

November 2, 2017 – Final Approved Standing Committee Charges for AY2017

ASEC (AS Executive Committee)

ASEC 1 Build and Charge a committee on Research and Scholarship based on the report from Academic Affairs, and the Senate minutes from 4/20/2017.

The executive committee will take on the responsibility of commencing the procedure for establishing the committee. Deans will need to be included as nominees from each college should be assembled.

ASEC 2 Work with Jeremy Haefner, Jim Hall and SOIS to develop the rationale for formally adding faculty representation from SOIS to the committees and to amend policy B02.0 accordingly.

Adding words such as "one faculty member per college or degree granting unit not residing within a college which offers a graduate program" should be added. This charge should be evaluated concurrently with associated charge ASEC 3.

In the meantime, encourage at-large representation by SOIS, Writing Program etc. on standing committees, with the motivation for a completed charge being the full and necessary inclusion of representatives from SOIS etc. in future standing committees.

ASEC 3 After review of the MSCHE report chapter on governance, make suggestions as to how Academic Senate can evolve at RIT.

ASEC 4 Review Governance Policy B02.0 and assess the need for separate by-laws for academic senate.

Chris Collison and Jules Chiavaroli have proposed this charge.

ASEC 5 Assess the value of each standing committee and the make-up of each committee taking into account efficiency and representation.

ASEC 6 Present a "Cliff Notes" for Academic Senate on use of Robert's Rules, and how we intend to use it. Provide suggested reading.

ASEC 7 Identify ways for senate to work formally with RIT Institute committees regarding development and improvement of the Wallace Center

Owen Gottlieb has suggested a charge that would lead to better supported library resources, "there is a committee in formation outside of Senate and I would like Senate to work with that committee".

ASEC 8 For policy revisions adopted at senate, ensure that the appropriate supporting information is sent to Assistant Vice President in the Division of Academic Affairs, once the Provost has signed off on these changes.

The appropriate supporting information is:

1. Revisions to policy will be sent to Sue Provenzano in a word document with the changes noted.
2. A clean version of the entire (amended and adopted) policy will also be provided to Sue Provenzano
3. Approved minutes that show the approval date (of the revised policy) and effective date for implementation of the revisions will be sent to Sue Provenzano

ASEC 9 Build SRATE Evaluation Taskforce with sponsorship by both the Office of the Provost and Academic Senate.

According to work from the Academic Affairs committee of 2016-17 and minutes from March 11th 2017, the Academic Senate and the Provost's office will co-sponsor a SmartEvals research initiative and will develop the charge and the associated timeline.

- a. Question: Who should develop the charge? Who has responsibility?
- b. How would the charge be developed? Read through minutes from Joe Lanzafame's visit to senate; supposedly from March 11th.
- c. We would be evaluating the use of SmartEvals; not the actual tool itself

The AAC Subcommittee makes the following specific recommendations moving forward:

1. The Academic Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate should maintain a central role, in concert with the Provost's Office, in the creation and implementation of the Research Committee.
2. The Research Committee should investigate appropriate statistical metrics for interpretation of SmartEvals results.
3. The Research Committee should undergo thorough training on the SRATE system as an integral part of their charge, and make recommendations as to the requirement, depth and frequency of training for deans, department chairs, and faculty.
4. The Research Committee should determine objective standards for acceptable performance that do not rely simply on being above or below the Institute average.
5. The Research Committee should survey the faculty to gauge their attitude and responsiveness to SmartEvals along with their understanding of the meaning of the results.
6. Student Government should be involved in the formulation of new guidelines.
7. Consideration should be given to mid-semester formative student evaluations. One major shortcoming of the current system is that any instructional issues that arise are not evaluated until after the semester has concluded. As a result, students will inevitably feel that the faculty are not responsive to their concerns because they do not observe any of the changes that their feedback helps to bring about.
8. The Research Committee should investigate a general system of instructional evaluation that does not rely solely on SmartEvals but that provides administrators with an efficient means of evaluating faculty performance and aiding faculty professional development.
9. While new standards are being researched and implemented, we suggest that SmartEvals data can be used robustly for formative assessment but cautiously for summative assessment.

ASEC10 Investigate the expansion of Academic Senate to include a parliamentarian and/or the General Counsel (or their delegate) in a non-voting capacity.

It has been suggested that the General Counsel, when representing faculty to interpret policy, serves on the senate as a non-voting member, the Academic Senate will be well served and policy may be written more concretely. A parliamentarian may add value regarding the use of Robert's Rules.

Academic Affairs Committee

AA 1 Review D5.1 and consider applying restrictions prohibiting suspended students from participating in other RIT sponsored activities such as student government, Simone Center grants, RIT Clubs and Teams. Make recommendations for associated policy changes and bring them to senate for discussion and vote.

It seems that suspended students are excluded from Division I or III sports, but the policy is not clear on club sports or other activities. Investigate RIT's liability to have non-RIT students on competition clubs, travel representing RIT, or participating in Tiger Tank or other Simone Center activities. Is there a loophole in policy? Should we suspend students from all Campus activities and not just academic activities? Policy D 5.1 Academic Action Policy might be reviewed, in particular the section containing, "a suspended student cannot enroll in any credit or non-credit course at the university while on suspension". Specific cases are known where students are suspended from RIT but still work for the Simone Center, travel with SAE Competition teams, or participate on other clubs. This charge was suggested by Rob Garrick, who has some data to support the concern.

AA 2 Assess the guidelines for contact time per credit hour in the case of laboratory intensive classes, from college to college, from both the students' and faculty's perspective (teaching load). Determine whether guidelines for contact time per credit hour and student work hours are being appropriately adhered to and, as necessary, suggest how these guidelines might change for more effective operation within the new calendar structure. Identify if this should be an Institute-wide initiative or whether this should remain under the purview of individual colleges or academic units.

Sean Rommel suggested this charge. Laboratory sections are RIT's hallmark for experiential/hands-on learning but seem to be only informally considered in the load. Since the switch to semesters, the question is asked as to whether a 3 credit hour class in certain units (engineering) is occupying a load more commensurate with a 4 credit class. What are best practices for counting credit hours, contact hours and student work hours for labs?

Michael Jackson explained it: "Since the [calendar] conversion, there are classes listed as 3 credits that require 3 lectures per week plus a Lab. Under quarters, that 2-3 hour lab was a separate credit hour. Basically, I see us requiring 4 credits of work but only awarding (and billing) for 3. This also ties up classroom space... Probably worse, a 3rd or 4th year student may

be taking 15 credits, but could easily be spending 20-22 hours in class/lab. Under quarters, students needed permission to carry this type of overload. I think too many of them are overloaded and not handling it well."

