ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE AY 2016-17

Final Report

May 31, 2017

Prepared by: P. Venkataraman

Membership

Callie Babbitt (GIS)	Tracy Davis (COS)
James (Minseok) Kwon (GCCIS)	David Halbstein (CIAS)
Chris Licata (Provost's Delegate, ex officio, voting)	Danielle Smith (CLA)
Joseph Miller (SCB)	Robert Osgood (CHST)
Dino Laury (NTID)	P. Venkataraman (KGCOE), **Chair**
Joseph Lanzafame (COS) - At Large	Scott Wolcott (CAST)
Joyce Hertzson (CIAS) - At Large	Matthew Fluet (GCCIS) - At Large

Subcommittee Membership

Charge AA1	Joe Lanzafame; David Halbstein
Charge AA2	Matthew Fluet; P. Venkataraman
Charge AA3.1& AA3.2	Joseph Miller; Minseok Kwon
Charge AA4	Callie Babbitt; P. Venkataraman; Matthew Fluet
Charge AA5	Tracy Davis; Scott Wolcott
Charge AA6	Dino Laury; Joyce Hertzson, (Christine Licata)
Charge AA7	(combined with AA4)
Charge AA8	Danielle Smith, (Christine Licata); Minseok Kwon
Charge AA9	Scott Wolcott; Joseph Miller; Joyce Hertzson,(Christine Licata)

AAC Charges for the Academic Year 2016-2017 reported to AS

No.	Charge	At AS
AA 1	Re-evaluate operational recommendations 1 through 3 in the "Steps to Establishing an Effective System of Student Ratings" report from 2013, in light of the research data and information collected since the implementation of SmartEvals in 2013.	Mar 11, 2017
AA 2	Develop a best-practices white paper to encourage consistent grading, given the recent introduction of +/- grades and the acceptance that inconsistencies exist with alignment of letter grades to number grades	Mar 18, 2017
AA 3.1	Count the number of cases at RIT each year where issues or disputes regarding academic matters have not been resolved in the opinion of the petitioner (faculty, instructional staff, graduate/undergraduate students), with the petitioner having applied thorough and good-faith efforts, and exhausting all available informal and formal means to resolution. Hence recommend whether or not a university policy should be drafted to establish a University Academic Appeals Board (UAAB)	Mar 18, 2017
AA 3.2	Draft a university policy that establishes a University Academic Appeals Board (UAAB) to address issues and disputes regarding academic matters that remain unresolved in the opinion of the petitioner (faculty, instructional staff, graduate/undergraduate students), with the petitioner having applied thorough and good-faith efforts, and exhausting all available informal and formal means to resolution.	
AA 4	Develop a white paper describing a standing "Research Committee" (with an appropriate name for the committee to be created) of academic senate, and bring forward the proposal as a motion for Academic Senate, along with a list of initial charges and ongoing responsibilities	Apr 20, 2017
AA 5	Review RIT Policy D 2.0 https://www.rit.edu/academicaffairs/policiesmanual/d020 and modify as needed in order to clarify/update the amount of transfer credit allowable for an undergraduate degree	Mar 18, 2017
AA 6	Revise Leave of Absence policy, D02.1 and propose modifications, as necessary https://www.rit.edu/academicaffairs/policiesmanual/d021	Apr 20, 2017
AA 7	Review policies Misconduct in Research and Scholarship C02.0 (last review (LR) 1996), Agreement for Commissioning of Educational Materials C03.1 (LR 2007), Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research C05.0 (LR 2011), Protocols for Academic Centers D01.6 (LR 2008), according to policy B05.0.	Apr 20, 2017
AA 8	Review policy Diplomas and Degrees Certification D13.0 (LR 2013) according to policy B05.0.	Apr, 6, 2017

AA 9	Review and summarize the report from the OTG Task Force and make recommendations for revision, as necessary, to Course Withdrawal Policy (D.05,IV) https://www.rit.edu/academicaffairs/policiesmanual/d050 and Probation and Suspension Policy (D.05.1) https://www.rit.edu/academicaffairs/policiesmanual/d051..	Apr, 6, 2017

In addition AAC, at the request of the AS Chair assisted with:

(1) Reviewing and providing suggestions for the RIT self-study report for the successful MSCHE visit.

(2) Helping the SG (Student Government) draft their changes to Policy D 05.

