations 1 through 3 in the “Steps to Establishing an**
4 **Effective System of Student Ratings” report from 2013, in light of the research data and**
5 **information collected since the implementation of SmartEvals in 2013.**

6 Background:

7 In the spring term of 2013, the Academic Senate endorsed the report and recommendation of the
8 Academic Affairs Committee concerning implementation of a new student ratings of teaching
9 effectiveness system. A recommended research plan, included in the “Steps to Establishing an Effective
10 System of Student Ratings” report, asked the Provost to designate an individual or group of individuals
11 to research certain aspects of the use of the SmartEvals implementation and report on the results after
12 a period of three years. Suggested components of the research report included the following:

- 13 1. Monitor for drifts in average ratings attributable to implementation of the new system
14 compared to previous systems.
- 15 2. Monitor return rates and association with strategies to improve return rates.
- 16 3. Examine effects on ratings of variables associated with course, respondent, instructor, and
17 survey characteristics.
- 18 4. Track attitudes, perceptions, and practices regarding the purposes, uses, and value of student
19 input over time among students, faculty, and administrators.
 - 20 a. Track student opinion about the value of their input.
 - 21 b. Monitor faculty sentiment regarding benefit of student feedback.
 - 22 c. Monitor number of faculty supervisors who consult multiple types of evidence in
23 evaluating teaching effectiveness.
- 24 5. Observe documented changes in (and perceptions of) instructional effectiveness as associated
25 with the availability and use of professional development and application of student feedback.
- 26 6. Apply research findings in formulating recommendations for system modification following a 3-
27 year period of data gathering.

28 In addition, the Academic Senate endorsed the following four operational recommendations:

- 29 1. Use of the SmartEvals system to gather student ratings of teaching effectiveness in classroom
30 settings across the university.
- 31 2. Use of the same set of established core items across the university that were used in the pilot (α
32 = 0.93 from pilot).
- 33 3. Provide the online results for individual instructor (except for instructor-added items) only to
34 the instructor, instructor’s immediate supervisor and dean, the Provost, and tenure and
35 promotion committees per college guidelines.
- 36 4. Re-evaluate recommendations 1-3 after three years of data collection with SmartEvals.

37 Use of SmartEvals started in fall 2013. As per the Academic Senate’s recommendation, the three-year
38 period concluded in the spring of 2016. Therefore, the Provost requests that the Academic Senate put
39 this topic on its agenda for the 2016-2017 academic year by accepting the following charge:

40 “To fulfill its commitment to the university, the Academic Senate will re-evaluate operational
41 recommendations 1 through 3 above in light of the research data and information collected.”

42 **AA 2 Develop a best-practices white paper to encourage consistent grading, given the recent**
43 **introduction of +/- grades and the acceptance that inconsistencies exist with alignment of**
44 **letter grades to number grades.**

45 See Report from AA Committee from 2015-16, Recommendation 3, Charge 2: Charge the AY2016/17AAC
46 to develop a best-practices white paper to encourage consistent grading.

47 **AA 3.1 Count the number of cases at RIT each year where issues or disputes regarding academic**
48 **matters have not been resolved in the opinion of the petitioner (faculty, instructional staff,**
49 **graduate/undergraduate students), with the petitioner having applied thorough and good-**
50 **faith efforts, and exhausting all available informal and formal means to resolution. Hence**
51 **recommend whether or not a university policy should be drafted to establish a University**
52 **Academic Appeals Board (UAAB)**

53 Two surveys might be set up, one to petition faculty regarding faculty grievances and another to petition
54 students regarding grade appeals or academic misconduct. A good-faith survey may offer the option of
55 an anonymous response, but data from an anonymous survey may be less reliable. If the count is zero,
56 then it is expected that no further action (including charge AA 3.2) will be needed. The concern with this
57 charge is that the benefits of this policy will not be quantifiable or apparent.

58 **AA 3.2 Draft a university policy that establishes a University Academic Appeals Board (UAAB) to**
59 **address issues and disputes regarding academic matters that remain unresolved in the**
60 **opinion of the petitioner (faculty, instructional staff, graduate/undergraduate students), with**
61 **the petitioner having applied thorough and good-faith efforts, and exhausting all available**
62 **informal and formal means to resolution.**

63 The AAC 2015-16 committee made the following recommendation to the Senate. Charge the Academic
64 Affairs Committee of 2016-2017 to draft a university policy that establishes a University Academic
65 Appeals Board (UAAB) with consideration of the following recommended characteristics and functions:

- 66 • To consider issues and disputes regarding academic matters that remain unresolved in the
67 opinion of the petitioner (faculty, instructional staff, graduate/undergraduate students), having
68 applied thorough and good-faith efforts, and exhausting all available informal and formal means
69 to resolution.
- 70 • To stipulate acceptable grounds as the basis for such appeal.
- 71 • To establish a process for determining which cases have merit for entering the appeal process.

- 72 • To delineate a clear path that might lead to the appeal process and a definitive end-point for
73 terminating the appeal process and to articulate the relationship between the formal academic
74 appeals process and (a) informal mediation processes; and (b) student conduct cases that
75 involve academic matters.
- 76 • To describe composition of the UAAB, to include students and faculty or instructional staff from
77 each college; with consideration of populating the Board, in part, with the existing chairs of the
78 Academic Integrity Committees of the colleges.
- 79 • To describe the future policy for applying findings for the UAAB in setting “best policy” or juris
80 precedence for the university, based upon the outcome of appeals cases.
- 81 • Delineate reporting responsibilities and budgetary implications.

82 The committee may pursue strategies used by other peer universities to draft a university policy, if they
83 are available publicly.

84 At the AS presentation on May 12, 2016 the senators had further recommendations to the list above:

- 85 1. Collect information of how many cases will be appealed to the UAAB at RIT every year.
- 86 2. Make sure that the development of UAAB is integrated with other policies at RIT.

87 **AA 4 Develop a white paper describing a standing "Research Committee" (with an appropriate**
88 **name for the committee to be created) of Academic Senate, and bring forward the proposal as**
89 **a motion for Academic Senate, along with a list of initial charges and ongoing responsibilities.**

90 Recommendation 2 from Final report of AAC from 2015-2016 was to form a Standing “Research
91 Committee” of Academic Senate. The Academic Senate Executive Committee took this on board to make
92 this happen in 2016-2017. Chris Collison is championing this charge. Input from Ryne Raffaele would
93 also be valuable.