- AA 3 Investigate the options for i) a new FA grade (Failure due to Absence) and ii) faculty initiated student withdrawal from a class based on a student's demonstrated absence from two or more classes during add/drop week. Make a recommendation to senate for further action and policy change, as necessary.**

Investigate whether withdrawn students should be barred from participation in course evaluations.

Tom Prevandoski has initiated this charge since a frequent occurrence is the absence of students during the opening week of a course, while other students are waitlisted. In these cases, the students do not contact the instructor regarding their absence and it is typically too late for students to join a class once the student has actually withdrawn. Furthermore, when there are team projects, a student's absence negatively impacts those of other students, and more importantly D's, F's and W's strongly influence the instructor's evaluations and may be student-attendance related. Other discussion points include the ability to place the student attendance rate on the transcript or on the instructor evaluation. A review of current attendance policies should be considered

- AA 4 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.**

Elmer Young proposed that after section I.B the following line might be added: *'In courses with multiple sections in a semester, the department head might require a common final exam'* or *'In courses with sections mostly taught by adjuncts and TA's, the department head might require a common final exam'*. Elmer suggests AAUP Parate vs. Isibor may be informational.

- AA 5 Per policy B05.0, review policy D01.6 – Protocols for Academic Centers (last reviewed in 2008)**

Policy B05.0 requires that policies be reviewed on a five-year cycle with one of three outcomes: i) The policy is reviewed and affirmed as accurate as written, ii) The policy is revised using the appropriate review and approval process or iii) The policy is recommended for decommissioning (it may no longer be applicable or obsolete).

- AA 6 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.**

This is a repeat of charge 2016-17 AA 5. Concerns from Senate meeting on May 25th 2017 should be addressed.

Background: Questions have arisen with respect to the amount of transfer credit a student can receive for completion of a two year degree. Policy D 2, Section 1.A, last paragraph, indicates that “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) degree”.

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

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

AA 7 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/d050t> and Probation and Suspension Policy (D.05.1) <https://www.rit.edu/academicaffairs/policiesmanual/d051..>

Chris Licata proposed this charge in 2016-17 as a placeholder in the hope that the necessary groundwork etc. would be finished in time to bring recommendations to the AAC in 2016-17. Work continues into 2017-18. The On-Time Graduation Task Force was to be discussing all of its recommendations with Provost Haefner in September 2016 and prioritizing those recommendations was to be part of this discussion.

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

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

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

AA 8 Review Policy D05.1 for possible revision to remove the upper credit 3 boundary.

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

Minimum University Requirements

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

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

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

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

Academic Support and Student Affairs Committee

ASSA 1 Explore the costs and benefits of a fellowships office at RIT and make a recommendation to the Senate regarding the creation of such an office.

Suzanne O’Handley has suggested this charge. Both her undergrad (Rutgers) and grad (U Rochester) alma maters have excellent fellowships offices, which increase the international prestige of the university, when their students win top fellowships.

Currently at RIT the international office handles Fulbright Scholarships and O’Handley handles Goldwater Scholarships but it may be that these efforts simply scratch the surface of available prizes. In working towards this charge the committee may consider links for other universities such as Rutgers and U Rochester, regarding fellowships, viz:

<https://www.rochester.edu/college/studentfellowships/winners.html>
<https://fellowships.rutgers.edu>

ASSA 2 Evaluate the need to extend the admissions window to 1.5 years and investigate possible modifications to the application-to-admission timetable.

Casey Miller proposed this charge. The charge is accounting for students targeted or impacted by federal travel bans. The suggestion is to Investigate a new approach to bring forward the application deadline to August for admission the following August.

ASSA3 Regarding Final Course Grade Dispute Policy, make appropriate changes to policies related to D17.0 to address issues with references to the Academic Appeals Sub-committee. Make necessary changes in order to revise inconsistencies in Policy D08.0 and D18.0.

This is a direct re-write of Charge ASSA from 2016-17. What is the status of this charge and should this charge be modified accordingly?

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

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

SUGGESTION OF ACTION

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

ASSA 4 Investigate the will for RIT to become a “Sanctuary Campus”.

Jack Beck proposed this charge as an outcome from AAUP meetings in Rochester. As background, “a sanctuary campus is any college or university in the United States that adopts policies to protect members of the campus community who are illegal immigrants.” – WIKI

ASSA 5 Investigate what elements students need to be centralized in RIT’s electronic course management system and whether to require faculty to use RIT’s electronic course management system. Identify the barriers for more widespread faculty use and write appropriate policy, as necessary, for full senate review.

A consistent concern for students according to Provost Haefner and Student Government is that myCourses is not widely enough used by faculty. In the digital age, use of myCourses is a foundational tool for all students and it is not clear what barriers exist as to why it is not more completely used by instructors across campus. Ian Webber (ILI) may have data to assess current usage by faculty, which should be collected if available.

ASSA 6 Assess how well faculty needs are being served by ITS. Investigate the appointment of a Faculty representative, “ITS Liaison” for the university or for each college as part of the review on committees (ASEC 5 2017-18).

This is motivated by several conversations among faculty in the college of science where it is felt that faculty needs are prioritized and addressed over and above the priority list of ITS; there is no reason why solving the actual problems of high priority for faculty should be more expensive than solving the problems that ITS identifies, given that we all recognize that cyber security is critical to all.

ASSA 7 Investigate policies at other universities regarding a minimum time for students to consider job offers and make a recommendation concerning whether RIT should have such a policy.

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

Faculty Affairs Committee

FAC 1 Review the already-stated responsibilities of the different ranks and determine if it is appropriate for faculty at the rank of lecturer (contracted for one-year) to hold administrative titles. Based on the results of the review, propose wording for all appropriate policies (e.g. B2.0, E6.0), as necessary, that would provide clarification on this matter.

Note that lecturers by definition are contracted for one year and therefore are neither senior nor principal lecturers. Heidi Nickisher suggested this.

Regarding a definition for administrative titles, please consider any position that automatically implies or ensures a longer-than-one year appointment and also, more importantly, any position

where the lecturer in question may be put in a position to vote (on a Faculty Council within a collage, for example). Additionally, especially with regard to graduate programs, not all lecturers have terminal degrees, which may impact the credibility of graduate program offering terminal degrees. This is something that may not be stipulated specifically in policy.