The Committee reports distributed to AS are available at the digital archives at:

https://digitalarchive.rit.edu/xmlui/handle/1850/2453

They are:

- AAC Report - Charges 2, 3 and 5 and Whitepaper on Deliberate Grading (Charge #2)

- AAC's Charge #1 - SmartEvals Report (May 11, 2017)

- AAC's Charge #6 - Proposed Student Leave of Absence Policy (Document and PPt) 4/20/2017

- AAC's Charge #4 - White Paper on the Proposed Formation of a Research & Scholarship Committee

- AAC's Interim Report (PPt) - Charges 8 and 9 (4/6/2017)

Charge AA 1

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

Subcommittee: Joe Lanzafame; David Halbstein

Report:
AAC's Charge #1 - SmartEvals Report (May 11, 2017)
Lanzafame, Joseph and Halbstein, David

Prior to the commencement of the AAC meetings for the academic year 2016-2017 the chair had a meeting with Dr. Fernando Naveda who is the primary contact for the SmartEvals system currently in use. This was facilitated by the AS Chair Chris in response to the questions:

1. Where is the data and Information? (Software vendor/RIT)
2. Who is collecting this information on campus?
3. Who is interpreting this data? (Vendor/RIT)
4. Have any reports based on the data been released?
5. Does AAC have the expertise to review the data?
6. Have the three years provided any actions at the supervisor level and subsequent feedback to the faculty?
7. Have there been any college or university-wide effort to examine the effect of implementing the SRATE on attitudes, perceptions, or practices surrounding student ratings

Fernando identified some of the issues with this charge:

- He mentioned that there is no research or data that is mentioned in the operational recommendation, except the overall responses to 10 questions and the response rate.

- There is no research report and no other data collection except the answers to questions.

- He said that there is a data mining expert available that can help us retrieve data if it is relevant and can be answered by the data.

- He mentioned that the AAC should revise the charge to start the research and use surveys to find if the system has been useful to the various users of the response.

- He mentioned that the data is being used in tenure and promotion.

After this the subcommittee of Joe and David took over and brought back to the full committee some of the issues and their discussion with the provost office and the statisticians. They worked with the Provost office and the data experts (Fernando and Mike) to find a way to move forward on this charge: to set up a committee to research the data; to report on this data; to create a process to educate administrators who will use this data; and a process for faculty to understand this data and make it useful for their professional growth.

Due to their work the Provost had agreed to form a committee to resolve the charge beginning 2017-2018.

A motion was made to the AS:

to direct the Senate and the Office of the Provost to co-sponsor a SmartEvals research initiative academic year 2017-18 to follow-up from the work on Charge AAC1 (2016-17)

A vote was then taken to endorse the motion and it passed 17-7-3.

The motion passed the AS on Mar 11, 2017.

Charge AA 2

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

Subcommittee: Matthew Fluet; P. Venkataraman

Report:

[AAC Report - Charges 2, 3 and 5 and Whitepaper on Deliberate Grading (Charge #2)](#)

by Matthew Fluet

This charge was based on the recommendation of the AAC 2015-2016. Then the committee found:

■ A lack of consistency in the use of +/− letter grades across the university
■ Different mappings from percentage grades to letter grades
■ Different opinions about the influence of +/− letter grades on GPA
■ Questions about the ``right'' interpretation of +/− letter grades

The committee concluded that:

• Ultimately, final course grades are the sole responsibility of the course instructor.
• A single, institute-wide system for consistent grading would not be appropriate for the diverse collection of colleges, departments, and programs found at RIT.
• A top-down imposition of grading practices would not be effective.
• Consistency is achieved bottom-up through the activities of peer instructors coordinated at the department- and college-levels.
• If instructors are deliberate in their decisions about grading, then differences should not be taken as inconsistencies, but rather as part of the ongoing self-dialogue that characterizes higher-education.

The following recommendations were made to the AS on **May 18, 2017** during the presentation.

• Senators bring to the attention of constituents and initiate dialogue
• Deans and department heads solicit action from faculty as appropriate
• Include on the Academic Affairs - Faculty website
• Reference in "Beginning of Semester" reminders from Provost's Office
• Include with "New Faculty" orientation materials

Charge AA 3.1 and AA 3.2

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

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

Subcommittee: Joseph Miller; Minseok Kwon

These charges were based on the recommendations of the AAC 2015-2016. With the change in RIT policies D8, D17, D18, and D19 there is currently no place to address academic conduct and appeals procedures that may arise due to personal and professional integrity of faculty, particularly in the case of graduate students.