94 **AA 5 Review RIT Policy D 2.0 <https://www.rit.edu/academicaffairs/policiesmanual/d020> and**
95 **modify as needed in order to clarify/update the amount of transfer credit allowable for an**
96 **undergraduate degree.**

97
98 Background: Questions have arisen with respect to the amount of transfer credit a student can receive
99 for completion of a two year degree. Policy D 2, Section 1.A, last paragraph, indicates that “Under no
100 circumstances can a recipient of a two-year associate's degree from another institution receive more
101 than two years' transfer credit for that degree. However, applicable courses successfully completed
102 beyond the associate's degree at the upper division or equivalent level may transfer to the student's
103 intended program. RIT residency requirements must be satisfied. (See Policy D.12) degree”.

104
105 The question posed by department chairs is what the unit of measurement is here for deciding what
106 ‘two years’ transfer credit for the degree is in terms of actual semester credit hours. Most associate
107 degree programs are 60-66 credit hours. The way some interpret the language of this policy is that you
108 can only transfer in 30 credit hours. Another way to look at it would be to say:

109

110 Programs which require 120 semester hours for a bachelor’s degree may transfer at most 60 semester
111 hours from courses associated with the two-year associate’s degree. Programs which require more than
112 120 semester hours for a bachelor’s degree may transfer at most 50% of their program total from
113 courses associated with the two year associate degree. So, for example a program that requires 126
114 semester hours could transfer a maximum of 63 semester hours; a program that requires 129 semester
115 hours could transfer a maximum of 64 semester hours.
116 Review is needed to determine if a modification to current policy language is warranted in order to
117 provide clarity of intent and consistency in interpretation.
118

119 **AA 6 Revise Leave of Absence policy, D02.1 and propose modifications, as necessary.**
120 <https://www.rit.edu/academicaffairs/policiesmanual/d021>
121

122 Background: Revisions were made to the Student Leave of Absence Policy in 2012-2013 with the
123 understanding that Academic Affairs, through the University Advising Office and the Registrar’s Office,
124 would track and assess policy implementation and determine if additional modifications are needed. In
125 cooperation with the On-time Graduation Task Force, a working team was formed in Fall 2015 to assess
126 current implementation and satisfaction with the LOA policy. As part of its work, LOA policies and
127 procedures from other institutions were examined, including RIT benchmark schools. As a result, this
128 team has identified areas in the policy that need clarification and/or modification. In addition, through
129 this “process assessment” review, the team has also identified the need for a University withdrawal
130 policy. RIT does not currently have such a policy. This team comprised of Tina Sturgis, Sr. Associate
131 Registrar; Stephanie Bauschard, Associate Director of UAO; and Megan Fritts, Academic Adviser, GCCIS
132 are ready to propose policy modifications and present the rationale for these changes.
133

134 **AA 7 Review policies Misconduct in Research and Scholarship C02.0 (last review (LR) 1996),**
135 **Agreement for Commissioning of Educational Materials C03.1 (LR 2007), Policy for the**
136 **Protection of Human Subjects in Research C05.0 (LR 2011), Protocols for Academic Centers**
137 **D01.6 (LR 2008), according to policy B05.0.**

138 According to Policy B05.0, Development, Review, Approval, And Promulgation of University-Level
139 Policies, all policies are reviewed on a 5-year cycle with one of three outcomes:

- 140 1. Reviewed and affirmed – this means the policy was reviewed and there are no changes needed.
141 The policy history is updated to reflect this determination.
- 142 2. Reviewed with edits – this means the policy was reviewed and non-substantive edits are needed,
143 i.e., the name of a department needs to be corrected. The policy history is updated as appropriate.
- 144 3. Reviewed and revised – this means the policy was reviewed and substantive revisions are
145 approved. The policy is updated as appropriate.

146 **AA 8 Review policy Diplomas and Degrees Certification D13.0 (LR 2013) according to policy B05.0.**

147 According to Policy B05.0, Development, Review, Approval, And Promulgation of University-Level
148 Policies, all policies are reviewed on a 5-year cycle with one of three outcomes:

- 149 1. Reviewed and affirmed – this means the policy was reviewed and there are no changes needed.
150 The policy history is updated to reflect this determination.
- 151 2. Reviewed with edits – this means the policy was reviewed and non-substantive edits are needed,
152 i.e., the name of a department needs to be corrected. The policy history is updated as appropriate.

153 3. Reviewed and revised – this means the policy was reviewed and substantive revisions are
154 approved. The policy is updated as appropriate.

155 Regarding D13.0, while it is not required to be reviewed, there were many questions about it in 2015-16,
156 especially around its application to PhD degrees. Joe Hornak can provide more detail but the questions
157 were centered around i) who exactly is eligible to walk and when, ii) who can grant exceptions and
158 under what circumstances should exceptions be granted, iii) whether there should be consistent criteria
159 across the university or if colleges may determine exception criteria for their students and iv) whether
160 PhD students be allowed to walk before they defend their dissertations.

161
162 **AA 9 Review and summarize the report from the OTG Task Force and make recommendations for**
163 **revision, as necessary, to Course Withdrawal Policy (D.05,IV).**

164 <https://www.rit.edu/academicaffairs/policiesmanual/d050t> and Probation and Suspension
165 Policy (D.05.1) <https://www.rit.edu/academicaffairs/policiesmanual/d051>.

166
167 Chris Licata has proposed this charge as a placeholder in the hope that the necessary groundwork etc.
168 will be finished in time to bring recommendations to the AAC this year. The On-Time Graduation Task
169 Force will be discussing all of its recommendations with Provost Haefner in September and prioritizing
170 those recommendations will be part of this discussion.

171 The On-Time Graduation Task Force has recommended that potential changes to certain RIT policies be
172 considered in order to better ensure that certain policies do not hinder on-time graduation. The current
173 Course Withdrawal policy is one such policy.