FAC 2 Consult with RIT ADVANCE and consider RIT ADVANCE recommendations for further consideration by the Academic Senate.

Aaron McGowan suggested an investigation into the gap between the trend in population of Tenure/Tenure Track female faculty at RIT and the trend in number of PhD's granted to females nationally over the same time period. It seems that RIT ADVANCE has much of this data. After further reflection by Chris Collison and discussions with Margaret Bailey and Jeff Pelz, the charge has been rewritten to create more awareness of Data measured by ADVANCE and the group's proposed initiatives. As RIT ADVANCE completes its federal funding, the goal is also to understand what recommendations by ADVANCE might be taken on in future years by academic senate.

FAC 3 Investigate policies at peer universities regarding term limits for Department Heads, PhD Program Directors and Deans and consider making recommendations for RIT.

Hossein Shahmohamad suggested this charge with a notion of more regular renewal, and in the spirit of grooming other future possible internal leaders to be identified. Anecdotally, many other universities impose strict term limits and so there may be an opportunity for a rigorous comparison.

FAC 4 Review Visiting Scholar policy E09.0 and determine whether the policy can be clarified and the process streamlined.

Manuela Campanelli and Nate Cahill have expressed how current policy E09.0 is inappropriate when it refers to any student, post-doc, professor on sabbatical, researcher who is supported via PI research grants, PI lab funds or other external funding. It is proposed that, when the responsibility for their salaries and research is with the PI and/or when the salaries are being provided from an external body, a letter of appointment should suffice, (mostly because of the need to access RIT facilities (library, sport facilities, student housing, etc). It is proposed that the need for consent from other faculty in the department, the dean and the Provost might not be necessary and should not hold up the process; this research workforce is of great value to RIT and the letter from the PI, lab director and Dean should suffice.

FAC 5 Consider whether tenure and promotion policies should incorporate an individual's impact on diversity and inclusion as these issues are recognized in the hiring process but not in tenure and promotion

This is a follow up to Charge 2016-17 LRPEC7 ("Identify specific tenure and promotion processes that either overlap and resonate with, or inhibit progress toward specific difference makers and objectives from the strategic plan associated with diversity, inclusion, and race and gender equality"), which resulted in the observation that "Diversity and inclusion is absent in

tenure/promotional guidelines". This charge asks the Faculty Affairs Committee to consider how RIT culture can be moved forward and how associated virtues can be appropriately recognized and rewarded through the tenure and promotion process.

FAC 6 Complete revisions to Policy on the Discontinuance, Reduction or Transfer of Academic Programs E20.0, in concert with ICC to include removal of portions dealing with program review, placing it in D01.0. Ensure collaboration with ICC, who will subsequently revise D01.0 to include program review and discontinuance.

This is a carryover from 2015-16, and from FAC 3 2016-17. Special instructions for E20.0 include a removal of portion dealing with program review and placing it in D01.0. This action would necessitate that a simultaneous charge be given to ICC to revise D01.0 to include program review and discontinuance. The result would be an E20.0 policy which addresses the treatment of faculty in the case of program discontinuance or reduction, but not the program review itself.

FAC 7 Complete revisions to Policy on Assignment and Transfer of Tenure-Track Faculty E21.0 to address the consolidation of all aspects of transferring a program and faculty.

This is a carryover from 2015-16, and from FAC 4 2016-17 and is expected to come to senate in September/October 2017. Further special instructions regarding E20.0 and E21.0 include the consolidation of all aspects of transferring a program and faculty to be included in E21.0 leaving E20.0 to address only the implications on faculty resulting from the discontinuance or reduction in a program.

FAC 8 Complete revisions to Policy on Financial Exigency E22.0, thus completing the review and revision of all E policies as part of the updating of university policy and procedures which began 5 years ago.

This is a carryover from 2015-16, and from FAC 5 2016-17 and is expected to come to senate in Fall 2017. This will complete the review and revision of all E policies as part of the updating of university policy and procedures which began 4 years ago.

FAC 9 Review policies Principles of Academic Freedom E02.0 (last review (LR) 2010), Oath of Allegiance (LR 2010) E03.0, Faculty Pursuing a Graduate Degree at RIT E19.0 (LR 2005), according to policy B05.0.

This is a carryover from FAC 7 2016-17. According to Policy B05.0, Development, Review, Approval, And Promulgation of University-Level Policies, all policies are reviewed on a 5-year cycle with one of three outcomes: 1) Reviewed and affirmed – this means the policy was reviewed and there are no changes needed. The policy history is updated to reflect this determination. 2) Reviewed with edits – this means the policy was reviewed and non-substantive edits are needed, i.e., the name of a department needs to be corrected. The policy history is updated as appropriate. 3) Reviewed and revised – this means the policy was reviewed

and substantive revisions are approved. The policy is updated as appropriate. 2016-17 FAC7 E19.0 to come to senate in 2017-18.

FAC 10 Complete revisions to E06.1

This brings back the need for more appropriate language that describes how Distinguished Professors should be differentiated in order for that title to be awarded.

2016-17 FAC3 to come to senate in September.

FAC 11 Per policy B05.0, review policy E17.0 – Faculty Leave of Absence (last revised 2011).

Policy B05.0 requires that policies be reviewed on a five-year cycle with one of three outcomes: i) The policy is reviewed and affirmed as accurate as written, ii) The policy is revised using the appropriate review and approval process or iii) The policy is recommended for decommissioning (it may no longer be applicable or obsolete).

FAC 12 Consider a policy that: 1) formally acknowledges peer-reviewed Scholarship and peer-reviewed Scholarship of Teaching & Pedagogy produced by RIT Lecturers of all ranks and 2) incorporates such acknowledgment in the annual merit review documentation and process.