Charge AA 3.1

The AAC is **unable to determine the number of cases** that have proceeded beyond resolution at the College level - :
- There are **No cases (Academic Affairs/Provost Office)**
- **No response (Legal Affairs, Ombudsman)**
- There are **strict privacy concerns** about discussions of such cases in open forums

The privacy concerns forced the AAC to rethink about a general survey of all faculty, instructional staff, and students. The committee were not sure how to get this information in the light of personal and confidential issues. It is not clear who would own this information and how they can be accessed or verified.
 The subcommittee did conduct an **informal survey** of administrative officers of the various colleges of RIT regarding this matter. They limited it to 5 basic questions:

1. How often do you have situations crop up when students in your college have issues of academic disputes?

2. What processes are set in place in your college, to accommodate this dispute process? Describe.
3. Are those disputes archived and used to set future policy for the college (if similar academic disputes were to occur in the future)?
4. For *graduate students* (as opposed to undergraduates) how are disputes handled?
5. What is your initial reaction to a centralized board at the university level that would serve as the ultimate authority on academic disputes?

The **summary of the responses** are included below:

- Number of disputes between 0 and 6 disputes per year.

- All of these disputes were handled within current policy.

- Most disputes resolved within the college. There are not many disputes that reach the Provosts office.

- There number of cases involving graduate students is even less. It was believed that the current policies also applied to graduate students.

- In view of current practices being adequate there does not appear to be any need for a centralized board. It was felt to be another bureaucratic overload. It diminishes the roles of current administrative officers and may present resolution of the dispute at the college level

Most of the disputes revolved around academic integrity matters in the case of an **undergraduate** student, particularly grade disputes

The AAC felt that academic disputes of Masters and PhD students will differ from undergraduate students in significant ways and may require different type of actions.

AAC Suggestion: Since RIT is seeking to increase graduate enrollment significantly these concerns should be brought to the attention of the Graduate Council.

Charge AA 3.2

The AAC understood that AA 3.2 would be determined by Charge AA 3.1

At this time the AAC **does not recommend** that a university policy should be drafted to establish a University Academic Appeals Board (UAAB)

Charge 4

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

Subcommittee: <u>Callie Babbitt</u>; P. Venkataraman; Matthew Fluet

Report:
- [AAC's Charge #4 - White Paper on the Proposed Formation of a Research & Scholarship Committee](#)

Background:
"We are now a national research university and research is a big part of how RIT is currently constituted, as evidenced by the $70M in awards last year. It is also a very important factor in how we are ranked and viewed by those outside the university. It has never been more important to have the faculty voice represented in our institutional governance of our research enterprise." – Ryne Raffaelle – Vice President of Research at RIT

- RIT is at a clear point of transition in the evolution as a research institution strategic goal: "the student-centered research university"
- Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education: from "Masters – Comprehensive" to "Doctoral University - Moderate Research Activity."
- Concurrently, an emphasis on *interdisciplinary* scholarship has been underscored, which presents new challenges and opportunities
- Research compliance issues have increased dramatically over the last decade and are likely to continue become even more complex moving forward.
- University policies and practices will likewise evolve and emerge to catalyze, facilitate, and sustain the growing research endeavor, while maintaining excellence in teaching and learning
- These policies are likely to have direct and indirect impacts on all faculty and our ability to provide students with meaningful research experiences
  - Ex: Indirect costs ("overhead) return distribution and strategic reinvestment

Process:
- benchmarking other universities
- seeking input from RIT VP of Research, Ryne Raffaelle, and relevant committees at RIT
- consulting with RIT documents, such as the Governance and Administrative Policy libraries and the RIT 2015-2025 Strategic Plan

Benchmarking was carried out by identifying universities who had standing committees focused on research issues and studying publicly-available information about their charges, activities, and findings

Universities: University of Rochester, University at Buffalo, University of Pittsburgh, Case Western, Drexel, North Carolina State, Stanford, Emory University, Georgia Tech, Oakland University, UC Davis, Penn State, and University of Washington

Key items identified included committee name, responsibilities, charges, and current issues and challenges being addressed.