174
175 In its final report and recommendations, the OTG Task Force highlights that RIT's policy is currently
176 relatively permissive and counter to on-time efforts, particularly when compared to the policies in effect
177 at other private four-year institutions. Policies from RIT's 21 benchmark schools were reviewed, along
178 with other institutions, and the task force concluded that it would be in RIT's best interest to revisit its
179 current policy. The working team led by Lynne Mazadoorian, Director of University Advising and Belinda
180 Bryce, Director, HEOP expect to be ready with proposed changes and proposed policy language by
181 Spring Semester or early Fall Semester. This timeframe is dependent on an intermediary procedural
182 step they plan to develop and implement prior to making policy language recommendations.

183
184 The On-Time Graduation Task Force has also identified the Probation and Suspension policy as
185 particularly important to an On-Time Graduation Culture. While not ready yet to bring specific
186 recommendations forward, the Task Force is currently collecting additional baseline data and expects
187 that it may be ready to bring forward recommendations for changes in policy language during this
188 academic year. The working team for this is comprised of Dr. Mohan Kumar, Professor and Chair,
189 Computer Science Department and Rebecca Fletcher Roberts, Assistant Dean, College of Health
190 Sciences and Technology.

191 **Academic Support and Student Affairs Committee**

192 **ASSA1 Propose communication to faculty in order to increase their awareness of resources available**
193 **to students for counseling.**

194 The mental health and health center consultants Keeling and Associates were brought in during the
195 AY2014-2015 year to evaluate and give recommendations for both RIT's Counseling Center and its

196 Student Health Center. This included meetings with students, staff, faculty, and administration and
197 resulted in a report of ten major recommendations for RIT on improving the services provided on our
198 campus. In 2015-16 the ASSAC was charged to follow up on the consultant’s recommendations. In 2016-
199 2017 a charge to identify all specific steps and their associated costs as a follow up to the Consultant
200 recommendations (Keeley and Associates) for improving the students counseling and health centers
201 programs and services was put forward but has been taken up by the office of the Vice President for
202 Student Affairs. Therefore the ASSAC charge in 2016-2017 looks to increase awareness of the counseling
203 options available to faculty, who all act as advisers to their students in some capacity. When faculty can
204 point students in the right direction, RIT will move further towards its sustained goal of student success.
205 More information is found in the final report of this committee from 2015-16:
206 <https://digitalarchive.rit.edu/xmlui/handle/1850/18494>.

207 **ASSA2 Regarding Final Course Grade Dispute Policy, make appropriate changes to policies related to**
208 **D17.0 to address issues with references to the Academic Appeals Sub-committee. Make**
209 **necessary changes in order to revise inconsistencies in Policy D08.0 and D18.0.**

210 Regarding Charge 3 (2015-2016): The Committee got documentation on all relevant policies: D17, D08
211 and D18 in order to establish where the inconsistencies were and make suggestions. The first finding
212 was that D17, updated in 2013, was not the issue; rather it is the inconsistency between D8 and D18,
213 right. After reviewing both policies, the inconsistency is in D08.0. In the appeals section of D08.0, there
214 is reference to the Academic Appeals Subcommittee of the Institute Appeals Board as described in
215 D18.0 – Student Conduct Policy. It appears that D18.0 was revised after D08.0 and D18.0 no longer
216 mentions the Academic Appeals Subcommittee of the Institute Appeals Board.

217 The committee found that the Academic Appeals Subcommittee is not defined in D18, but the
218 Subcommittee appears well defined in D08.0.VII, which we believe is correct since this Subcommittee
219 has no role other than to deal with academic integrity issues, the focus of D8 and not D18.

220 SUGGESTION OF ACTION

221 Our suggestions are changes to the wording of D8 and D17 to clear up any perceived inconsistencies and
222 make sure they are all compliant. The committee suggests to change “Institute” to “University” in
223 D8.0.VII 2nd line “..Academic Appeals Subcommittee of the Institute Appeals Board (see Policy D18.0,
224 section VI)”. We also suggest changing “VI” to “IX”. In addition, we also suggest the following change in a
225 slight inconsistency in D17 in section III.B where it refers to “Academic Conduct Committee”, we believe
226 it should read “Academic Integrity Committee” to be consistent with D08.0.

227 **ASSA3 Propose steps to ensure that students (and faculty advisers) understand the degree to which**
228 **health, and academic information is protected from unwanted and unexpected disclosure,**
229 **either by prohibiting unwanted disclosures or by ensuring student knowledge of potential**
230 **disclosure.**

231 Suggestions are to address how to

- 232 ○ Better communicate with students and providers about HIPAA and FERPA.
- 233 ○ Promote the Student Behavioral Consultation team (SBCT) among faculty and staff so that
- 234 RIT employees know how to refer students with medical/behavioral issues while protecting
- 235 their privacy.

236 This continuing charge is set forth in 2016-17 in response to review of Charge 4: Student Health
237 Information Privacy from 2015-16 – "Review current policies related to the confidentiality and privacy
238 of student health information and propose necessary changes to the ways in which policies are
239 communicated to students, faculty, staff, and families (hereafter "consumers").

240 **ASSA 4 To underscore the importance of inclusion and diversity at RIT, propose an approach to**
241 **include discussions on "diversity, inclusion, gender and race equality" across campus for**
242 **incoming first year students.**

243 In the spirit of Difference Makers found in RIT's Strategic Plan's under the section Leveraging Difference,
244 this charge seeks to make cultural improvements at the grass roots level by ensuring discussions on
245 gender and race equity throughout campus, with emphasis on courses taken by entering freshmen.
246 Ideas for consideration through this charge may include providing a copy of "The Gender Knot" by Allan
247 Johnson for every first year student.

248 Campus Environment (merged with the Long Range Planning Committee AY 2014)

249 See below.

250 Faculty Affairs Committee

251 **FAC 1 Identify current trailing spouse practices, at RIT, and review for effectiveness. Compare and**
252 **contrast trailing spouse policies at other institutes, in regions similar in size when compared**
253 **to Rochester. Make a recommendation to draft a policy, as necessary.**

254 Chris Collison originates the charge after discussion with Advance. A hypothesis is presented such that
255 RIT may be able to hire and retain faculty of the highest caliber when an effective trailing spouse hire
256 can be made. The charge seeks to confirm or reject this hypothesis through comparison with other
257 institutes in regions similar in size when compared to Rochester.