While policy E06.0 states that RIT Lecturers are “not expected to conduct scholarship,” it is well known that a great number of the 240 Non-Visiting Lecturers currently employed at RIT (especially 80 Lecturers with terminal degrees) are actively engaged in scholarship and produce peer-reviewed articles, edited volumes, books, and textbooks. Current problem the charge is addressing: Currently Lecturers in a number of Colleges are not allowed to include information about their scholarly publications in their annual Self-Evaluation document. More importantly, Department Chairs are discouraged from: 1) acknowledging in writing a Lecturer’s scholarly publications in the Merit review letter and 2) rewarding a Lecturer for such an accomplishment. Current policy E06.0 (and the above described practice) is founded on the concern that acknowledging scholarship produced by Lecturers blurs the difference between Non-T/T Lecturer faculty and T/TT faculty, and that it could implicitly convey an expectation of scholarship by Lecturers. However, by disallowing the acknowledgment of scholarship, the current policy sustains a deeper culture of inequity among faculty, by discounting Lecturers' contributions in advance. This charge is designed to rectify that inequity. It entails no adjustment in titles or entitlements for Lecturers, but only the removal of what has essentially become an unwritten prohibition of sorts on Department Chairs and Program Heads. Denying proper acknowledgment and recognition of peer-reviewed scholarly publications to a significant segment of full-time non-Visiting RIT Lecturer faculty discourages scholarly productive teachers from engaging in creative and innovative projects that benefit the students and the University overall. This is not a sustainable model for or a research Institution. RIT policy states that the primary responsibility of RIT Lecturers is teaching. Teaching encompasses many dimensions. Scholarly active Lecturers who seamlessly incorporate their research into teaching pedagogy should be applauded for their efforts. In evaluating their teaching effectiveness, Lecturers’ contributions to every teaching dimension should be recognized. Since the most significant part of Lecturers’ duties encompasses teaching, to exclude them from acknowledgement of Scholarship of any kind and Scholarship of Teaching & Pedagogy in particular is short sighted.

Thus acknowledgement of scholarly publications should be included in the annual review process, recognized, and rewarded when appropriate.

FAC 13 Review policy E6 VI.B and E6 VI.C for internal consistency.

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

E6. VI. Promotion to Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer

B. Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

1. Eligibility

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

C. Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer

1. Eligibility

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

Heidi Nickisher is championing this charge.

FAC 14 Review and propose clear guidelines regarding communication while a faculty member is placed on leave. This includes, but is not limited to, a timeline of ongoing association (including digital) of a suspended faculty member with the University.

The dismissal for cause process provides a backup to any offenses committed by an RIT faculty member after an initial criminal background check is cleared. However, there are no current policies that clearly address the implications of said faculty member’s ongoing association with the Department or program during the dismissal for cause process. (Example: appearing on the Department website, which is a public act of association with the program, etc.) **Request that** the FA committee propose or clarify the safeguards in place during the “limbo period”

of a dismissal for cause process.

General Education Committee

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

Following on from Charge GEC 1 2016-17: The Committee determined that the audit should be done on a department by department basis, and has done preliminary work to identify departments with which we should start (mostly Elizabeth Hane). Our plan has been to conduct the audit in part as an exercise in departmental self-evaluation, beginning the process by presenting them with a list of all their classes that have Gen Ed status and Perspective Designation and simply ask them to review the list for accuracy. We had planned on delaying the full rollout of the audit until we had acquired the curriculum management system (on advisement from the Provost's office); however, given that the curriculum management system will be delayed, we will start the audit next fall.

GEC 2 Determine whether it would be beneficial to have a protocol for awarding a variance to courses that are ill-suited to assessment of the student learning outcomes listed in the Essential Elements category (such courses might include large-enrollment courses in chemistry and biology), and if so, design and adopt such a protocol

Following on from Charge GEC 3 2016-17: A subcommittee has been formed (including GEC Chair, Provost's Rep, and College reps from the colleges where this is most significant an issue). Our inclination was to avoid creating a variance and instead focus on "educating" departments assessment protocols. Our initial plan was to combine the work on this charge with the audit, meaning to wait until the new curriculum management system was in place, but given the delay in acquiring the system, we will begin work on charge three next fall, along with the audit. An additional problem we encountered is that some of the rubrics for these SLOs haven't been completed yet, work will be ongoing over the summer. We will do the final work on this beginning in the Fall, along with the audit.

Global Education Task Force

GETF 1 In consultation with the Academic Affairs Committee, develop explicit policy regarding curriculum development and delivery at global campuses.

New policy will be drafted. The policy will address the creation of new courses proposed by faculty at global campuses as well as the delivery of programs, concentrations and minors at global locations that already exist in Rochester. Furthermore we will ask that the draft policy be

shared with all stakeholders, upon generation. Stakeholders will include Academic Affairs committee, ICC and college curriculum committees.

The concluding consensus at the 2017 Global Faculty Forum was that we needed a policy or set of guidelines for our global campuses, which would tell our global campus counterparts the steps they would need to take to instigate a new course.

GETF 2 In consultation with faculty leadership at global campuses and the Executive Committee, determine the purview, make-up/participant list and scope of charge for a Global Education Committee and propose the creation of such a committee if deemed necessary.

GETF 3 Review policy D7.0 and propose changes.

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

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

GETF 4 Communicate regularly with the faculty leadership at RIT global campuses regarding any governance issues of shared concern, including acting as a conduit between the global campuses and the relevant Rochester-based committees and offices. Report back to Academic Senate once per semester.

GETF 5 Investigate the pros and cons of adding global campus representation as a voting or non-voting member of Academic Senate

This charge is motivated by a desire to increase intercampus relationships and perhaps to formalize this relationship through Academic Senate representation.

GETF 6 Report to senate each semester on the availability of long-term course scheduling calendars for each global campus.

At the 2017 Global Faculty Forum, we talked about the need for a long range calendar from each campus so that we could encourage students to visit campuses more freely and more easily. At the very least that level campuses should need to plan for a year in advance, or such that the courses could be rolled over to the next year with some 80% confidence. When students do not know what courses are available each coming year these classes will not be populated. It was discussed how the Polycom schedule was a barrier. Other barriers were presented. Nevertheless it seemed that a major priority was that calendars must be developed for Global campuses for at least one year out. Academic Senate has no power to enforce this but by maintaining conversations about progress we keep this in full awareness of all stakeholders. One overarching goal is an increase in the number of successfully completed student exchanges.

GETF 7 Review policy associated with hiring faculty at Global Campuses to gain awareness of RIT Henrietta's participation through faculty representation on search committees. If necessary, propose amendments to E4.0 and E8.0.

The goal is to accomplish better cooperation between campuses.

Graduate Council

GC 1 Review Graduate Thesis/Dissertation Policy (D12.0 VII) and make any necessary changes.

This is a carryover from GC 2 2016-17 because efforts to establish minimum guidelines for Thesis/Dissertations were not completed. In particular, underlined text from Charge 2 of the GC 2016-17 report should be revisited. This suggested text pertains to the use of a program-specified style guide and a description of pages or sections that would be central to all RIT theses and/or dissertations. The suggested text was not brought to senate in 2016-17 and a final completion of the charge should be made. The committee is also encouraged to identify parts of a similar charge from 2016-17, which still remain and address them as they see fit.