Findings:

- Currently, mechanisms for the faculty role in shared governance related to research policies and procedures are diffuse and unclear
- In some cases, needed research policies have not been formulated due to lack of a "home" committee to undertake the necessary research and recommendations.
- Many universities have a comparable committee at the level of Academic Senate (or comparable)
    - Typically focused on evaluation of and advisement on university-level research policies, compliance issues, and support structures (library, research computing, IT/reporting systems)
    - Some assist in review and awarding of internal grants and awards (e.g., seed funds, research recognition)
    - They often include both funded and non-funded research and scholarship

Recommendations:

The sub-committee recommends that the Academic Senate form a <u>Research and Scholarship Committee</u> to represent the faculty in matters pertaining to research and scholarly activity

with the following responsibility, scope and example charges

Responsibility: to evaluate, propose, and monitor effectiveness and implementation of University-level policies and procedures with respect to research operations and facilities, and research regulation and compliance in support of the diverse research and scholarship activities throughout the University.

Scope: research and scholarship of all types for which University-level policies and procedures may apply (e.g., funded and non-funded; faculty and student; graduate and undergraduate).

Example Charges:
- Evaluate sufficiency and opportunities for improvement of current models and mechanisms for strategic reinvestment in research (e.g., the University overhead return model, seed funds for research initiation)

- Propose mechanisms for catalyzing interdisciplinary research (e.g., overhead return distributions between colleges, credit for collaborating researchers on sponsored awards)
- Propose policy and guidelines for forming or affiliating with a named research center or lab (including Centers for Research Excellence and Signature Interdisciplinary Research Areas)

- Review existing research-related policies, such as Misconduct in Research and Scholarship C02.0 (last review (LR) 1996); Protection of Human Subjects in Research C05.0 (LR 2011); C04.0 Individual Conflict of Interest and Commitment Policy (as it relates to research) (LR 2011); C03.0 Intellectual Property Policy (LR 2009)
  (This is current charge AA 7 of the AAC)
- Review the adequacy of RIT communication and resources provided to assist faculty with policy compliance (e.g. Understanding applicability of Human Subjects Research Policy in conducting Pedagogical studies)
- Evaluate the adequacy and effectiveness of current systems for collecting data to characterize faculty scholarship (e.g., Faculty Scholarship Report).
- Evaluate the adequacy and effectiveness of current systems for collecting university-level data on sponsored research (e.g., RAPID)
- Advise VP for Research and/or Sponsored Research Services as necessary with respect to calls for proposals with limited submissions

Motion:
The Academic Senate establishes the Research and Scholarship Committee

On Thursday, April 20, 2017 12:05 – 1:50 PM Slaughter Hall – 2230/2240

The Academic Senate endorses the establishment of a Research and Scholarship Standing Committee. The motion carried 23-0-2. The Executive Committee will take on the responsibility of commencing the procedure for establishing the committee.

Charge AA 5

Review RIT Policy D2.0
https://www.rit.edu/academicaffairs/policiesmanual/d020
and modify as needed in order to clarify/update the amount of transfer credit allowable for an undergraduate degree.

Subcommittee: Tracy Davis; Scott Wolcott

This charge consumed a lot of time within the committee and more within the subcommittee. It was driven by Scott Wolcott at the later stages.

Current Status: Transfer Credit is decided by Policy D 02.0 (Admission) and D12.0 (Graduation Requirements)

From RIT Registrar Web Site: - **Undergraduate – Transfer credit - The Basics**

RIT awards transfer credit for courses completed at other regionally accredited colleges and universities only. Transfer credit at the undergraduate level will only be granted for course work completed with a grade of "C" or above (see RIT Grades policy). There is **no limit on the number of credit hours that can be awarded**, however, a recipient of a **two-year associate degree cannot receive more than 60 semester credits for that degree**. Regardless of the total amount of transfer credit awarded, a **minimum of 30 semester credit hours needs to be completed at RIT in the college granting the degree for Associate and Baccalaureate degree candidates**

Who evaluates my transfer credit?
Transfer credit is evaluated by the academic school or department in question and the College of Liberal Arts. Official transcripts from each college or university previously attended must be sent to the RIT Office of Undergraduate Admissions.

