

1 **ASEC and AAC charges only were approved and the rest of the charges listed will be**
2 **brought to senate on 9/20/2018.**

3
4 **ASEC – Approved as Amended**

5
6 **New charges:**

- 7 1. **Propose** a task force to explore governance questions regarding B2. Specific charges for this ad
8 hoc committee/task force should include:
- 9 i. As the university grows, and as certain areas are tapped for increased growth while others
10 are not, thereby having the number of faculty and resultant representation in governance
11 influenced by the administration, it may be time for us to consider a structure that reflects a
12 senate rather than a congress. Should each area have 2 representatives rather than a
13 number based upon the population of faculty? Colleges/academic units under X faculty
14 could be combined for the purpose of governance representation, e.g. SOIS and GIS.
 - 15 ii. Consider and if deemed appropriate add a sentence to the general description of standing
16 committees of senate stating the chairs of all standing committees shall be a faculty
17 member.
 - 18 iii. Consider providing guidance on the time between when a faculty member has been termed-
19 off a committee and when they can be elected again. For instance, if a senator has served
20 for 2 terms (6 years), does that individual have to be off senate for 1 term or 1 year before
21 they can again be elected to serve again? And during that interim would the person be
22 permitted to serve as an alternate or no?
 - 23 iv. Assess the benefits of modifying B2.0 to state a requirement for the ASEC Treasurer is to be
24 a liaison between academic senate and RABC.
 - 25 v. Evaluate the possibility of adding new responsibilities to the Nominations Committee
26 associated with oversight of senate processes, training for incoming senators, and
27 succession plans for replacing outgoing executive committee knowledge.
- 28 2. Explore:
- 29 i. the use of PawPrints to allow charges for standing committees to be appropriately
30 prioritized based on quantified faculty support;
 - 31 ii. Implementing a regular internal evaluation process to determine Academic Senate's
32 effectiveness as viewed by its constituents;
 - 33 iii. the benefits of shifting the cycle of 50% of all standing committees such that they start
34 the review of new charges in the Spring semester, completing those charges at the end
35 of the fall semester;
 - 36 iv. the benefits of delegating the solicitation of charges to the outgoing chairs of each
37 standing committee. Make appropriate recommendations for senate review.

38
39 **Academic Affairs Committee – Approved as amended**

40
41 **Carryover charges:**

- 42 1. AA3 Assess the guidelines for contact time per credit hour in the case of laboratory intensive
43 classes, from college to college, from both the students' and faculty's perspective (teaching
44 load). Determine whether guidelines for contact time per credit hour and student work hours
45 are being appropriately adhered to and, as necessary, suggest how these guidelines might
46 change for more effective operation within the new calendar structure. Identify if this should be
47 an Institute-wide initiative or whether this should remain under the purview of individual

- 48 colleges or academic units. *To be split between AAC and FAC? The contact time per credit hour*
49 *is clearly within the purview of AAC; the issue of faculty teaching loads would fall with FAC.*
- 50 2. AA6 Per policy B05.0, review policy D01.6 – Protocols for Academic Centers (last reviewed in
51 2008). Senate agreed to move forward to next year *in conjunction with Research & Scholarship*
52 *Committee on 4/05/18.*
 - 53 3. AA9 Review and summarize the report from the OTG Task Force and make recommendations for
54 revision, as necessary, to Course Withdrawal Policy (D.05,IV)
55 <https://www.rit.edu/academicaffairs/policiesmanual/d050t> and Probation and Suspension
56 Policy (D.05.1) <https://www.rit.edu/academicaffairs/policiesmanual/d051>. *Has not been*
57 *returned to Committee from Student Government.*
 - 58 4. AA11 Draft policy to require that all media for courses be captioned in accordance with
59 guidelines provided by the Provost and the Department of Justice. Specify a process to address
60 student concerns regarding captioned media. And to consider implementation implications and
61 edge cases (media heavy courses, assignment that include viewing videos).
 - 62 5. AA7 Review RIT Policy D 2.0 <https://www.rit.edu/academicaffairs/policiesmanual/d020> and
63 modify as needed in order to clarify/update the amount of transfer credit allowable for an
64 undergraduate degree.

