

1 **Approved Charges thus far. Research & Scholarship Committee & RABC yet to be**
2 **approved**

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 **Academic Support and Student Affairs Committee - Approved**

131

132 **Carryover charges:**

- 133 1. Investigate the will for RIT to become a "Sanctuary Campus".
- 134

135 **New charges:**

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

140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186

Faculty Affairs Committee- Approved

Carryover charges:

1. FAC 2 Complete revisions to Policy on the Discontinuance, Reduction or Transfer of Academic Programs E20.0, in concert with ICC to include removal of portion 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 policy was a carry-over from 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 academic years; expected to be presented to the Academic Senate this past fall but could not. FAC has discussed this policy extensively, and agreed on how to proceed, including conditions to be met before program discontinuance, status of tenured and pre-tenured faculty, and senior or principal lecturers. FAC has completed a draft that is ready for Senate. We halted discussions because we had no input from ICC yet. Per committee chair, this will be the first policy addressed in the new academic year.
2. FAC 3a Review and update Policy on Dismissal of Faculty Member for Adequate Cause E23.0. The FAC discussed this policy extensively with multiple votes on how to advance this policy. We made significant changes to this policy, including a major change merging policies E23.0 and E23.1, such that a single policy would cover all faculty (tenure-track, lecturers and adjuncts). There were proposed changes on the constitution of the dismissal review committee, depending on who is being considered for dismissal for adequate cause. This policy has been approved by the FAC (vote was not unanimous), was to be presented to Academic Senate before the Provost raised objections to the propriety of having a single policy that would likely blur the line between tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty. FAC met with Bobby Colon at the full committee meeting and he recommended that E23.0 and E23.1 not be combined into a single policy. However, he did recognize the authority of the “owner” of the policy to make a final business decision on the propriety of a combined policy. Will be presented to the Senate in the fall.
3. FAC 3b 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 policy was reviewed by FAC, discussed and some changes made to existing policy. However, we are awaiting further discussion before a vote is taken. Will transition to the new academic year for further discussion.
4. FAC 6 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. This policy was discussed briefly by FAC and sent to sub-committee.
5. FAC 8 Per Policy B05.0, review policy E17.0 – Faculty Leave of Absence (last revised 2011). This policy was reviewed and revised by sub-committee, presented to FAC for further debate and discussion, and finally approved by FAC. The revised policy E17.0 is ready for presentation to the Academic Senate. Will be presented to the Senate in the Fall.
6. FAC 9 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 policy was discussed extensively by FAC, and new ideas proposed, including clarifications on how to demonstrate that faculty have introduced diversity into their scholarship, teaching and service. Such diversity should be clearly reflected in the submitted portfolio for tenure and promotion purposes. However, FAC could not come to an agreement as

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

210
211 **New charges:**

- 212 1. Per policy B05.0, review E04.1 – Faculty Extra Service Compensation and Summer Employment
213 Policy – and either affirm with no changes; make revisions or edits through the appropriate
214 review process; or recommended for decommissioning because it is obsolete or superseded by
215 another policy.
- 216 2. Per policy B05.0, review E12.7 – Outstanding Teaching Award for Non Tenure-Track Faculty
217 Policy – and either affirm with no changes; make revisions or edits through the appropriate
218 review process; or recommended for decommissioning because it is obsolete or superseded by
219 another policy.
- 220 3. Review policy E7.0. Specifically, the timing of faculty evaluations and plans of work. In GCCIS
221 there has been a lot of talk and speculation that they might consider reviewing faculty on the
222 academic year (instead of the calendar year) now that HR has changed the date that merit
223 increases go into effect.
- 224 4. Review RIT policies regarding maternity leave and their application and make recommendations
225 for policy change or clarification or better training for department heads and deans. Perhaps
226 establish a task force to examine institutional bullying of junior, particularly female, pre-tenure
227 faculty as well as non tenure-track faculty.
- 228 5. Investigate benefits of changing the parking registration window for faculty such that it occurs
229 earlier in the calendar rather than late in the summer when many faculty take their long-
230 awaited vacations and go offline.
- 231 6. Review all RIT policy to ensure consistency regarding our commitment not to exclude or
232 discriminate against any faculty by reference to their degree or previous professional
233 background. Make recommendations where necessary to ensure consistency and compliance
234 with the principles of inclusion and non-discrimination. Specifically, consider the benefits and

235 liabilities associated with allowing an individual holding a law degree to participate in grievance
236 hearings, and make a recommendation to the Academic Senate regarding whether to change
237 current faculty grievance policy on this matter.
238
239