Policy D02.0 – I A
Under no circumstances can a recipient of a **two-year associate's degree from another institution receive more than two years' transfer credit for that degree.** However, **applicable courses successfully completed beyond the associate's degree at the upper division or equivalent level may transfer to the student's intended program**. RIT residency requirements must be satisfied. (See Policy D.12).
This policy as currently stated was acceptable to the AAC.

AAC felt that:
   • Only deserved transfer credits were being allowed

- Students have to obtain written permission of the dean or the program head prior to taking the course at other institutions and requesting transfer credit, once they are registered in the program.

Policy D 12 – II C (original)

A minimum of 30 credit hours shall be successfully completed in residence at the university in the college granting the degree (inclusive of service courses). If the student has successfully completed 30 credit hours in residence, a petition may be submitted to the dean to study 10 credit hours in absentia in the final year of the degree; at a minimum, 20 of the final 30 credit hours are to be completed in residence.

Scott communicated with the following personnel across colleges to understand the issues and concern with the change in policy.

Lynne Mazadoorian, Director University Advising Office;

Sean Bennett, CAST Assistant Dean for Undergraduate Academic Affairs;

Linda Tolan, CAST Senior Associate Dean;

Andrew Herbert, CLA Associate Dean and

James Hall, Interim Graduate Director School of Individualized Study.

The following are some of the remarks from AAC and the above personnel

- The minimum is 30 credit hours
- The minimum is 50 credit hours in certain circumstances
- The minimum credits required for "branding" from a program
- Students can transfer 90 credits hours from other institutions
- The current policy should be more flexible
- Could there be a middle ground such as 30 of the remaining 60 credits in the degree must be RIT courses?
- Or go with percentages to allow for the credit variation of programs?
- 25% of any program must be RIT courses taken during the last four semesters of the academic program excluding co-op semesters.
- What does 'inclusive of service courses' mean? Does that mean that all the math, science and liberal arts courses count toward the 30 credits? This needs clarification for that reason but also since we need a clear definition of what a service course is.
- Also, a student becomes inactive after not being registered for two semesters (check with registrar?) they must re-apply so this needs some statement about re-applying to RIT and coming under the curriculum and transfer evaluation in effect at the time of re-admission to their program –lots could change - to be sure students understand. This might be references to other policies.
- One question we always have is why doesn't COS evaluate math and science? Couldn't we add COS specialists to the existing CLA Transfer evaluation office and make this General Education Transfer Evaluation Office?
- A question came up about the fact that the final year residency requirement and flexibility has been removed. Is that the intent? – SOIS is particularly interested in this flexibility to

bring back students to the campus to complete the graduation requirements after years of leaving RIT.

- Student spends 4 years at RIT, in their last year they take a job for Spring. The old system allowed them to take 10 credits (with permission) elsewhere and have the RIT degree. The new policy is silent on that. Is that the intent?
- The basic philosophical question here is 'what makes a degree an RIT degree?' I believe that any solution should be around the total percent of the credits that need to be RIT credits and RIT – approved transfer. If we figure that out – does it really matter what the scheduling timeframe is?
- The in-absentia policy is a confusing nightmare and a barrier to degree completion,
- Is the 30 credit residency requirement the same for baccalaureate and associate degrees?
- Current policy includes both baccalaureate and associate in one section --but I wonder if they should be proportionate to program length?
- Should the proposed changes go into effect, is the residual language sufficient to assure continuity across colleges and departments? In other words, is the revised language so flexible that some colleges and departments would elect to hold students to the old standard while others elect to implement more liberal standards? Further, absent additional clarity, might there also be a risk of wide variance in the application of the rule from student to student within the same department?
- The current policy provides the opportunity for transfer students to be cost efficient in deciding when and where to take courses.
- We want to encourage transfer students to come to RIT. They are often very good students and exhibit a high retention rate.
- Transfer students make up a large percentage of some programs at RIT.
- Increasing the residence requirement could negatively impact transfer numbers by limiting the amount of transfer credit awarded and extend the amount of time a student would have to pay RIT tuition to get this degree.
- Increasing the residency requirement could result in transfer taking the repeating course content at RIT that they successfully completed at another college or university.
- The current policy allows programs to assist international students who currently hold similar BS degrees from another country to obtain a US degree from RIT. It is the belief of some immigrants with professional degrees that they need a US degree to find employment in the US.
- A current student from Egypt is typical. He has a BS degree in civil engineering from a university in Egypt. He went to MCC to earn a two year degree in automotive technology. He was not happy doing that and is now enrolled in the civil engineering technology program. Most of his lower level technical courses and math courses transferred from Egypt. While working at a local 'bigbox' store, he has taken many GE courses from MCC to reduce costs. The MMC courses have transferred. We require him to take all our upper level and some lower level technical courses (e.g. autocad) to insure that he is well prepared for a civil engineering career in the US.
- The current charge from AS does not ask AAC to makes changes to policy intent; only clarification. "Review is needed to determine if a modification to current policy language is warranted in <u>order to provide clarity</u> of intent and consistency in interpretation."