65

66 **New Charges:**

- 67 1. Review policy D.08 and make recommendations for change as necessary. Also revisit D18.2 as
68 there is a discrepancy between Policy D08.0 – Academic Integrity, section VII, which explains the
69 appeals process – and a new policy, D18.2 – Student Appeals Process, which was approved on
70 interim basis. As a reminder, D18.2 was endorsed by all the governance groups in May 2018 but
71 not in time for final action by University Council. That policy includes the process for appeals in
72 regard to D08.0, but outlines a different process than the information currently in D08.0. It may
73 be a simple edit to D08.0 to refer students to D18.2 for information for appealing decisions
74 under D08.0 or it may be more complicated. There is some urgency to this as D18.2 is scheduled
75 for final action at the first meeting of University Council in September. If need be, D18.2 can
76 continue as an interim policy until final action occurs.

77

78 In addition, clarify D.08, specifically section V.B. Here are the specific sections of the policy that
79 could use greater specificity:

80

81 *V. B. The instructor will notify the student in writing (email is acceptable) as to the rationale for*
82 *all actions taken pertaining to the breach of student academic integrity within three calendar*
83 *weeks of the alleged incident. After this time, an allegation may not proceed. Copies of the*
84 *written notification, either paper or electronic, will be provided to the instructor's academic unit*
85 *head and the instructor's Dean's Office. The Dean's Office will forward the written notification to*
86 *the Office of Student Conduct and the student's home academic unit. In cases involving graduate*
87 *students, a copy will also be sent to the Office of Graduate Studies.*

88

89 Clarity needed re timing: Does the clock (3 weeks) begin when the student submits the
90 assignment/test/etc. or is this when the faculty member discovers the potential infraction? I
91 believe the policy makes it clear that it is within 3 weeks of the date that the paper was
92 submitted, test taken, etc. and not three weeks from when the faculty member becomes aware
93 of the potential violation. Even so, there seems to be confusion about this point. For example,
94 if it is a violation on the final exam and students have left for the end of the term, does the
95 policy require the faculty member to communicate over the break? Clarity also needed with

- 96 regard to what is sent to the instructor’s academic unit head and Dean’s office. Is it just a copy
 97 of what the instructor sent to the student? If yes, then it should say that. If what is sent to the
 98 academic unit head and dean’s office contains additional information, the student should also
 99 receive whatever information is sent to the department head because the next steps in the
 100 process involve meetings between the student and the instructor, department head, and dean’s
 101 designee. There have been instances when the documentation has not been the same.
- 102 2. Per policy B05.0, review D01.3 – Undergraduate Dual Degree Policy – and either affirm with no
 103 changes; make revisions or edits through the appropriate review process; or recommended for
 104 decommissioning because it is obsolete or superseded by another policy.
 - 105 3. Per policy B05.0, review D11.0 – Final Examination Policy – and either affirm with no changes;
 106 make revisions or edits through the appropriate review process; or recommended for
 107 decommissioning because it is obsolete or superseded by another policy.
 - 108 4. Per policy B05.0, review D13.0 – Diplomas and Degrees Certification Policy – and either affirm
 109 with no changes; make revisions or edits through the appropriate review process; or
 110 recommended for decommissioning because it is obsolete or superseded by another policy.
 - 111 5. Update C22.0 Records Management Schedule to match the various division schedules (owners
 112 of the documents) for example the Academic Affairs supplemental schedule. Or just provide the
 113 links to the various retention schedules and not have a table that can be misleading.