258 Work being done by Advance and the "Dual Career Taskforce" currently being led by Judy Bender and
259 Margaret Bailey needs to be considered before any policy is written. Therefore this charge should be
260 delayed until completion and presentation of the appropriate task force report. It will be valuable to ask
261 FAC whether policy should be written and where it would belong. If an E policy, then FAC could work to
262 write it. If it belongs elsewhere it would be passed along. It is recommended that this be put on the low
263 end of the priority list for FAC, giving time for the taskforce to finish its charges.

264 **FAC 2 Complete revisions to Academic Administrator Search Statement E08.0.**

265 This is a carryover from 2015-16.

266 **FAC 3 Complete revisions to Policy on the Discontinuance, Reduction or Transfer of Academic**
267 **Programs E20.0, in concert with ICC to include removal of portion dealing with program**
268 **review, placing it in D01.0. Ensure collaboration with ICC, who will subsequently revise**
269 **D01.0 to include program review and discontinuance.**

270 This is a carryover from 2015-16. Special instructions for E20.0 include a removal of portion dealing
271 with program review and placing it in D01.0. This action would necessitate that a simultaneous charge
272 be given to ICC to revise D01.0 to include program review and discontinuance. The result would be an
273 E20.0 policy which addresses the treatment of faculty in the case of program discontinuance or
274 reduction, but not the program review itself.

275 **FAC 4 Complete revisions to Policy on Assignment and Transfer of Tenure-Track Faculty E21.0 to**
276 **address the consolidation of all aspects of transferring a program and faculty.**

277 This is a carryover from 2015-16. Further special instructions regarding E20.0 and E21.0 is the
278 consolidation of all aspects of transferring a program and faculty to be included in E21.0 leaving E20.0
279 to address only the implications on faculty resulting from the discontinuance or reduction in a program.

280 **FAC 5 Complete revisions to Policy on Financial Exigency E22.0, thus completing the review and**
281 **revision of all E policies as part of the updating of university policy and procedures which**
282 **began 5 years ago.**

283 This is a carryover from 2015-16. This will complete the review and revision of all E policies as part of
284 the updating of university policy and procedures which began 4 years ago.

285 **FAC 6 Determine whether new "process for upward evaluation of department chairs/heads and**
286 **deans" should be described in governance policy or in administrative policy and, if governance**
287 **policy is deemed the appropriate home, review the policy and bring it to Academic Senate for**
288 **approval.**

289 This is a carryover from 2015-16. Deans have a subcommittee working on putting together a process for
290 upward evaluation of department chairs (Discussed in a charge in 2015-16, "Evaluation of College
291 Administrative Faculty".) Indeed, a policy for evaluating department Chairs has been drafted by the
292 Council of Deans and will be presented to the FAC by Dean Jamie Winebrake. FAC should then propose
293 that the process be either a governance policy or an administrative policy. If it is a governance policy,
294 FAC will review the policy and will bring it to Academic Senate for approval.

295 **FAC 7 Review policies Principles of Academic Freedom E02.0 (last review (LR) 2010), Oath of**
296 **Allegiance (LR 2010) E03.0, Faculty Pursuing a Graduate Degree at RIT E19.0 (LR 2005),**
297 **according to policy B05.0.**

298 According to Policy B05.0, Development, Review, Approval, And Promulgation of University-Level
299 Policies, all policies are reviewed on a 5-year cycle with one of three outcomes: 1) Reviewed and
300 affirmed – this means the policy was reviewed and there are no changes needed. The policy history is
301 updated to reflect this determination. 2) Reviewed with edits – this means the policy was reviewed and
302 non-substantive edits are needed, i.e., the name of a department needs to be corrected. The policy

303 history is updated as appropriate. 3) Reviewed and revised – this means the policy was reviewed and
304 substantive revisions are approved. The policy is updated as appropriate.

305 **FAC 8 Revisit E4.0 ([Faculty Employment Policies](#)) in light of Provost’s request to include support**
306 **for/recognition of interdisciplinary teaching and scholarship.**

307 In light of RIT’s strategic plan, which explicitly calls for rewarding and encouraging faculty to work in
308 new interdisciplinary teaching and research areas, the Provost has asked us to revisit E4.0 and consider
309 changing the policy to strengthen it in this regard.

310 **FAC 9 Revisit E6.0 ([Policies on Faculty Rank and Promotion](#)) in light of the Provost’s request to**
311 **include support for/recognition of interdisciplinary teaching and scholarship.**

312 In light of RIT’s strategic plan, which explicitly calls for rewarding and encouraging faculty to work in
313 new interdisciplinary teaching and research areas, the Provost has asked us to revisit E6.0 and consider
314 changing the policy to strengthen it in this regard.

315 **General Education Committee (Subcommittee of Inter-college Curriculum Committee)**

316 **GEC 1 Audit General Education courses campus wide, to assess whether i) Perspective courses**
317 **include assignments/activities by which faculty can assess respective student learning**
318 **outcomes, ii) whether General Education courses include assignments/activities by which**
319 **faculty can assess student learning outcomes in Communication, and Critical Thinking, and iii)**
320 **whether general education courses have registration restrictions.**

321 In the normal assessment cycle conducted by the office of Educational Effectiveness Assessment (EEA),
322 and its subsequent report to the General Education Committee, it has come to light that some classes
323 designated as fulfilling a Perspective have not included an assignment appropriate for the assessment of
324 the associated student learning outcome(s). This might happen for various reasons, including
325 assignment of the course to an instructor who is new to RIT, or the evolution of the course outline and
326 focus.

327 It is incumbent upon us, the faculty of RIT, to clearly articulate the student learning outcomes of our
328 courses, to recognize which requirements students fulfill by taking these courses (said requirements
329 serving as proxies for larger educational goals), and if need be, to revise our classification of courses as
330 they change naturally over time so that academic programs at RIT continue to help students develop
331 both a general breadth and a professional depth of knowledge, skills, and ways of thinking.