Scott did an informal search of residency requirements for universities granting 4 year degrees. He took the first 19 universities that appeared in Google using the following keywords: credit, hour, residency, requirement, undergraduate.
Joe Laffredo, Associate Vice President and Registrar, offered to have his staff do a more formal search.

University	Minimum Credit Hours	X of their last Y credit hours	Other
University of Georgia http://bulletin.uga.edu/bulletin_files/uga_req.html	None	45 of the last 60 credit hours	15 of the credit hours in a student's major.
University of Central Florida http://catalog.ucf.edu/policies/degree-requirements	25% of the total hours required for the degree	30 of their last 39 credit hours	
University of Utah http://registrar.utah.edu/graduation/undergraduateresidency-requirement.php	30 credit hours.	20 of the last 30 credit hours	
Texas Christian University http://catalog.tcu.edu/2009-2010/undergraduate/1469.htm	58 semester hours	last 30 semester hours	42 of the total hours in advanced courses 12 semester hours of advanced work in the major
William and Mary http://www.wm.edu/offices/registrar/studentsandalumni/militaryandveterans/credit_hr_residency_req/index.php	60 credit hours		15 credit hours in the major

University	Minimum Credit Hours	X of their last Y credit hours	Other

University of Illinois at Chicago http://catalog.uic.edu/ucat/deg ree-programs/univ-degreerequirementsgraduation/#enrollment residence requirement		**either the first 90 hours or the last 30 hours of University work must be taken at UIC**	
Arizona State University https://catalog.asu.edu/ug_gra d_req	**30 credit hours**		
DePaul University https://www.depaul.edu/univer sity-catalog/colleges-andschools/business/academics/ undergraduate/academicpolicies/Pages/residency.a spx		**Final 60 credit hours**	**... and one-half of the credit earned in the major area of concentration**
University of Mississippi http://catalog.olemiss.edu/aca demics/regulations/degreerequirements	**25% of degree requiremen t.**	**15 of the last 21 credit hours**	**30 semester hours of residence credit must be taken in the school or college recommendin g the degree.**
Missouri State https://www.missouristate.edu /registrar/catalog/genebacc.ht ml	**30 hours of courses**	**20 out of the last 30 hours (note: there is petition language, too!)**	**12 hours of upper division credit in the major**
American University http://www.american.edu/prov ost/undergrad/undergradrules-and-regulations.cfm		**45 of the last 60 credit hours**	

University	Minimum Credit Hours	X of their last Y credit hours	Other
Temple University http://bulletin.temple.edu/undergraduate/academicpolicies/academic-residencyrequirements/		45 hours of the last 60 hours	
Kettering University https://www.kettering.edu/programs-and-degrees	five full-time academic terms		
Northern Illinois University http://catalog.niu.edu/content.php?catoid=10&navoid=264	30 semester hours		
Texas State http://advising.txstate.edu/graduation/requirements.html	25 percent	24 semester hours of the last 30 hours	And at least 24 semester hours must be advanced and at least 12 hours of the advanced work must be completed in the major
University of Alabama at Birmingham http://catalog.uab.edu/undergraduate/completionofadegree/	25 percent	21 of the last 30 semester hours	
University	Minimum Credit Hours	X of their last Y credit hours	Other

University of Iowa https://clas.uiowa.edu/students/handbook/requirementsbachelors-degree		final 30 credit hours in residence OR Earn 45 of the final 60	OR earn an overall total of 90 s.h. in residence credit
Lehigh University http://catalog.lehigh.edu/undergraduatestudies/graduationrequirements/undergraduateresidencyrequirement/		60 of the last 75 credit hours	OR a minimum of 90 credit hours,
West Virginia University http://catalog.wvu.edu/undergraduate/degree_regulations/degree_regulations.pdf		final 30 credit hours in residence	OR a minimum of 90 credit hours,

8 of the 19 universities have 30 ch or 25% similar to RIT

15 of 19 had requirements for all or some portion of their last ch

be taken in residence. 7 of 19 required # credit hours in the

major.