114 EXAMPLE:

Item	Retention Period	Official Repository
Academic advisement files	1 year after graduation/last date of attendance	Appropriate Academic Departments

116 Per Institute Audit, Compliance & Advisement: “However, Academic Affairs has a supplemental
 117 schedule that is applicable also. To access that schedule: in the narrative at the top of that
 118 section, there is a hyperlink (click on Office of Legal Affairs) to various retention schedules for
 119 RIT divisions. Once at their website, click on the “Policies & Procedures” link in the left sidebar;
 120 at the resulting webpage, you will note the various retention schedules (Records Management
 121 Policy – Retention Schedules) in the second section down on the page. Select Academic
 122 Affairs. In this document, you will note that the Academic Affairs division has opted for a longer
 123 retention period for academic advisement files – 3 years after graduation/date of last
 124 attendance.” **Which is it?**

- 125
- 126
- 127 6. Survey whether the mycourses platform is adequate to accommodate different forms of
 128 assessment used by faculty.
- 129

130

131 [The rest of these charges will come before Academic Senate on 9/20/2018 for vote to approve.](#)

132

133 **Academic Support and Student Affairs Committee**

134

135 **Carryover charges:**

- 136 1. Investigate the will for RIT to become a "Sanctuary Campus".

137

138 **New charges:**

- 139 1. Evaluate RIT’s policy on junk email, with particular attention to whether junk email with a link
140 labelled “unsubscribe” should continue to be unfiltered, given that the “unsubscribe” link could
141 take the user anywhere.
142 2. Consider instituting Student Evaluations of Academic Advisors.
143
144

145 **Faculty Affairs Committee**

146
147 **Carryover charges:**

- 148 1. FAC 2 Complete revisions to Policy on the Discontinuance, Reduction or Transfer of Academic
149 Programs E20.0, in concert with ICC to include removal of portion dealing with program review,
150 placing it in D01.0. Ensure collaboration with ICC, who will subsequently revise D01.0 to include
151 program review and discontinuance. This policy was a carry-over from 2015-2016 and 2016-
152 2017 academic years; expected to be presented to the Academic Senate this past fall but could
153 not. FAC has discussed this policy extensively, and agreed on how to proceed, including
154 conditions to be met before program discontinuance, status of tenured and pre-tenured faculty,
155 and senior or principal lecturers. FAC has completed a draft that is ready for Senate. We halted
156 discussions because we had no input from ICC yet. Per committee chair, this will be the first
157 policy addressed in the new academic year.
- 158 2. FAC 3a Review and update Policy on Dismissal of Faculty Member for Adequate Cause E23.0.
159 The FAC discussed this policy extensively with multiple votes on how to advance this policy. We
160 made significant changes to this policy, including a major change merging policies E23.0 and
161 E23.1, such that a single policy would cover all faculty (tenure-track, lecturers and adjuncts).
162 There were proposed changes on the constitution of the dismissal review committee, depending
163 on who is being considered for dismissal for adequate cause. This policy has been approved by
164 the FAC (vote was not unanimous), was to be presented to Academic Senate before the Provost
165 raised objections to the propriety of having a single policy that would likely blur the line
166 between tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty. FAC met with Bobby Colon at the full
167 committee meeting and he recommended that E23.0 and E23.1 not be combined into a single
168 policy. However, he did recognize the authority of the “owner” of the policy to make a final
169 business decision on the propriety of a combined policy. Will be presented to the Senate in the
170 fall.
- 171 3. FAC 3b Complete revisions to Policy on Assignment and Transfer of Tenure-Track Faculty E21.0
172 to address the consolidation of all aspects of transferring a program and faculty. This policy was
173 reviewed by FAC, discussed and some changes made to existing policy. However, we are
174 awaiting further discussion before a vote is taken. Will transition to the new academic year for
175 further discussion.
- 176 4. FAC 6 Review the already-stated responsibilities of the different ranks and determine if it is
177 appropriate for faculty at the rank of lecturer (contracted for one-year) to hold administrative
178 titles. Based on the results of the review, propose wording for all appropriate policies (e.g. B2.0,
179 E6.0), as necessary, that would provide clarification on this matter. This policy was discussed
180 briefly by FAC and sent to sub-committee.
- 181 5. FAC 8 Per Policy B05.0, review policy E17.0 – Faculty Leave of Absence (last revised 2011). This
182 policy was reviewed and revised by sub-committee, presented to FAC for further debate and
183 discussion, and finally approved by FAC. The revised policy E17.0 is ready for presentation to
184 the Academic Senate. Will be presented to the Senate in the Fall.