GC 2 Review policy D12.0 and clarify the role of defense chair in this policy.

This is a carryover from GC 2 2016-17 and is addressing a concern that the role of defense chair is not clear enough in recently revised policy. Particular attention here should be given to the context of the PhD defense format, when policy D12.0 describes cross-campus procedures. For example, the question remains as to whether the defense chair has any vote on the defense outcome. Since the defense chair is not likely technical in the student's field, their role might be clarified; is participation of the defense chair purely to benefit the student and program by serving as an advocate for fair proceedings and to ensure the defense follows university guidance?

GC 3 Investigate the variation across all RIT graduate programs in interpretation of the policy to require a minimum GPA (currently 3.0) required for graduation, and how the

minimum GPA is calculated. Review all related policy to determine if modification is required based on these findings.

In the GC 2016-17 report a similar charge was proposed for 2017-18 given that there is perceived inconsistency across campus.

It is understood that some programs only count courses offered by and within the program “home”, while others count all courses. There is some variation as to when a grade on an elective is counted. In some programs, when a student performs poorly on an elective, another elective can be chosen without penalty, and in other programs the poor elective grade is counted. Other approaches include asking students to take *additional* courses beyond the number of credits required) to bring their GPA upwards. This procedure should be consistent across all programs.

In addition, if a course is a required course and the student receives a C- or lower, then they must repeat that course and the overall GPA must be calculated with the repeated course grade *in addition to* the initial C- course grade. Grad Council is asked to clarify/update/write a new policy to make sure there is consistency across campus for all stakeholders.

Please involve Agamemnon Crassidis, Ed Hensel in discussions

GC 4 Develop a more effective mechanism for communicating Graduate Policy changes to the Graduate Program Directors, Program Faculty, and Students.

Based on the GC Final report of 2016-17, graduate retreats often reach only 25% of the program directors and it is unclear as to whether all graduate program directors are effectively implementing, interpreting or understanding of revised policy. It is recognized that a more effective communication mechanism will benefit all parties.

GC 5 Make recommendations for streamlining the graduate program proposal process.

Graduate Program Proposal Process: The process of proposing new graduate programs is long, labor intensive, cumbersome and often results in program proposals being declined at the last stages.

Sophia Maggelakis, Michael Kotlarchyk, Robert Boehner, Vic Perotti and others have independently proposed the need to speed up and make more efficient the curriculum approval process.

Sophia Maggelakis writes, “New Professional Masters degrees and Micromasters/certificates may be formed quickly to adjust to a need in the workforce. The pace of change in the world is very rapid and therefore the development of certain courses and programs must be agile. Processes for new masters, in general are considered time intensive and there is a concern that these processes inhibit the development of new programs that would benefit from transient swells in demand. It is suggested that GC also be charged to review how the process for

developing new Professional Masters and advanced certificate courses can be streamlined for increased agility.

Robert Boehner writes, “our existing new degree approval process is highly bureaucratic and a significant barrier to innovation. When a new degree program is proposed that requires significant investment of Institute resources a rigorous review process is absolutely justified. But if a proposed degree has low financial risk and limited impact on teaching resources the process should be significantly simplified.” An example follows.

In SCB, an MBA degree requires 16 courses; an MS degree 10 courses. SCB could create an MS in Marketing degree with a sub-set of classes that we already teach in the MBA program. In other words the 10 courses for the MS in Marketing already exist and are already taught. The additional expense and requirement for additional faculty would be minimal - we would simply add approximately 10 students to course sections that we are already teaching. The financial impact on the college and Institute would be positive, in this case the tuition for 10 additional students.

The recommendation is that such a new MS in Marketing degree could be approved in 2 months within the College and Institute. Given the current process, approval for such a degree would probably take 2 years, perhaps 3.

GC 6 Identify whether current policy is sufficient to guide students in the situation where they are studying for multiple graduate degrees.

Ed Hensel describes how KGCOE adopted a standardized practice effective Fall 2016 because KGCOE encountered difficulties with students taking multiple graduate degrees, and the current policy did not anticipate that (increasingly common) occurrence. For example, a student completing both an engineering and a business graduate degree encounters several unusual circumstances. Ed prepared a detailed slide presentation illustrating several “special cases” where the current policy was not sufficient in meeting the intent and would be happy to make that presentation with any group(s) interested in identifying the underlying problems to be addressed in a graduate policy.

GC 7 Review policy D.12, specifically where it concerns the 20% limit of graduate transfer credits in Section V, Subsection C. Identify the origins, and impacts of this limitation to graduate education. Make recommendations for change in policy as necessary.

Michael Yacci has suggested review of this policy in addition to continual interest from members of Graduate Council 2016-17. The policy may refer to external programs and is therefore not well understood in its current form. Furthermore it is not clear as to why RIT limits the number of graduate transfer credits to 20% of the total. One suggestion is that RIT allows each program to set a number in accordance with its goals and outcomes to best facilitate education and to allow for reasonable flexibility. The committee is being asked to investigate this suggestion and others, with the goal of providing a clear policy that serves well the graduate programs and

graduate education across the Institute.

Inter-college Curriculum Committee

ICC 1 Study undergraduate curricular proposals from an institute-wide perspective, maintain appropriate inter-college relationships with regards to curriculum, assure that existing undergraduate curricula are periodically reviewed and make recommendations to the Academic Senate for action on proposals of new and significantly modified undergraduate programs.

ICC 2 Work with the Honor's program to revise Policy D1 to clearly outline curricular processes with regards to the Honor's program.

ICC 3 Work with Faculty Affairs to revised policy on discontinuance of academic programs (E20.0).

ICC 1 through ICC 3 were suggested in the 2016-17 ICC report by Dawn Hollenbeck.

ICC 4 Brainstorm, rank-order and propose to senate approaches to increase the flexibility of RIT's undergraduate degrees in order to allow students more truly free electives.

Clyde Hull suggests that, while RIT strives to be more interdisciplinary, there are multiple institutional barriers. Among them, students are constrained in their choices of what classes to take, making it hard for them to explore options outside their home major. Specific avenues to examine include:

- Do new requirements that students take classes to fulfill seven perspectives with eight courses provide meaningful options?
 - For each of the Perspectives, how many courses are there on campus that count toward that perspective?
 - Alternatively, what percentage of existing courses can be taken as electives by non-majors to allow these courses to qualify toward at least one Perspective?
- In non-CLA majors, how many of the GE courses are pre-specified? How many free electives are actually being chosen by the students, rather than being dictated by Major and Perspective requirements?

