

Academic Affairs Charge 5 and Charge 10

Joe Lanzafame and Heidi Nickisher

AA 5 Review Policy D05.0 and address the need to include language stating how in courses with multiple sections in a semester, the department head might require a common final. Propose a policy change if necessary and bring to senate for discussion and vote.

AA5

AA5 is written to inquire about changing policy D05.0 which reads:

I. STATEMENT OF STANDARD

At the commencement of the course, and as appropriate throughout the course, it is the instructor's responsibility to:

- A. Define criteria for evaluation.
- B. State the process for converting the professor's evaluation criteria to the RIT grading system.
- C. Identify timelines for announcement, submission, and the return of graded work either at the beginning or during the progress of the course.

Plaintiff's concern:

The plaintiff wants language added that empowers the Chair/Head to mandate common exams.

After discussion with the plaintiff, we concluded that his main concern was his academic freedom -- that when a department chair requires a common exam, it potentially impacts the freedom of the faculty to teach classes in the ways in which they see fit -- and that he feels D5.0, as currently written, which makes grading *his* responsibility, means that his School Head/Department Chair does not have the authority to mandate common exams or syllabi.

Our Discovery:

- The College of Science is trying to get to more uniformity across multi-section courses and it is our understanding that KGCOE is trying to do the same with some of their courses. COS has been doing common exams for some time now. For the university physics courses, all exams midterms and finals are entirely common and are typically a combination of multiple choice questions and problems to solve.
- Moreover, Policy E2.0 which reads (excerpted with emphasis added):

All members of the faculty at Rochester Institute of Technology are entitled to full freedom in their teaching, in studies and research, and in the publication of the results of their studies or research. Likewise, they are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subjects and material relating directly to them. However, they shall not regularly introduce into their teaching controversial material which has no relation to their subjects. **Likewise, it is expected that the aforementioned teaching will be aimed toward achieving the educational objectives agreed upon by the faculty, administration and board of trustees.**

Bobby Colon discussion (excerpted)

1. Private institutions (like RIT) do not have any inherent right to free expression. Any such rights are strictly a function of the institutions internal policies.
2. E2.0 could be read to apply to the plaintiff's concern.
3. The C11.0 revisions [**C11.0 POLICY WITH RESPECT TO DEMONSTRATIONS ON CAMPUS**] MAY clear up the limits of freedom of expression on the campus.

Our Recommendation:

No policy changes in response to the charge brought as current policy covers the concern of the plaintiff.

Point of Information: Do we need a motion to dispose of the charge or can we just dispose of the charge?

Questions?

AA10

AA 10 - Review Policy D05.1 for possible revision to remove the upper credit boundary.

This charge specifically refers to D05.1.IV.B

D05.1 ACADEMIC ACTIONS AND RECOGNITIONS

IV. OUTSTANDING UNDERGRADUATE SCHOLAR AWARD

B. Minimum University Requirements

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

Sue Provenzano comments (from an email):

“There really isn’t an advantage to having the upper boundary. It was in the policy to ensure that only eligible undergraduate students would be pulled from the system. But we quickly realized that for BS/MS programs, it created the opposite issue by not pulling eligible students because of the number of credits they had earned even if they were still undergraduate students. This was also the case for students who had transfer or AP credit. The Registrar’s Office had to sometimes run two lists in order to be sure no eligible students were missed. They can pull the list using undergraduate status as a parameter so they are in favor of removing the upper boundary. ”

Our Motion:

Change D05.1.IV.B.1 to read:

1. Must have completed a minimum of 83 credit hours of work, of which not less than 45 hours must be in RIT grade-bearing courses.