- 185 6. FAC 9 Consider whether tenure and promotion policies should incorporate an individual's
186 impact on diversity and inclusion as these issues are recognized in the hiring process but not in
187 tenure and promotion. This policy was discussed extensively by FAC, and new ideas proposed,
188 including clarifications on how to demonstrate that faculty have introduced diversity into their
189 scholarship, teaching and service. Such diversity should be clearly reflected in the submitted
190 portfolio for tenure and promotion purposes. However, FAC could not come to an agreement as
191 to how to demonstrate this, as doing so could create additional criteria for tenure and
192 promotion, to the intent some candidate might advocate their work in the community meets
193 these criteria, and we may inadvertently push the criteria of scholarship, teaching and service to
194 the background. Discussion is ongoing and a final vote has not been taken.
- 195 7. FAC 10 Consider a policy that: 1) formally acknowledges peer-reviewed Scholarship and peer-
196 reviewed Scholarship of Teaching & Pedagogy produced by RIT Lecturers of all ranks and 2)
197 incorporates such acknowledgment in the annual merit review documentation and process. This
198 policy was discussed briefly. FAC agreed to carry over this into the new academic year. In
199 addition, some members of the sub-committee are leaving the FAC and as such we plan to
200 constitute a new sub-committee to examine this in detail and present to the full committee.
- 201 8. Complete revisions to E20.0 and E21.0
- 202 i. Special instructions for E20 include a removal of portion dealing with program review
203 and having it placed in D01.0. This action would necessitate a simultaneous charge to
204 given to ICC to revise D01.0 to include program review and discontinuance. E20.0 draft
205 policy with FAC addresses the treatment of faculty in the case of program
206 discontinuance or reduction.
- 207 ii. Further special instructions regarding E20.0 and E21.0 is the consolidation of all
208 aspects of transferring a program and faculty to be included in E21.0 leaving E20.0 to
209 address only the implications on faculty resulting from the discontinuance or reduction
210 in a program.
- 211 9. Continue discussion on policy that: 1) formally acknowledges peer-reviewed Scholarship and
212 peer-reviewed Scholarship of Teaching & Pedagogy produced by RIT Lecturers of all ranks and 2)
213 incorporates such acknowledgment in the annual merit review documentation and process.
- 214 10. Complete revisions to policy E5.0 and E6.0 entailing whether tenure and promotion policies
215 should incorporate an individual's impact on diversity and inclusion as these issues are
216 recognized in the hiring process but not in tenure and promotion.

217
218 **New charges:**

- 219 1. Per policy B05.0, review E04.1 – Faculty Extra Service Compensation and Summer Employment
220 Policy – and either affirm with no changes; make revisions or edits through the appropriate
221 review process; or recommended for decommissioning because it is obsolete or superseded by
222 another policy.
- 223 2. Per policy B05.0, review E12.7 – Outstanding Teaching Award for Non Tenure-Track Faculty
224 Policy – and either affirm with no changes; make revisions or edits through the appropriate
225 review process; or recommended for decommissioning because it is obsolete or superseded by
226 another policy.
- 227 3. Review policy E7.0. Specifically, the timing of faculty evaluations and plans of work. In GCCIS
228 there has been a lot of talk and speculation that they might consider reviewing faculty on the
229 academic year (instead of the calendar year) now that HR has changed the date that merit
230 increases go into effect.
- 231 4. Review RIT policies regarding maternity leave and their application and make recommendations
232 for policy change or clarification or better training for department heads and deans. Perhaps