Possible solutions include:

1. Invite more courses that satisfy those Perspectives with the fewest number of currently available qualifying courses (and include an approach to allow seminars to qualify).
2. Eliminate or combine Perspectives for which there are too few qualifying courses on the books.
3. Combine (1) and (2) as a backup plan to reduce the likelihood of roadblocks.
4. Increase the number of Perspective classes that can be required within a major and still count as Perspectives (review the current approach that only allows two required classes

that can be counted toward Perspectives). The rationale here is that a Perspective class is a Perspective class, regardless of whether it's required. It is understood that students are encouraged to take courses outside their majors, but this may not be the appropriate avenue to accomplish this; the appropriate avenue may simply be that students are required to take X number of electives outside their home college.

5. Identify incentives/benefits to RIT for colleges/departments to reduce the number of required courses in their curriculum and increase the number of electives they allow their students to take. Among other things, this may also make it easier to take minors and double majors outside the college.
6. Identify incentives/benefits to RIT for colleges/departments to offer courses to students from other colleges. The current cost structure seems to discourage a given college from offering more classes to students from other colleges, since resources are allocated to a significant degree based on the student's major, rather than on what courses the student takes. Hence, outside of CLA, there may be a penalty for teaching students from other colleges.
7. Identify incentives/benefits to RIT for colleges/departments to work with SOIS to develop degree options for students who want to focus on one professional area (in the college/department) but want the flexibility offered by SOIS's BS Applied Arts and Science degree.

ICC 5 Using the sample sustainability learning outcomes, request all academic departments to identify all programs (majors, minors, immersions, etc.) that have a sustainability learning outcome. Set up a process (which may be delegated) by which this information is updated every 3 years, to reflect changes in existing programs and the development of new programs. [Moved from LRP&EC to ICC.]

This is a continuation of LRPEC 4 from 2016-17.

"Write a white paper and thereby propose an approach to perennially collect accurate data on the number of students graduating from programs for which there is at least one "sustainability" learning outcome. In addition, propose an approach to allow "sustainability" to be classified as a general education learning outcome."

This charge is expected to be completed during Fall 2017-18 based on a recommendation specifically made in the 2016-17 LRPEC report.

In more detail, the 2016-17 LRPEC recommended:

1. Approve sample sustainability learning outcomes against which departments can use to evaluate their existing learning outcomes. Sample sustainability learning outcomes are identified in the next section.
2. Using the sustainability learning outcomes referenced in #1, request all academic departments to identify all programs (majors, minors, immersions, etc.) that have a

sustainability learning outcome.

3. Update this information every 3 years to reflect changes in existing programs and the development of new programs.

Using the program list developed through this process, the number of unique students graduating from any of the identified programs can be acquired through the registrar's office on an annual basis.

Based on best practices from other schools, there are two ways for a program to be considered as having at least one sustainability learning outcome:

1. Sustainability is central to the degree program as is the case of Sustainable Engineering; Environmental Sustainability, Health, and Safety; or Sustainable Systems as examples. These programs focus on the interconnected nature of global challenges from a systems perspective and include economic, environmental, and social perspectives.
2. A required course for the degree program (major, minor, immersion, etc.) contains a sustainability learning outcome.

Examples include:

- Design products, process, or services in a manner that considers the social, environmental, and economic implications of those products, process, or services.
- Understand the impact that human activities have on the environment and society, including the consumption and allocation of resources.
- Understand the ethical responsibility toward present and future generations.
- Recognize sustainability as an integrated concept having social, economic, and environmental dimensions.
- Define and integrate social, economic, and environmental dimensions of global problems.
- Apply the principles of sustainability within the program field(s)
- Incorporate insights from multiple disciplines to address sustainability challenges.
- Identify and explain major sustainability challenges within the program field
- Understand how the Sustainable Development Goals relate to the program field.

Institute Writing Committee

IWC 1 Investigate the current state of writing in graduate programs, taking into account admissions, advising, course work, assessment, and student experience.

The motivation for this charge is associated with a concern throughout the RIT community that the standards of writing for graduate students should be stated. If the standards of writing are to be set for those students who graduate with a postgraduate degree, then it makes sense to understand first the percentage of applicants for each graduate program who are a) being rejected, or b) receiving contingencies against their admission or enrollment based on their perceived weakness in writing. What are the admissions standards for incoming postgraduate students? This charge asks IWC to quantify the selectivity of graduate programs based on writing strength of the applicant. Essentially, what are the admissions policies for each program?

If we admit students with poor writing skills, then it becomes a much more difficult job for the students' writing skills to be brought up to a very high level.

One approach may be to write and circulate a template to each graduate program director such that graduate writing standards for that program can be clearly and deliberately articulated, as a necessary first step in establishing a writing assessment tool. Thus, the motivation is that each program director deliberately identifies key learning outcomes for the students pertaining to written communication. Program directors may also describe the assessment tools already in place pertaining to writing quality. When a template is circulated there can be an apples to apples comparison between programs.

IWC 2 Convene a working subgroup to include at-large key RIT stakeholders (English Language Center Delegate, Wallace Center Delegate, Graduate Education delegate etc.) to write a third section of D01.5 University Writing Policy addressing graduate writing. This policy should i) provide a clear directive as to how graduate programs must participate in graduate writing improvement, and ii) modify the policy such that full buy-in from graduate programs is accomplished, based on discussions from IWC 1.

This is motivated by the Graduate Writing Report from Graduate Council 2016-17 and also by the need to consider the expected responsibilities of the entire RIT community - student, advisor, program and institute.

IWC 3 Add graduate writing to IWC's oversight and to evaluate generation or modification of associated policy across domestic and overseas campuses. Bring to senate any necessary amendment to Policy B02.0 for senate discussion and vote.

This is suggested by Linda Underhill, and seemingly endorsed by Joseph Hornak and Chris Licata.

IWC 4 Monitor and report to AS on the implementation and assessment of the Institute Writing Policy.

IWC 5 Review proposed WI courses.

IWC 6 Review COF Appendix B for internal consistency, as well as consistency with Appendix A (Gen Ed).

IWC 7 Serve as the faculty liaison with the University Writing Program and other writing-related initiatives, making recommendations when appropriate.