332 The practical meaning of this charge is: The General Education Committee should provide each college
333 with a list of its perspective-designated courses, and ask academic units to review the list with an eye
334 toward both the definitions of the Perspectives and the student learning outcomes associated with each
335 Perspective. Courses that are no longer aligned with the designated Perspective should be removed
336 from the list; by leaving a course on the list, the unit reaffirms its commitment to the student learning
337 outcomes associated with the Perspectives, their assessment in every offering of the listed courses, and
338 cooperation with EEA.

339 This audit of General Education courses should be performed with the help of the colleges, the
340 registrar's office, and EEA and the GEC should respond to the information as appropriate. As described
341 in the charge, this audit would be designed to answer the following questions: i) Do Perspective courses
342 include assignments/activities by which faculty can assess respective student learning outcomes, ii) Do
343 General Education courses include assignments/activities by which faculty can assess student learning
344 outcomes in Communication, and Critical Thinking, iii) do general education courses have registration
345 restrictions?

346 **GEC 2 Revise the "Framework document" to reflect current practice (including the student learning**
347 **outcomes formerly known as "orphans" that have been incorporated into the Essential**
348 **Elements category).**

349 This charge was recommended for 2016-17 in the 2015-16 General Education Committee Report to
350 Academic Senate, dated May 2016.

351 **GEC 3 Determine whether it would be beneficial to have a protocol for awarding a variance to**
352 **courses that are ill-suited to assessment of the student learning outcomes listed in the**
353 **Essential Elements category (such courses might include large-enrollment courses in**
354 **chemistry and biology), and if so, design and adopt such a protocol.**

355 This charge was recommended for 2016-17 in the 2015-16 General Education Committee Report to
356 Academic Senate, dated May 2016.

357 **Global Education Task Force**

358 **GETF 1 Form a faculty led academic senate standing committee on Global Education and Research**
359 **Develop a white paper describing a standing " Global Education Committee" of academic**
360 **senate, and bring forward the proposal as a motion for Academic Senate, along with a list**
361 **of initial charges and ongoing responsibilities.**

362 Jim Myers, Associate Provost for International Education and Global Programs would like to suggest a
363 charge be related to the potential future of the taskforce as a standing committee. The taskforce is
364 asked to consider and articulate the following issues in the proposed white paper:

- 365 a. The need for formal policies and procedures on the implementation of programs and curricula
366 outside of the RIT campus
- 367 b. The need for transparency on international operations and faculty participation in the oversight of
368 our international engagement initiatives
- 369 c. The emerging need to define policies related to international research collaborations and
370 partnerships
- 371 d. A vehicle for linking faculty at our international locations with the governance process.

372 **GETF 2 Engage leaders of research centers, signature research groups, research heavy hitters to**
373 **identify strategic/complementary hubs of intellectual/production excellence with a target**
374 **of developing more collaborative partners in the US and internationally (Targeted Centers**
375 **of Collaboration).**

376 Chris Collison has written the following 7 charges based on a review of the Global Education Task Force
377 Report from 2015-16, review of the Strategic Plan and lengthy discussion with Jim Myers, who has
378 articulated the following strategic benefits of RIT's Growing International footprint: 1) If we don't
379 internationalize, we will fall behind our target peer group/competitors, and Undergraduates
380 fundamentally want internationalization, 2) Significant opportunities exist outside the US and we need
381 to be connected; globally developed curricula need to be incorporated into our portfolio of academic
382 options, 3) global hubs exist already based on areas of strategic research importance to us – we need to
383 connect to these hubs for the benefit of research at RIT and the move towards R1 standing, 4) Global
384 community – we have 3000+ international students on campus and with the (full) tuition generated we
385 must be aware of the outstanding revenue generation this provides.

386 Successful implementation of the strategic plan around globalization will require a leadership from
387 individual faculty and many of these charges are put forward to seed more effective implementation of
388 the plan.

389 **GETF 3 Identify and make recommendations to Senate and/or the Associate Provost for International**
390 **Education as appropriate regarding the academic policies, procedures, and communication**
391 **strategies necessary to encourage faculty to pursue strategic international activities.**

392 **GETF 4 Develop the guidelines, policies and procedures required to enable our international locations**
393 **(global campuses) to implement programs and to develop courses for listing in the RIT course**
394 **portfolio.**

395 **GETF 5 Develop a framework for evaluating RIT's international partnerships (across global campuses).**

396 The goal of this charge is to evaluate and assess collaborations between formalized established RIT
397 partnerships such that the habit of collaboration might be maintained. An additional idea to make this a
398 beneficial process for the partnership may be to incentivize self-assessment by offering an RIT award
399 based on the assessment.

400 **GETF 6 Make recommendations regarding how to best include faculty at our international locations**
401 **(global campuses) in RIT's shared governance model.**

402 The motivation comes from Chris Collison, who considers there may be a benefit to identifying "bright
403 spots" regarding how collaborations are particularly successful between international locations. This
404 may also naturally follow on from GETF 5.

405 **GETF 7 Review policy Foreign Travel Programs D07.0 (last review (LR) 1970), according to policy**
406 **B05.0.**

407 According to Policy B05.0, Development, Review, Approval, And Promulgation of University-Level
408 Policies, all policies are reviewed on a 5-year cycle with one of three outcomes: 1) Reviewed and
409 affirmed – this means the policy was reviewed and there are no changes needed. The policy history is
410 updated to reflect this determination. 2) Reviewed with edits – this means the policy was reviewed and
411 non-substantive edits are needed, i.e., the name of a department needs to be corrected. The policy
412 history is updated as appropriate. 3) Reviewed and revised – this means the policy was reviewed and
413 substantive revisions are approved. The policy is updated as appropriate.

414 Jim Myers suggested to Sue Provenzano that the Global Education Committee of Senate review this
415 policy. There is another component to this policy that may require working with the folks in Global Risk
416 Management and that is around knowing where people are in case of emergencies, political unrest, etc.
417 We have a good system for students but I don't think we have as robust a system for faculty and staff
418 travelers. Given the current environment, it might be good to include some policy around this issue, and
419 that is where Global Risk Management can help.