AAC believed that this policy was the reason for confusion. The AAC felt it could be improved to be
- **more clear**
- **Degree granting unit is fully capable and obligated to ensure the integrity of their degree and therefore has the completely responsible for the transfer credits earned in the program**
- **According to current policy students seeking to transfer credit through courses at other institutions must get written permission from the dean before enrolling for the course in those institutions.**

Policy D 12 – II C (Proposed revision - AAC)
A minimum of 25% of the total semester credit hours required for the degree shall be successfully completed in residence at the university in the college granting the degree. The degree granting program shall decide which specific courses and semester credit hours shall count towards the residency requirement**.**

A motion was made to modify Policy D 12 – II C above in the AS on May 18, 2017.

The motion did not pass.

Charge AA 6

Revise Leave of Absence policy, D02.1 and propose modifications, as necessary https://www.rit.edu/academicaffairs/policiesmanual/d021

Subcommittee: Dino Laury; Joyce Hertzson, (Christine Licata)

Report:
AAC's Charge #6 - Proposed Student Leave of Absence Policy (Document and PPt) 4/20/2017
Tina Sturgis, Senior Associate Registrar

Leave of Absence (LOA) Policy and its effects:
- LOA has been identified to influence on-time-graduation (OTG).
- The institute needs to control LOA to make sure they are justified and are not due to low grade expectations at the end of the quarter.
- The federal government is cracking down on abuses in financial aid. They are getting stricter with student aid and wants the institute to make sure students complete their program on time. The audit of the financial aid office has increased.
- There is no financial aid if students take more than 150 % to complete the program.
- Students on LOA fr a term are basically throwing out a terms worth of expenses, including financial aid. LOA for a year costs students $60,000.
- LOA approval still primarily rests with the academic unit with input from SBCT if appropriate.
- The institute wants to get tough with LOA for low grades. A new explicit statement about processing LOA after the last day of class is now included in the policy.
- It was suggested that the academic unit can always grant LOA after the last day of class if it is justified.
- The institute wants to train the academic advisers to communicate with the students about the trivial use of the LOA policy.
- The policy implementation still rests with the academic unit.
- Currently LOA information is part of student privacy. When students transfers to a new academic unit at RIT the new unit may not be aware of previous LOA issues.
- There is not much data being shared about the use of LOA on campus. The academic units do not have to share this information.
- There is no data available about granting or the denial of LOA across campus.
- There are 70 applications for LOA in the finals week last session.
- Students cannot earn a grade if they are on LOA
- LOA is the complete responsibility of the academic units.
- RIT is a **nonattendance University**? What does this mean?
- LOA and grades on short courses or during intersession? Students cannot earn a grade when on LOA at RIT. It is not clear if they can earn grade on short courses.
- LOA affects student financial condition.
- The changes in the policy is in line with FERPA

- RIT is also developing (planning to develop?) a stricter course withdrawal policy that will tie into the new LOA policy being proposed.

The proposed changes to Policy D02.1
Thursday, April 20, 2017 12:05 – 1:50 PM Slaughter Hall – 2230/2240 - AS

Overview of Changes in Policy
- Change in title of policy – from Student Leave of Absence to Leave of Absence and University Withdrawal Policy
- Address University Withdrawal for the first time in University policy.
- Removed LOA administrative procedures/processes from the policy.
- Detailed deadlines for request for leave of absence or university withdrawal in the current term (immediate Leave of Absence).
- Inserted additional information on financial implications and responsibilities of students to strengthen clarity.

Leave of Absence - Policy Clarifications:
- Duration of Leave of Absence – may not exceed 3 consecutive terms of non-enrollment.
- Extension of Leave of Absence – option removed.
- Window to request an Immediate Leave of Absence – between 1st day and last day of classes for a term (in cases where the last day of class is a Saturday requests must be completed by close of business Friday).
- In Case of Emergency or Involuntary Leave of Absence – in cases where the student is unable to initiate the request, the chair of the Student Behavioral Consultation Team (SBCT) may initiate and process a leave of absence in conjunction with the student's primary academic unit. The signature of the chair of SBCT will be accepted in lieu of the student signature.
- Academic or disciplinary suspension will override a Leave of Absence.