IWC 8 Make recommendations on how current Institute Writing policy that addresses desired language and level of writing proficiency may be clarified.

Charges 4 through 8 are standard perennial charges that are taken up by the Institute Writing Committee and are recommended in their year-end report for 2016-17.

Long Range Planning and Environment Committee

LRPEC1 Review status of Strategic Plan as it pertains to faculty.

Investigate implementation of prioritized dimensions and objectives. Identify and report on tactics that are already being implemented.

LRPEC2 Recommend what an appropriate level of paper consumption should be at RIT and compare our actual paper consumption with this level. If a significant gap exists, the committee should further investigate the root causes of the discrepancy and based on these root causes, make recommendations to bring us to the appropriate level of paper consumption. (This wording was amended on 9/21.)

During the 2016-2017 Spring, there were substantial copier/printer problems during finals week but it is unclear whether this is an isolated problem or one that is consistent across campus. These observations were made by Michael Osier, and Tom Prevandoski has proposed an associated charge of investigating RIT becoming paperless.

As far as possible seek out budgets for printing from each college and each administrative office. Valuable context would also be provided with a comparison of costs before centralized printing with costs after centralization. There were some studies showing centralization would increase printing costs and paper usage.

This charge originates from faculty dissatisfaction but it may be prudent to make a recommendation that the Office of Finance and Administration co-sponsor this effort since an expected outcome may be cost cutting as well as increased faculty satisfaction.

LRPEC3 Investigate the impact on global sustainability (e.g. carbon footprint) of total meat consumption at RIT and make recommendations in line with RIT's leadership in sustainability.

Investigate the impact on sustainability of reducing the total amount of meat product purchased by RIT Food/Catering and propose tactics to accomplish such a reduction to allow RIT to become a leader in food-based sustainability. Tactics may include the application of a sustainability tariff on meat dishes, which may allow for margins to be reduced on vegetarian options so that total current profit margins are maintained. Based on a cost-benefit analysis, bring recommendations (or a resolution) forward to academic senate, student government, staff council and University council, as necessary.

Chris Collison originated this charge given RIT's leadership in sustainability and the 2006 United Nations Report, "Livestock's Long Shadow: Environmental Issues and Options", released by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) on 29 November 2006. Local sourcing of food may be a broader issue, also worthy of consideration and likely overlapping this charge.

LRPEC4 Compare RIT against our benchmark schools regarding the extent of its Faculty governance. Make recommendations for evolving shared governance at RIT.

In this new dawn of presidential leadership at RIT, investigate the role of Academic Senate, understand the perceptions of value of shared governance and consider how RIT compares with other benchmark institutions. Make recommendations for how shared governance can work

more effectively for faculty at RIT given its current needs and philosophies.

LRPEC5 Determine the state of gender inclusivity across the campus.

The following issues might be addressed, beyond the work of ADVANCE, taking into account all women faculty, staff and students on campus (not just STEM). ADVANCE have data to support this work and should be consulted.

- Sexual harassment and sexual assault: only one case of sexual assault in the last several years has been handled, and it was proven to be a false accusation. It would seem that many cases are not being brought forward. Any woman with a legitimate accusation to make may look at what happened to the last woman who made an accusation and be intimidated. How can this intimidation factor be reduced? To what extent are concerns not being addressed?
- Nursing facilities: Female employees who need to pump milk for their babies and do NOT have their own offices may have to pump in a stall in the bathroom, an unpleasant setting for pumping. Identify the state of nursing facilities and assess the extent of the problem.
- Bathrooms: Some of our buildings may be scant on women's bathrooms. Could we audit them and put adding more women's bathrooms for the ones that are short on the list of things to do as buildings get renovated?

Resource Allocation & Budget (RABC)

RABC 1 Investigate the Activity-Based Budgeting and Responsibility Center Management budget models, and develop modifications and processes to align the models with RIT's needs and philosophies.

Charge RABC 4 from 2016-17 was, "Brainstorm and propose actionable, alternate approaches for allocating budget and resources to each college, along with a timeline for implementation. Provide expected impact, costs and benefits for new approach." The results of this charge are provided in the RABC 2016-17 report. The committee's research showed that there are several popular budgeting models used in higher education. At RIT, we currently use a variation of the Incremental Budgeting model.

RIT has been using this model for many years and has well-established practices (e.g., annual budget hearings) available to support it. While this model is relatively simple and straightforward to utilize, provides budget stability, and allows future planning by the units, it has created some issues that require addressing and does not allow the allocation of funds in a manner that drives the goals of the university.

Having investigated the various aspects of several budget models, the experiences of other universities, and the needs of RIT units, the 2016-17 committee concluded that the current

Incremental Budgeting Model is ineffective and that either an Activity-Based Budgeting or Responsibility Center Management model would be more appropriate. The main charge of RABC in 2017-18 is therefore to deeply investigate the Activity-Based Budgeting and Responsibility Center Management budget models, and develop modifications and processes to align the models with RIT's needs and philosophies. The full charge and timeline for that charge is provided in detail in the RABC 2016-17 report.

RABC 2 Identify presently available funding, and gaps in funding, for implementation of refined tactics for the prioritized strategic plan. Make recommendations for budgetary prioritization and resource allocation.

In 2016-17, the RABC committee received the list of prioritized strategic plan dimensions and difference makers through charge AY 2016-17 LRPEC1 (Prioritize the strategic plan from the perspective of faculty. Identify, through a ranking survey, the key difference makers that motivate faculty). Given that these prioritized dimensions came in to RABC towards the end of the 2016-17 academic year, there was insufficient time to investigate Charges RABC 1 and RABC 2 from AY 2016-17 in depth. However, even if the information had been received sooner, the committee felt that the list of strategies would first need to be refined into tactics in order to estimate required resource levels.

As Strategic plan dimensions and objectives are further refined, likely by Spring 2017-18, the RABC will estimate resource levels for implementation of prioritized tactics. RABC is encouraged to talk to the Academic Senate Executive Committee, the Academic Senate Long Range Planning and Environmental Committee, the offices of the Provost and the Office of the President regarding prioritized strategic plan tactics.

RABC 3 To build a 3-5 member steering committee, who will fully articulate the scope and membership of the Ad Hoc Committee to address the 50th percentile, overload and benchmarking for faculty compensation.

50% Benchmarking committee

Context.