420 **Graduate Council**

421 **GC 1 Investigate and report upon the accuracy of enrollment projection from GES.**

422 This is a carryover from 2015-16. Enrollment estimates for new programs always seem very positive.
423 Are good programs to propose always selected or are there other factors which skew the estimates?
424 The Graduate Council are motivated to look into the enrollment projection process. If enrollment
425 projects are found to be substantially different to the projected numbers, the committee shall
426 investigate the causes for the discrepancies; for example, internal factors such as funding, or external
427 factors such as a global recession might be found to prevent programs from achieving the projections.

428 **GC 2 Identify and propose solutions to issues related to guidelines, standards, paperless archiving, 429 timing, and certification after submission of graduate theses/dissertations.**

430 This is a carryover from 2015-16. This is a very involved charge and the recommendation is to separate
431 the charge into smaller deliverable parts: 1. Paperless archiving of a thesis by the RIT library. 2. Institute
432 guidelines for MS Theses and PhD dissertations. 3. A completion timeline for components required for
433 certification of a degree.

434 **GC 3 Articulate how the graduate education goals and objectives of the strategic plan will be most 435 effectively implemented, based on review of the strategic plan undertaken by this committee 436 in 2015-16.**

437 In the GC report from Summer 2016, a suggestion for continued review of graduate education goals in
438 the strategic plan was made. Chris Collison has reframed the charge in line with an overall Senate theme
439 to enhance the implementation of the strategic plan through faculty leadership. See GC Report from
440 2015-16 for more detail regarding overlap with Strategic Plan 2015-2025 and the purview of the
441 Graduate Council. This charge has been assigned to the Dean of Graduate Education. However some
442 exchange of progress updates/information with Graduate Council will prove to reduce inefficiency.

443 **GC 4 Examine and propose optimal ways of developing more accurate estimates of costs and long-**
444 **term viability of new graduate programs, for interested parties such as the Provost.**

445 In the GC report from Summer 2016, a suggestion for exploring the financial viability of graduate
446 programs was suggested. Chris Collison has reframed the charge.

447 **GC 5 Propose ways of providing all graduate students the English writing skills needed to succeed at**
448 **RIT and in their career.**

449 In the GC report from Summer 2016, a suggestion for exploring the Graduate writing quality was
450 proposed. A subcommittee was established to examine this and write a proposal to achieve this goal.

451 **GC 6 Collect data for ongoing student tuition costs and time for degree completion to confirm**
452 **whether or not there is a correlation (an inverse relationship) with accrued billing costs to the**
453 **student and completion date of the degree.**

454 RIT has a 7-year graduation rule outlined in D12.0 Graduation Requirements, Section V.F. Students may
455 be billed for each academic term until graduation and some argue that this provides a motivation to the
456 student to complete their studies, Dissertation or Thesis. The committee is charged with collecting data
457 for ongoing student tuition costs and time for degree completion to confirm whether or not there is a
458 correlation (an inverse relationship) with accruing billing costs to the student and completion date of the
459 degree. The motivation is to enable better decisions for RIT in the long run; do tuition bills actually lead
460 to a faster completion of thesis or dissertation, or do they merely lead to strongly negative memories
461 and disconnection of that student as an engaged alumnus/alumna? It should be noted that a small
462 fraction of the RIT MS students write a thesis with most being project or capstone exam based. There is
463 also an apparent inconsistency across the programs as to if this fee is charged. Evaluation of this
464 inconsistency may also form part of this charge.

465 **GC 7 Examine the 7-year rule related to BS-MS degrees and propose policy change.**

466 Establish a policy for when the 7-year clock starts for undergraduate and graduate courses taken as a
467 part of a BS/MS dual degree.

468 **GC 8 Review RIT Policy D2.0 <https://www.rit.edu/academicaffairs/policiesmanual/d020> regarding**
469 **transfer credit allowable to an RIT graduate program and make modifications as needed to**
470 **ensure we are not penalizing our own RIT graduate students.**

471
472 Background: The policy referenced above indicates that “20% of the program degree credits may be
473 awarded as transfer credit from other institutions (external) to RIT.” This language implies that a
474 student who may already have a graduate degree from RIT but wishes to pursue a second graduate
475 degree is unable to transfer any credit under the current policy. Some graduate program directors have
476 pointed out that this seems to be biased against prior graduate degrees obtained from RIT. For
477 example, a student applying to the 30 credit Manufacturing Leadership Program who already has an
478 MBA from any school but RIT can be awarded 6 transfer credits (20%x30). If instead the applicant has
479 an MBA from RIT, he/she gets nothing toward the program because transfer credits can only be applied

480 from non-RIT programs and waivers may not reduce program requirements below 30 semester credit
481 hours (see policy D 5).

482
483 Review of this policy to determine if modifications are needed in order to ensure that we are not
484 penalizing our own RIT graduate students should be taken up this year.

485

486 **GC 9 Monitor evolution of the Graduate Minors policy and report to Academic Senate changes.**

487 In its 2015-16 session, Academic Senate passed a Graduate Minors proposal. The proposal is being
488 reviewed for implementation. Report back to Academic Senate on differences between the approved
489 and implemented versions of the policy.

490 **GC10 Make recommendations to increase the number of graduate student fellowships at RIT and to**
491 **increase philanthropic contributions to support such fellowships.**

492 New charge submitted with a motivation to encourage use of endowed fellowships to smooth out the
493 "boom" and "bust" approach to recruiting PhD students based on the real availability of external (grant)
494 sponsorship, which leads to lags in student hire and acceptance into various graduate programs. This is
495 championed by Chris Collison.

496 **GC 11 Propose an FFCEP equivalent (Future Graduate Student Exploration Program) for graduate**
497 **students, to enhance the diversity of prospective students and to increase the rate of**
498 **acceptance of high achieving applicants from outside RIT.**

499 This approach would likely increase the diversity of incoming graduate students at RIT and would also
500 enhance the perception of RIT to those considering RIT for graduate programs. Such an early investment
501 in prospective high-caliber students would also likely lead to higher quality incoming students and
502 higher accept rates.

