

1 **APPROVED New Charges**
2 **October 19, 2017**

3 **Charge AAC NEW 1 Review Policy D05.1 for possible revision to remove the upper credit**
4 **boundary.**

5 Sue Provenzano writes, “the Outstanding Undergraduate Scholar Award is governed by policy
6 D05.1 – Academic Actions and Recognitions. The policy sets the minimum requirements for
7 award as follows:

8 *Minimum University Requirements*

9 *Must have completed 83-128 credit hours of work, of which not less than 45 hours must be in*
10 *RIT grade-bearing courses.*

11 *Must have a cumulative GPA of 3.85 for all work completed at the university as of the previous*
12 *spring term.*

13 Over the past couple of years, we have noticed a problem with the upper boundary of credit
14 (128) as it essentially makes BS/MS students or undergraduate students with significant
15 transfer/AP credit ineligible for the award. Jeremy has been approving exceptions to the policy
16 so that these students can be considered. To eliminate the extra work involved in manually
17 checking these students and then Jeremy having to approve exceptions, could the Academic
18 Affairs Committee review this section of the policy for possible revision to remove the upper
19 credit boundary? We have checked with the Registrar’s Office and the upper boundary could
20 be removed without creating other problems in identifying students who are eligible for the
21 Award.

22 I know that charges may already be set for this year but it would be really helpful if this revision
23 could be considered for next year’s candidates. For this year, we will continue to have Jeremy
24 approve exceptions.”

25

26 **Charge NEW 2 Identify ways to develop and improve the holdings of research materials**
27 **(books, journals and other materials, print and electronic formats) of the RIT Libraries in**
28 **order to support the needs of faculty and students as RIT continues to gain in stature as a**
29 **research university.**

30

31 Given RIT’s strategic commitment to improving its research profile and student success, review
32 benchmark data comparing the Wallace Center’s capacities and resource base for supporting
33 this commitment. Report the review of the data to the Senate during the spring 2017 semester
34 and, if appropriate, make a recommendation.

35 Owen Gottlieb, GCCIS

36 Tim Engstrom, CLA
37 Marcia Trauernicht, RIT Libraries
38

39 ***

40 Background:

41 As RIT enlarges its academic portfolio, including the addition of more Master's and Ph.D.
42 programs and the corresponding faculty positions to support those programs, the resources
43 provided by the RIT Libraries lag behind the needs of faculty and students.

44 Identification of the need for additional space and staffing at the Wallace Center is described in
45 the April 2017 report "Expanding the Core: Renovation and Expansion of The Wallace Center
46 (TWC) at RIT."

47 ([https://www.rit.edu/academicaffairs/sites/rit.edu/academicaffairs/files/memos/TWCLibrary](https://www.rit.edu/academicaffairs/sites/rit.edu/academicaffairs/files/memos/TWCLibrary_Narrative_Updated_06-08-17.pdf)
48 [Narrative Updated 06-08-17.pdf](https://www.rit.edu/academicaffairs/sites/rit.edu/academicaffairs/files/memos/TWCLibrary_Narrative_Updated_06-08-17.pdf)) Since this report's purpose was to address physical space
49 needs, an analysis of library materials themselves was not provided.

50 The Information Services Department (interlibrary loan) acquires documents, articles, papers
51 and books that not held by the library for faculty and students. No library will ever maintain on
52 site every resource needed. However, multiple faculty requests repeated for the same
53 resources, increases in Ph.D. programs requiring in-depth resource coverage of those fields,
54 and major resources required by new programs that are not presently supported here indicate
55 the need for an examination of the library's current portfolio of resources, its ability to maintain
56 those resources, and an analysis of the financial support needed to raise the level of those
57 resources to reflect the research needs of RIT.

58 As a secondary point to this charge, faculty input on the enhancement of existing services and
59 collaboration opportunities provided by RIT Libraries, and the identification of desired services
60 not present may be gathered and analyzed. This information will be utilized in the examination
61 of future spaces and staffing needs.

62 The Director of RIT Libraries will be able to provide information concerning historical materials
63 funding, benchmarking data on the amount of materials dollars per student FTEs, and an
64 analysis of commonly requested resources by RIT faculty. A description of the current state and
65 future trends of publishing and access models can also be provided.

66 In addition, specific input from program directors and chairs on the library resources required
67 for the success of those disciplines—including accreditation—can be gathered. A survey of
68 faculty may also be conducted to provide more granular feedback. This information will be
69 compared to existing library resources.

70 If requested, a report to Academic Senate can be provided in spring semester 2017, and any
71 recommended actions to be taken by the Senate can be identified for its consideration.

72 **Charge FAC NEW 3** Revise the policy on Expedited Tenure to create a process by which a
73 criminal background check is completed and cleared before Expedited Tenure is granted,
74 **consistent with existing policy**. Request that Faculty Affairs Committee work together with
75 appropriate University channels and report back to the Senate with their recommendations
76 on February 1st, 2018. **(THIS CHARGE WAS NOT VOTED ON BUT POSTPONED)**
77

78 Background: As the Democrat and Chronicle reported, an RIT Associate Professor was placed
79 on leave on August 30th, 2017 due to a conviction related to soliciting a 15 year old girl in 2015.
80 The associate professor joined RIT that same year and was granted expedited tenure shortly
81 after. Our policies might be rewritten to prevent such a series of events from recurring.

82 Current Expedited tenure policy E05.0 link:

83 <https://www.rit.edu/academicaffairs/policiesmanual/e050#4- review process>

84 Elena Sommers is championing this charge.

85 **Charge FAC NEW 4 Review policy E6 VI.B and E6 VI.C for internal consistency**

86 In **VI.B.**, it is clear that after four years a lecturer *is eligible to apply* for promotion. However,
87 per policy language, in **VI.C.**, after four years, a senior lecturer is *eligible for promotion*.
88 Period. As per my colleague, this could be interpreted as meaning that a senior lecturer could
89 just “get” promoted – no application necessary. Perhaps the language in part “B” should be
90 repeated in part “C”. (Policy excerpted below.)

91 -----

92 E6. VI. Promotion to Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer

93 B. Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

94 1. Eligibility

95 At the time of hire as a full-time lecturer, an individual may receive up to two years of credit for
96 teaching at RIT or another institution of higher education. Credit will be assessed based upon
97 an equivalent full-time lecturer load. After four years of full-time teaching at RIT including any
98 credits received, a lecturer is eligible to apply for promotion to senior lecturer. If promotion is
99 granted, it will be awarded at the start of the following academic year.

100 C. Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer

101 1. Eligibility

102 After four years of full-time teaching at RIT as a senior lecturer, an individual is eligible for
103 promotion to principal lecturer. If promotion is granted, it will be awarded at the start of the
104 following academic year.

105 Heidi Nickisher is championing this charge.

106 **Charge AS/SA NEW 5: Investigate policies at other universities regarding a minimum time for students**
107 **to consider job offers and make a recommendation concerning whether RIT should have such a policy.**

108 Rationale: A number of other universities have policies that require employers to give students a
109 specific minimum time to consider offers (and receive competing offers). Such policies appear to work
110 well for their students, so a similar one might work well for ours as well.

111