- 233 establish a task force to examine institutional bullying of junior, particularly female, pre-tenure
234 faculty as well as non tenure-track faculty.
- 235 ~~5. Review C04.0 Individual Conflict of Interest and Commitment Policy and clarify. At the very end~~
236 ~~of the policy about conflicts of interest, there is a mention of teaching at other institutions. It~~
237 ~~would be helpful if this was made more prominent so everyone sees this or knows this. I know~~
238 ~~there are faculty on this campus who have taught or are currently teaching at other colleges and~~
239 ~~universities, and they may not know the official policy.~~
- 240 6. Investigate benefits of changing the parking registration window for faculty such that it occurs
241 earlier in the calendar rather than late in the summer when many faculty take their long-
242 awaited vacations and go offline.
- 243 7. Review all RIT policy to ensure consistency regarding our commitment not to exclude or
244 discriminate against any faculty by reference to their degree or previous professional
245 background. Make recommendations where necessary to ensure consistency and compliance
246 with the principles of inclusion and non-discrimination. Specifically, consider the benefits and
247 liabilities associated with allowing an individual holding a law degree to participate in grievance
248 hearings, and make a recommendation to the Academic Senate regarding whether to change
249 current faculty grievance policy on this matter.

250
251

General Education Committee

252

Carryover charges:

253

254 Continue the audit/review of General Education student learning outcomes and courses.

255

New Charges:

256

257 Review policy regarding immersions to determine if the policy/definition should be changed to support
258 the inclusion of alternatives to the three-course model, such as the single 9-credit course from SOIS.

259

260

Global Education Task Force

261

Carryover charges:

262

- 263 1. Communicate regularly with the faculty leadership at RIT global campuses regarding any
264 governance issues of shared concern, including acting as a conduit between the global campuses
265 and the relevant Rochester-based committees and offices. Report back to Academic Senate
266 once per semester.
- 267 2. Review policy D7.0 and propose changes.

268

New charges:

269

- 270 1. In accordance with the findings of the governance symposium, determine the purview, make-
271 up/participant list and scope of charge for a Global Education Committee.
- 272 2. Work with the appropriate stakeholders to develop policy for new offerings of new or existing
273 degree programs at global campuses.
- 274 3. Investigate methods of promoting international research, including at global campuses, and
275 through collaboration across campuses.

276

277

278

279

280 **Graduate Council**

281

282 **Carryover charges:**

- 283 1. GC Charge 2: Review Policy D12.0 (Graduation Requirements) and address the need to clarify
284 the ROLE OF DEFENSE CHAIR in this policy (carryover from 2016-2017). Revisit D.12VIb to
285 determine if clarification is needed on the role of the Defense Chair.
- 286 2. GC Charge 3: Investigate the variation across all RIT graduate programs in interpretation of the
287 policy to require a Program GPA (currently 3.0) required for graduation, and how the Program
288 GPA is calculated. Review all related policy to determine if modification is required based on
289 these findings.
- 290 3. GC Charge 5: Make recommendations for streamlining the graduate program proposal process.
291 *Continue charge next year to include: i. Clarify expectations for the proposal content or clearly
292 articulate what information GC must have, to adequately review and offer approval; ii. Develop a
293 one or two-page guideline or FAQ's sheet that clarifies proposal content expectations, clearly
294 communicates GC's review process; iii. Provide sample timelines for proposal submission and
295 approval.*

296

297 **New charges:**

- 298 1. Investigate Policy D05.0 VI Repeating Courses to raise low grades, Section B. Graduate Students
299 and Policy D5.0 – VII Grade Point Average. Make recommendations for repeating courses and
300 for the calculation of Program Grade Point Average (PGPA) for graduate programs. The
301 committee should consider the following:
- 302 • Why are graduate grades done differently than UG grades?
 - 303 • Why are graduate grades averaged for all course attempts?
 - 304 • Why not count the most recent grade received for a course, for which the student has made
305 multiple attempts, similar to UG grades?
 - 306 • It is very difficult to recover from a bad grade, if a grade of a second attempt with an improved
307 grade is averaged with the first one. Are RIT graduate students at a disadvantage when applying
308 for jobs or for PhD programs, because of the way we calculate graduate grades?
 - 309 • Should this policy for graduate grades be reviewed and benchmarked with other universities?
- 310 Based on the findings and on suggested modifications, to D05.0 VI, make changes to D5.0 VII for the
311 calculation of Program Grade Point Average (PGPA) for graduate programs.