503 Institute Effective Teaching Committee

504 **Institute Writing Committee (Sub-Committee of Inter-college Curriculum Committee)**

505 **IWC 1 Monitor and report to AS on the implementation of the Institute Writing Policy.**

506 This is recommended as a charge for the 2016-17 year in the 2015-16 end of year report

507 **IWC 2 Highlight RIT "best practices" for use of writing in course instruction, especially WI courses.**

508 This is recommended as a charge for the 2016-17 year in the 2015-16 end of year report

509 **IWC 3 Report to the Academic Senate and campus community progress on the assessment of WI**
510 **courses.**

511 This is recommended as a charge for the 2016-17 year in the 2015-16 end of year report.

512 **IWC 4 Collaborate with the University Writing Program to provide resources and consultation to**
513 **program directors and faculty that will facilitate their assessing of the effectiveness of their**
514 **writing intensive (WI) courses**

515 Chris Collison has written this charge based on review of the 2015-16 IWC report, on discussions with
516 David Martins and feedback from Sarah Thompson. The IWC has no authority to impose curricular
517 changes but, nevertheless, the provision of such a resource can help drive improved consistency within
518 a program, if not across the Institute.

519 This charge might establish a rubric and/or scoresheet for each academic unit to measure how well
520 writing intensive courses are connected to ensure common practice within that department or academic
521 unit. It seems that the WI courses within certain programs might dovetail more effectively and the
522 resource could facilitate this.

523 Inter-college Curriculum Committee

524 **ICC 1 Study undergraduate curricular proposals from an institute-wide perspective, maintain**
525 **appropriate inter-college relationships with regards to curriculum, assure that existing**
526 **undergraduate curricula are periodically reviewed, and make proposals to the Academic**
527 **Senate for undergraduate curriculum approval or discontinuance.**

528 This is the standard bread and butter charge for the ICC and is motivated through the 2015-16 end of
529 year report, by Dawn Hollenbeck, ICC Chair

530 **ICC 2 Revise Program Proposal Template – endorsed by Academic Senate in Spring 2015-16.**

531 This charge is motivated by reference to the 2015-16 end of year report by Dawn Hollenbeck, ICC Chair.
532 ICC feels the template approved by Academic Senate should be revised to focus more attention on the
533 aspects of a new or revised program proposal that connect more readily to what we believe are the key
534 components of the proposal, given ICC's experience.

535 **ICC 3 Work with the Honor's program to revise Policy D1 to clearly outline curricular processes with**
536 **regards to the Honor's program.**

537 This is a continuation of charge 2 from the list of charges from 2015-16 and is motivated through the
538 2015-16 end of year report, by Dawn Hollenbeck, ICC Chair.

539 **ICC 4 Work with Faculty Affairs to revise policy on discontinuance of academic programs (E20.0).**

540 This charge is motivated by reference to the 2015-16 end of year report by Dawn Hollenbeck, ICC Chair.

541 Due to concerns about large credit hour courses, ICC requested that an oversight group be created or
542 assigned to assess courses that have more than 4-credit hours associated with them. ICC has been
543 tasked by the Provost with this duty for the year 2016-17. This will be triggered when Faculty Affairs
544 Committee successfully revises E20.

545 **Long Range Planning and Environment Committee**

546 Long Range Planning Committee (merged with Campus Environment AY 2014)

547 **LRPEC1 Prioritize the strategic plan from the perspective of faculty. Identify, through a ranking survey,**
548 **the key difference makers that motivate faculty (to accomplish them).**

549 Chris Collison has originated this charge based on the introduction of the strategic plan in 2015-16. The
550 suggestion is to evaluate the strategic plan for importance to faculty – identify which difference makers
551 may be adopted by AS standing committees (and faculty) independent of top-down administration
552 driven approach.

553 For example we are just one governance group and we *DO* have a say in what we think is important and
554 carries maximum value, given that it has already been identified *IN* the strategic plan!

555 **LRPEC 2 Identify specific policies associated with tenure and promotion that either overlap and**
556 **resonate with or inhibit progress toward difference makers and objectives from the Strategic**
557 **Plan.**

558 Chris Collison has originated this charge based on the introduction of the strategic plan in 2015-16. This
559 provides a report as to how faculty can be incentivized to work on the strategic plan as part of their
560 normal tenure and promotion responsibilities. This feedback will indicate what objectives and difference
561 makers are incentivized for faculty, independent of their own interests and independent of the
562 administrations directives. The idea here would be that eventually we would all be on the same page
563 regarding implementation of the strategic plan. It may also be important to assess the faculty's
564 perception of what is necessary or dispensable in terms of actions overlapping with targeted tenure or
565 promotion and the strategic plan. For example, within a particular college one might find that the faculty
566 believe that any progress they make towards interdisciplinary teaching will not be rewarded through the
567 promotion process, even though there are no actual policies stating how tenure should be rewarded for
568 such actions.

569 Given that the Strategic Plan describes what we want to be, identify model establishments for each
570 difference maker group in RIT's Strategic Plan, such that new schools might be identified to act as future
571 benchmarks. Therefore (in this way) we take a more pro-active approach to benchmarking, as opposed
572 our current approach which relies on benchmarking for who we are today. This charge also leads
573 towards a discussion around how RIT can compete effectively against other institutions which claim
574 strengths in the same areas as those described in RIT's strategic plan.

575 **LRPEC 3 Write a white paper and thereby propose an approach to perennially collect accurate data**
576 **on the number of students graduating from programs for which there is at least one**
577 **"sustainability" learning outcome.**

578 In 2015-16, the LRPEC was asked to assist with the provision of academic related data. The committee
579 was asked to find i) the percentage of courses offered at RIT that include sustainability as part of the
580 content and ii) the number of students who graduated from a program that has adopted at least one

581 sustainability learning outcome. With some difficulty and a significant amount of resources, some
582 courses were identified by the committee; the number of students should now be collected and
583 calculated this academic year (2016-17) to complete the overall charge. The committee should also
584 ensure that this information reaches the intended audience (at RIT) in order for RIT's STARS data to be
585 disseminated. This data should be presented annually in order to maintain a STARS rating.

586 It has also been proposed that "sustainability" could be adopted as a general education learning
587 outcome. This suggestion should be discussed and a proposal brought to senate for an up or down vote.