University Withdrawal:
Formally known as Institute Withdrawal.
- Introduced into policy for the first time – defining the parameters of University Withdrawal.
- Generally parallels the policy for Leave of Absence; HOWEVER a University Withdrawal is a permanent separation from the University. Students wishing to return to RIT after an University Withdrawal would need to apply through admissions.
- Window to request a University Withdrawal – between 1st day and last day of classes for a term.
- Academic or disciplinary suspension overrides a University Withdrawal.

Financial Considerations:
- New to policy – not new in practice.
- Details for students that take a Leave of Absence or University Withdrawal may have financial implications.

- Students who withdraw, drop out, are suspended, or take a leave of absence prior to completing more than 60% of term will have their financial aid eligibility recalculated.

Motion:
The Academic Senate approves the proposed changes to Policy D2.1

Support for the proposed policy was given by senators and the motion carried 23-0-1

Charge AA 7

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

Subcommittee: <u>Callie Babbitt</u>; P. Venkataraman; Matthew Fluet

The charge was not addressed in AY 2016-2017. It was proposed as one of the sample charges for the new Research and Scholarship committee to be formed by the AS in 2017-2018.

Charge AA 8

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

Subcommittee: Danielle Smith, (Christine Licata); Minseok Kwon

This charge was considered a once in five year consideration of the policy to determine if there is a need to bring forth some changes.

Current Status:
Undergraduates: There does seem to be any pressing concerns about certification or the ceremony

Graduates (PhD): The Dean of Graduate Education, Twyla Cummings, is reviewing the process for certification along with the PhD directors of the colleges. Graduate Council is making recommendations for language in D12.0.

Recommendations:
1. The AAC does not recommend any policy change to D 13.0 at this time

Charge AA 9

Review and summarize the report from the OTG Task Force and make recommendations for revision, as necessary, to Course Withdrawal Policy (D.05,IV) https://www.rit.edu/academicaffairs/policiesmanual/d050 and Probation and Suspension Policy
(D.05.1) https://www.rit.edu/academicaffairs/policiesmanual/d051

Subcommittee: Scott Wolcott; Joseph Miller; Joyce Hertzson, (Christine Licata)

Current Status:
The final report of the OTG task force was only available recently.
1. Provost Haefner shared the OTG report with the AS on March 9, 2017. Therefore no summary is presented.
2. Revisions to course withdrawal policy will be discussed by AAC in 2017-2018 and brought to AS for action (recommendation)

Potential Impact on Course Withdrawal Policy
In the current report among the considerations for revisions to policy:
- Prohibiting full-time students from dropping below 12 credit hour without departmental approval
- Prohibiting students from withdrawing from the same course more than once
- Placing a maximum credit withdrawal limit for a student's undergraduate career (4-6 credit bearing courses)

Key Issues recognized in OTG (on Course Withdrawal):
- RIT's current course withdrawal policy is very liberal and contributes to students not earning sufficient credits to graduate on time.
- Students must earn a minimum of 30 credits per academic year in order to graduate on time.
- Based on our research, the number of course withdrawals is significant.
- Additionally, the number of students who withdraw from at least one course in an academic year and don't earn 30 or more RIT credits in the same academic year is also significant.
- Our current process allows students to withdraw from courses without receiving information about the possible impact.
- We suspect that students are frequently unaware of the impact of their decision to withdraw from one or more courses.
- A real-time mechanism that provides guidance before the course withdrawal occurs may result in fewer course withdrawals and more students positioning themselves for on-time graduation.

Action item in current OTG report (on Course Withdrawal)
- Given the large number of course withdrawals that occur every term, we recommend modifying the current course withdrawal request process within SIS.
- The request process would require a student to review statements about the potential impact of course withdrawals, acknowledge their understanding, and identify the reason for the course withdrawal before submitting their request.
- This would require a custom build in SIS, and could be modeled after a similar process at NYU.

- We believe that this would ensure that students are making informed decisions regarding their course withdrawal, and we suspect that some students may choose not to process their request once they read through the impact statements.

Recommendation:
1. The AAC recommends that the charge for making revisions to Course Withdrawal Policy will be addressed by AAC during the 2017-18 Academic year in consultation with members of the OTG Task Force.