312

313

314 **ICC**

315

316 **Carryover charges:**

- 317 1. ICC Charge 2 – Work with the Honor's program to revise policy D1 to clearly outline curricular
318 processes with regard to the Honors Program.
- 319 2. ICC Charge 3 – Work with Faculty Affairs to revise policy on discontinuance of academic
320 programs (E20.0)
- 321 3. ICC Charge 4 – Brainstorm, rank-order and propose to Senate approaches to increase flexibility
322 of RIT's undergraduate degrees.

323

324 **New Charges:**

- 325 1. Review RIT policies that impact undergraduate curriculum that are brought to the committee's
326 attention and propose revisions as appropriate to the Academic Senate.

- 327 2. Make UG Certificates a top priority. This charge is going into its third or fourth year and for some
328 academic units, it is an important matter to be resolved.

329

330

331 **Institute Writing Committee**

332

333 **Carryover charges:**

- 334 1. Liaison with the University Writing Program and other writing-related initiatives.
335 2. Monitor and report to AS the implementation and assessment of the Institute Writing Policy.
336 3. Review proposed WI courses.
337 4. Serve as the faculty liaison with the University Writing Program and other writing-related
338 initiatives, making recommendations when appropriate.

339

340 **New charges:**

- 341 1. Draft a third section of D01.5 University Writing Policy addressing graduate writing, after
342 completing an investigation of the current state of writing in graduate programs, which includes
343 a working subgroup comprised of at-large key RIT stakeholders (e.g., Wallace Center delegate,
344 Writing Commons Coordinator, Graduate Education delegate, etc.) and an investigation into
345 graduate student experience. This policy should i) provide a clear directive as to how graduate
346 programs participate in graduate writing support and improvement; ii) modify such policy such
347 that full buy-in from graduate programs is accomplished, based on discussions from IWC1.
348 2. Add graduate writing to IWC's oversight and evaluate formulation or modification of associated
349 policy across domestic and overseas campuses. Bring to Senate any necessary amendment to
350 Policy B02.0 for Senate discussion and vote.
351 3. Propose allocation of resources for the support of graduate student writing based on findings
352 from IWC1.

353

354

355 **Long Range Planning & Environment Committee**

356

357 **Carryover charges:**

- 358 1. LRPEC1 Review status of Strategic Plan as it pertains to faculty. *On hold due to development of*
359 *new strategic plan.*
360 2. LRPEC3 Investigate the impact on global sustainability (e.g. carbon footprint) of total meat
361 consumption at RIT and make recommendations in line with RIT's leadership in
362 sustainability.
363 3. LRPEC4 Compare RIT against our benchmark schools regarding the extent of its Faculty
364 governance. Make recommendations for evolving shared governance at RIT. *To be revisited after*
365 *the Summit on Academic Governance, 12.11.18.*
366 4. LRPEC5 Determine the state of gender inclusivity across the campus.

367

368 **New charges:**

- 369 1. Investigate the status of restroom facilities in the academic buildings, including how many
370 bathrooms/stalls by gender, condition (e.g. worn, broken, not working), last renovation, and
371 building usage (faculty/staff/students). Make recommendations as appropriate in relation to
372 campus welfare, e.g., priority for renovations.