588 **LRPEC 4 Write a white paper, with a cost/benefit analysis to propose a central searchable (data**
589 **minable) university curriculum data base such that learning outcomes can be identified under**
590 **certain criteria, towards more cost effective auditing of courses.**

591 Does a system already exist? How well does it work? (oracle?) This would be good for auditing Gen Ed
592 and writing intensive courses in addition to sustainability courses.

593 As a result of review of the LRPEC report from 2015-16 it seemed that individual courses and programs
594 could not be easily identified through keyword searches, although this is not entirely clear. The
595 committee expressed its thanks to Ann Wahl for help in this regard. Nevertheless, given that STARS
596 needs to be updated every three years, the LRPEC additionally recommended in 2015-16 that a
597 standardized process be developed that enables departments to identify courses containing
598 sustainability and programs with sustainability-related learning outcomes. It makes sense therefore to
599 assess the viability of a central searchable university curriculum data base. This suggestion comes from
600 Chris Collison.

601 **LRPEC 5 Submit motion to senate that a Campus Master Plan Task Force be instigated.**

602 Many years of Campus Master Plan information gathering, discussion and recommendation was
603 summarized in the 2015-16 LRPEC Final report. We must move forward in addressing these
604 recommendations and a motion should be brought to the Senate floor.

605 **LRPEC 6 Identify specific tenure and promotion processes that either overlap and resonate with, or**
606 **inhibit progress toward specific difference makers and objectives from the strategic plan**
607 **associated with diversity, inclusion, and race and gender equality.**

608 Chris Collison has originated this charge based on the introduction of the strategic plan in 2015-16. This
609 provides a report as to how faculty can be incentivized to work on inclusion, diversity, race and gender
610 equity as part of their normal tenure and promotion responsibilities. For example the charge may lead
611 to approaches where faculty a) encourage equal populations across gender in their research groups or in
612 their recruiting strategies or b) involve discussion that promotes self-awareness of unconscious bias in
613 their classrooms, or c) demonstrate model behavior in meetings etc. where they encourage
614 contributions from all independent of their race, gender, introversion etc. This charge may also lead to a
615 motion to include self-assessment of activity aligned with increasing diversity in all end of year faculty
616 evaluation metrics if none exists currently. This charge piggy-backs off of charge LRPEC 2.

617 Multidisciplinary Curriculum Committee

618 Nominations Committee

619 **Resource Allocation and Budget Committee**

620 **RABC 1 Based on how faculty will prioritize implementation of the strategic plan (LRPEC Charge),**
621 **identify presently available funding for implementation of the Strategic Plan and make**
622 **recommendations for budgetary prioritization and resource allocation.**

623 Chris Collison has originated this charge based on the introduction of the strategic plan in 2015-16. A
624 budget that becomes available to faculty to implement the strategic plan, based on faculty priorities, will
625 be a budget that is very effectively spent because the motivation to move forward is already apparent.
626 Over the course of the year, recommendations made to Academic Senate, and from there the
627 administration and the board of trustees, may lead to more effective implementation of objectives of
628 the strategic plan, for everyone's benefit.

629 This follows on from the 2015-2016 charge to review and assess RIT's plan to fund the strategic plan.

630 **RABC 2 Based on how faculty will prioritize implementation of the strategic plan (LRPEC Charge),**
631 **identify gaps in funding for implementation of the strategic plan and make recommendations**
632 **for subsequent budgetary prioritization. Thus, make a proposal for allocation of funding**
633 **towards more effective implementation of the strategic plan.**

634 This charge asks the committee to contrast i) the overlap with funding priorities already determined and
635 faculty priorities, with ii) the gap between faculty priorities and the available resources

636 Consider the gaps between costs of accomplishment and available funding for each difference maker.
637 Purely from a "dollar-based" gap analysis (i.e. incremental money is REQUIRED to achieve goal versus
638 "goal can be accomplished as part of faculty plan of work assuming directions are changed"), the work
639 of the committee this year will identify the "low hanging fruit" and the "most difficult to accomplish"
640 difference makers so as to make the most substantive progress towards the strategic plan.

641 **RABC 3 Identify what difference makers and objectives have already been identified for allocation of**
642 **funding and/or resources.**

643 Chris Collison has originated this charge based on the introduction of the strategic plan in 2015-16. The
644 charge seems informational but is set up so as to start a discussion about how resources might be
645 applied. Each RIT governance body (Board of Trustees, Administration, Staff Council, Student
646 Government, Academic Senate) may have their own opinion as to what has been funded based on the
647 strategic plan. Thus, this charge recommends discussion between all RIT governance bodies; it is
648 motivated by a need to not duplicate efforts. It hopefully will also lead to a greater connection between
649 all governance bodies where progress towards the strategic plan can more effectively be achieved when
650 we all work together.

651 Over the course of the year, recommendations made to academic senate, and from there the
652 administration and the board of trustees, may lead to more effective implementation of objectives of
653 the strategic plan, for everyone's benefit.

654 This also follows on from the 2015-2016 charge to review and assess RIT's plan to fund the strategic
655 plan.

656 **RABC 4 Brainstorm and propose actionable, alternate approaches for allocating budget and resources**
657 **to each college, along with a timeline for implementation. Provide expected impact, costs and**
658 **benefits for new approach.**

659 This moves beyond the 2015-16 charge of "Review and assess the method of allocating budget and
660 other resources based on enrollment – majors versus credit hours generated." This informs the Senate
661 of possible new approaches and starts a discussion on campus that may lead to a more effective system
662 that may reduce our over-reliance on enrollment numbers.

663 **RABC 5 Identify specific hurdles for Calendar change in 2017-18. Report on the budget assigned to**
664 **Calendar conversion for 2017-18 and make recommendations for allocation of resources**
665 **before the end of Fall 2016 semester.**

666 There seem to be many hurdles to overcome ahead of calendar conversion in 2017-18. Hurdles such as
667 effective use of calendaring systems (MS Outlook) may simply be modified through software
668 modification at the university level. Such solutions would have significant impact through-out the
669 institute. Such solutions would be considered of very high value for the RIT community. Other hurdles
670 may exist such as synchronizing buses, restaurant opening times, Field House booking, Margaret's house
671 opening times, Parking signs, scheduled lunch times for support staff.

672 Student Affairs Committee (merged with Academic Support in AY 2014)