In Spring 2016 a motion was made, "For the Academic Senate to form an ad hoc committee in collaboration with administration next year [2016-17] that will address the 50th percentile, overload and benchmarking for faculty compensation. The committee's composition will be determined by the Academic Senate by Fall 2016 and will include administration."

- The motion was approved with a vote of 21 in favor, 0 opposed and 7 abstentions

Delegated to Dr. Eli Saber, Academic Senate Vice Chair and the maker of this motion in Spring 2015-16.

On December 15 2016, Eli provided an update to senate. He reviewed related passages from the Strategic Plan and the presidential search committee for context. This illustrated potential gaps and challenges. A proposed charge for the committee was then shared:

Develop/recommend an upward trajectory growth of the 50th percentile to be more strategically aligned and correlated with the University's Strategic Plan 2015-2015 Vision, Mission and Execution.

He shared a proposed committee action plan and a request for senators to acquire feedback from college constituents and to provide a Yea/Nay vote as to whether to proceed. He asked senators to work through email over [winter] break. No response was received to trigger further senate discussion. The motion is effectively tabled.

Attachments as background information will be sent for your review.

Recommended motion:

I move to charge the Resource Allocation and Budget Committee to build a 3-5 member steering committee, who will fully articulate the scope and membership of the Ad Hoc Committee to address the 50th percentile, overload and benchmarking for faculty compensation

I want to make sure that we define the scope of an Ad Hoc Committee to address the 50th percentile, overload and benchmarking. I want the steering committee to be made up of passionate and informed individuals and I think RABC can identify those individuals. We want to ensure that this is done well."

Research and Scholarship Standing Committee

RSSC 1 Investigate whether RIT has the authority to classify travel reimbursement for students and faculty to conferences, or other travel associated with research, as income and therefore taxable, independent of when the request for reimbursement is made.

Daryl Johnson and Matt Wright independently proposed this charge. It is motivated by the institute classifying RIT reimbursement of travel if the person is not presenting at the conference as income and asking them to pay income tax on the funds. A top research university recognizes the critical importance of having research students attend conferences, even when they aren't presenting something.

Also RIT has instituted a policy that if you do not submit your travel expenses within 60 days it will count as income for you personally and charge you income tax. There are many issues with this but the most glaring is whether RIT has the federal authority to declare when funds become income!

RSSC 2 Identify policy, make appropriate changes and propose such amendments with a view to reducing RIT's reliance on original copies of paper receipts used in travel reimbursements.

Casey Miller proposed this charge and states that insisting on original copies of receipts is burdensome on the staff and a waste of time and therefore money. Also, many retailers are moving to fully e-receipts, so clearly those original receipts are not on paper. It is understood that other universities accept scans of receipts without issue. This may be motivated from a fear of being audited but it likely costs more money to be 100% compliant than to pay a minor fine for minor infractions.

RSSC 3 Identify best practices for hiring research-intensive faculty. Make recommendations as to further action by senate if hiring policy restricts the ability to land top faculty.

Matt Wright has described how, in his opinion, the hiring process for faculty is very rigid. For example, there is an unnecessary requirement to interview every candidate before making any offers. He writes, “for strong faculty candidates in computing, offers are accepted about 20% of the time and many candidates are lost to other offers early on”.

RSSC 4 Identify best practices for SPA to respond to the needs of Research Faculty as opposed to the research faculty needing to respond to pre-established accounting preferences.

Matt Wright has expressed some concerns regarding the RIT approach to accounting for NSF grants. He states that “the accounting rules for managing NSF funds are more strict at RIT than required by NSF.” He states an example of how it is standard practice for faculty to be working on their research projects year round and take a month of summer salary that represents their effort on the grant. Yet SPA states their expectation that faculty have to be physically present on campus for a specific month of the summer working on that grant. If NSF does not expect this it is unclear as to why RIT enforces it.

It may be valuable to learn the extent to which the current procedures and mindset in some of the administrative departments is harming research productivity. The charge is written to encourage administrative offices to support the faculty, without adding unnecessary procedural barriers.

RSSC 5 Identify the gaps between current graduate student quality and needed graduate student quality for graduate programs across campus.

Chris Collison proposed this charge to create awareness of the importance of graduate student quality and potential for high level research. Specifically he recommends a description of the current state given that student quality is a driver for research success at RIT. For which programs is the gap smallest and largest and how can RIT provide resources to enable more successful recruitment of top level incoming graduate students? What are the best practices in those departments where the gap is smallest and graduate student research productivity is highest?

RSSC 6 Per policy B05.0, review policies C02.0 and C03.1.

Policy B05.0 requires that policies be reviewed on a five-year cycle with one of three outcomes: i) The policy is reviewed and affirmed as accurate as written, ii) The policy is revised using the appropriate review and approval process or iii) The policy is recommended for decommissioning (it may no longer be applicable or obsolete).

C02.0 – Misconduct in Research and Scholarship (shared responsibility with VP for Research, last reviewed 1996)

C03.1 – Agreement for Commissioning of Educational Materials (shared responsibility with VP for Research and ILI, Last reviewed 2007 to correct department names)

RSSC 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.

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

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

RSSC 8 Consider tactics to strongly advocate for more student fellowships and work with Development to promote the increase in endowment for graduate fellowships.

RSSC 9 Make a recommendation as to how the RSSC should be involved in evaluating proposals where the number of proposals submitted from one university is limited (e.g. NSF Major Research Instrumentation).

RSSC10 Make recommendations for new policy or a default agreement addressing faculty affiliation with a given Center for Research Excellence (CRE) / Major Research Laboratory (MRL). Propose policy which will allow the CRE/MRL to can modify such an agreement as long as it is made transparent to the RIT community.

See background from Academic Affairs Committees from 2015-16 and 2016-17.

RSSC11 Identify ways to develop and improve the holdings of research materials (books, journals and other materials, print and electronic formats) of the RIT Libraries in order to support the needs of faculty and students as RIT continues to gain in stature as a research university.

Given RIT's strategic commitment to improving its research profile and student success, review benchmark data comparing the Wallace Center's capacities and resource base

for supporting this commitment. Report the review of the data to the Senate during the spring 2017 semester and, if appropriate, make a recommendation.

Owen Gottlieb, GCCIS
Tim Engstrom, CLA
Marcia Trauernicht, RIT Libraries

Background:

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

Identification of the need for additional space and staffing at the Wallace Center is described in the April 2017 report "Expanding the Core: Renovation and Expansion of The Wallace Center (TWC) at RIT." (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 needs, an analysis of library materials themselves was not provided.

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

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

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

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

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