- 373 2. Produce a publicly available document (i.e., available on a university website) that details
374 university policy regarding video surveillance and associated data retention policy on the
375 campus. Specific points to address include: what are the RIT policies for retention of video that
376 is being recorded by the RIT installed security cameras now placed building hallways? What is
377 the data retention policy regarding the video data capture by the RIT parking office cars
378 that cruise through the parking lots? Is any of this information shared with any non RIT
379 entities? Has any of this information been shared with any police or government authorities?
380 Will RIT notify the community if such requests are made?
- 381 3. Update and clarify charge LRPEC5 with clearer, more actionable language and a longer period of
382 study with a dedicated taskforce and funding to accomplish charge. Consider the charge in the
383 context of a larger, better funded, longitudinal research study with dedicated researchers, full
384 institutional support, and a commitment to act upon its findings. Use specific language to
385 update the charge based on direct feedback from current stakeholders and suggest that
386 additional research is needed to fill in the gaps of knowledge that we have identified.
- 387 4. Protect RIT by shifting from its current reactive stance toward gender issues to a preventative
388 approach that mitigates risk and reduces overall instances of gender related discrimination.
- 389 5. Create an umbrella organization or centralized clearinghouse for all issues on gender to
390 coordinate among the diverse groups and organizations already in place.
- 391 6. Broaden the focus into “the state of gender inclusivity” beyond just women’s issues to other
392 groups, such as men in traditionally “caring” fields (physician assistant, teacher), the specific
393 needs of transgender students (such as safe administration of hormone drugs), and
394 underrepresentation of LGBTQ faculty member’s needs across all colleges. We suggest that RIT
395 take seriously the claims of those most involved in the issues of gender and seek a clearer long-
396 term, and centralized, approach to understanding gender inclusion and its important role on our
397 campus.

398
399

400 **Research and Scholarship Committee**

401
402

402 **Carryover charges:**

- 403 1. Per policy B05.0, review policy C02.0 – Misconduct in Research and Scholarship
404 2. Per policy B05.0, review policy D01.6 – Protocols for Academic Centers (last reviewed in 2008).
405 Senate agreed to move forward to next year *in conjunction with Academic Affairs Committee on*
406 *4/05/18*, which includes investigating whether Research Centers need more formal structure
407 and autonomy to better be able to support the research they undertake. Do we need a parallel
408 structure to departments, with Center Directors acting as department chairs, etc.?

409
410

410 **New charges:**

- 411 1. Review RIT’s decision-making principles and practices regarding Professional Leave, and whether
412 present budget allocations are sufficient to advance RIT’s agenda of improving its standing as a
413 university that supports and rewards research. *Collaborate with FAC as primary.* We ask that
414 this review address the following specific aspects:
- 415 i. Assess and evaluate whether RIT’s professional leave budget is resourced sufficiently to
416 achieve its research aspirations.
- 417 ii. Make explicit and transparent the principles behind any professional leave policy and
418 consider whether these principles would benefit from additional recommendations.

- 419 iii. Assess the patterns of distribution of professional leaves across the colleges in the last
420 five years to determine how these distributions might differ by college and discipline.
421 iv. Consider whether the decision criteria for allocating and distributing professional leaves
422 are based on transparent principles and, if they are not, to recommend those principles.
423 v. Recommend an appeals process that allows colleagues who have been denied
424 professional leave to request clarification and reconsideration beyond the initial
425 “explanation” already provided by committee on Professional Development Leave.

426 Background: During the past several years there has been a perception, if not an actual
427 practice, of a growing level of competition for the granting of academic/professional leaves, and
428 an increase in the number of denials of academic/professional leave requests by the University.
429 A system of competition that results in increasing denials of requests for research-related
430 professional/academic leave, on its surface, is antithetical to RIT’s initiatives towards improve
431 our research portfolio and visibility on a national and international level. If such a system is now
432 being used, faculty need clear and explicit explanations of the rationale for such a system, and
433 the principles and practices used for making such decisions, and should be offered a possibility
434 for an appeal process when requests have been denied.

435 2. Evaluate the pros and cons of RIT adopting an open access policy for scholarly research from RIT
436 faculty and staff. Make a recommendation based on those findings. Background for this charge:
437 The existence of an Open Access Policy is one the criteria that the Sustainability Tracking
438 Assessment and Rating System (STARS) evaluates. There are some parties on campus that are
439 interested in adopting such a policy and there are others that have concerns. I think it makes
440 sense to have AS evaluate the pros and cons and make a determination.

441 3. Identify ways to develop and improve the holdings of research materials (books, journals and
442 other materials, print and electronic formats) of the RIT Libraries in order to support the needs
443 of faculty and students as RIT continues to gain in stature as a research university.
444 Rationale: RIT libraries have been reducing holdings such as electronic journals over the last
445 number of years, likely due to budget constraints. One example of the impact is that President
446 Munson has addressed GCCIS about expanding publishing in the area of pedagogy, yet RIT
447 libraries eliminated educational technology journals prior to 2014. ILL, sometimes referenced as
448 a path requires individual submissions per article (so potentially 10-30 typed submissions per
449 journal issue) and waiting periods for each article. Interdisciplinary work often requires reading
450 across multiple journals and hundreds of articles and editing submissions to journals requires
451 fast turnaround access to articles. If we wish to advance in research, we need access to journals
452 and other materials. While holdings in areas such as IEEE and ACM are plentiful, crossover areas
453 are missing such as education, digital humanities, social sciences. Another example is that
454 research universities typically have access to a variety of “jobbers” such as Taylor and Francis,
455 which we do not have access to at RIT. I would argue that library holdings are one of the key
456 areas to help us expand our research.

457
458

459 **Resource Allocation & Budget Committee**

460
461 **Carryover charges:**

- 462 1. RABC 3: Build a 3-5 member steering committee, who will fully articulate the scope and
463 membership of the Ad Hoc Committee to address the 50th percentile, overload and
464 benchmarking for faculty compensation. *ASEC agreed on 8/30/18 that the RABC and RSC may*
465 *need to work in conjunction moving forward.*

466

467 2. Draft an Activity-Based Budgeting model, first forming a task force consisting of RIT stakeholders
468 and outside experts. The task force shall be charged with developing the parameters and
469 weightings for an appropriate allocation formula. Furthermore, we recommend that two sets of
470 weightings be developed by the task force—a current set that results in minimal change to
471 current allocations, and a future set that will represent where we want to be and will be phased
472 in gradually. The transition to the new model should happen over a period of 2-3 years. (On
473 May 10, 2018, the motion was made: The Senate commends the work done by the RABC on the
474 budget model, and charges the RABC for AY 2018-19 to return with a specific ABB model for the
475 Senate’s consideration. Seconded. No objections. APPROVED by Unanimous Consent.)
476
477
478

479 **New charges:**

480 1. RABC 1 Consider waiving undergraduate tuition for course credit for undergraduate research at
481 a level higher than first semester of research for the same professor. The rationale is based on
482 several experiences that I've had, when students had to max out their credits for various
483 reasons (i.e. changing majors, having transferred, wishing to repeat classes), but still wished to
484 conduct research leading to publications or providing experience for job applications or
485 graduate school admissions. Their work fully deserved credits, but they could not afford the
486 extra tuition required. If a student is in the honors program, this tuition is waived - so it is clear
487 that this has a protocol. The problem is with those students who are productive students, yet
488 for whatever reason did not gain entry to honors. it is often the case where some of the best
489 researchers in the lab are not the highest performing students in class-work, so this could be a
490 further consideration. There could be restrictions on the tuition waiver for credits based on
491 maintaining a certain gpa (for example a 3.0, or 3.2). There could be a restriction that this must
492 be at least the second or third semester of research and a caveat where the mentor has certified
493 that this is not just an introductory semester (what we call shadowing) in his or her lab. There
494 could be a restriction that research in summers does not qualify. The rationale is further
495 centered in the high impact of undergraduate research on the scholarship aspect of Science and
496 Technology at RIT. This research serves not only the student but advances the professor's
497 success and the success of the school or center they are in. It is becoming clear that
498 undergraduate research is a hallmark of RIT's excellence. Such a policy could even be used as an
499 advertising aspect to draw in a prospective student who might be interested in research "on the
500 bench" as part of his or her education. It would advantage grant applications such as the NIH R-
501 15 AREA grants, for which a detailed description of undergraduate research at RIT is required,
502 and is a section of which the reviewers take particular note. *ASEC agreed on 8/30/18 that the
503 AAC and RABC may need to work in conjunction moving forward.*