240 **General Education Committee- Approved**

241
242 **Carryover charges:**

243 Continue the audit/review of General Education student learning outcomes and courses.
244

245 **New Charges:**

246 Review policy regarding immersions to determine if the policy/definition should be changed to support
247 the inclusion of alternatives to the three-course model, such as the single 9-credit course from SOIS.
248
249

250 **Global Education Task Force - Approved**

251
252 **Carryover charges:**

- 253 1. Communicate regularly with the faculty leadership at RIT global campuses regarding any
254 governance issues of shared concern, including acting as a conduit between the global campuses
255 and the relevant Rochester-based committees and offices. Report back to Academic Senate
256 once per semester.
- 257 2. Review policy D7.0 and propose changes.
258

259 **New charges:**

- 260 1. In accordance with the findings of the governance symposium, determine the purview, make-
261 up/participant list and scope of charge for a Global Education Committee.
- 262 2. Work with the appropriate stakeholders to develop policy for new offerings of new or existing
263 degree programs at global campuses.
- 264 3. Investigate methods of promoting international research, including at global campuses, and
265 through collaboration across campuses.
266

267 **Graduate Council- Approved**

268
269 **Carryover charges:**

- 270 1. GC Charge 2: Review Policy D12.0 (Graduation Requirements) and address the need to clarify
271 the ROLE OF DEFENSE CHAIR in this policy (carryover from 2016-2017). Revisit D.12VIb to
272 determine if clarification is needed on the role of the Defense Chair.
- 273 2. GC Charge 3: Investigate the variation across all RIT graduate programs in interpretation of the
274 policy to require a Program GPA (currently 3.0) required for graduation, and how the Program
275 GPA is calculated. Review all related policy to determine if modification is required based on
276 these findings.
- 277 3. GC Charge 5: Make recommendations for streamlining the graduate program proposal process.
278 Continue charge next year to include: i. Clarify expectations for the proposal content or clearly
279 articulate what information GC must have, to adequately review and offer approval; ii. Develop
280 a one or two-page guideline or FAQ's sheet that clarifies proposal content expectations, clearly

- 281 communicates GC's review process; iii. Provide sample timelines for proposal submission and
282 approval.
- 283 4. GC Charge 6: Identify whether current policy is sufficient to guide students in the situation
284 where they are studying for multiple graduate degrees.
- 285 5. GC Charge 7: Review policy D12.0 (Graduation Requirements), specifically where it concerns the
286 20% limit of graduate transfer credits in Section V, Subsection C. Identify the origins, and
287 impacts on this limitation to graduate education. Make recommendations for change in policy as
288 necessary.

289

290 **New charges:**

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

305

306

307 **ICC- Approved**

308

309 **Carryover charges:**

- 310 1. ICC Charge 2 – Work with the Honor's program to revise policy D1 to clearly outline curricular
311 processes with regard to the Honors Program.
- 312 2. ICC Charge 3 – Work with Faculty Affairs to revise policy on discontinuance of academic
313 programs (E20.0)
- 314 3. ICC Charge 4 – Brainstorm, rank-order and propose to Senate approaches to increase flexibility
315 of RIT's undergraduate degrees.
- 316 4. Study undergraduate curricular proposals from a university-wide perspective, maintain
317 appropriate inter-college relationships with regards to curriculum, assure that existing
318 undergraduate curricula are periodically reviewed, and make recommendations to the
319 Academic Senate for action on proposals of new and significantly modified undergraduate
320 programs. (carry over)

321

322 **New Charges:**

- 323 1. Review RIT policies that impact undergraduate curriculum that are brought to the committee's
324 attention and propose revisions as appropriate to the Academic Senate.
- 325 2. Review and make recommendations on the guidelines, process and how UG certificates can be
326 pursued and awarded.

327

328 **Institute Writing Committee**

329

330 **Carryover charges:**

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

336

337 **New charges:**

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

350

351

352 **Long Range Planning & Environment Committee**

353

354 **Carryover charges:**

- 355 1. LRPEC1 Review status of Strategic Plan as it pertains to faculty.
- 356 2. LRPEC3 Investigate the impact on global sustainability (e.g. carbon footprint) of sourcing,
- 357 service items, menu selections, packaging and waste disposal policies at RIT food services and
- 358 make recommendations in line with RIT's leadership in sustainability.
- 359 3. LRPEC4 Compare RIT against our benchmark schools regarding the extent of its Faculty
- 360 governance. Make recommendations for evolving shared governance at RIT. *To be revisited after*
- 361 *the Summit on Academic Governance, 12.11.18.*
- 362 4. LRPEC5 Determine the state of gender inclusivity across the campus.

363

364 **New charges:**

- 365 1. Investigate the status restroom facilities in the academic buildings, including how many
- 366 bathrooms/stalls by gender, gender inclusive status, condition (e.g. worn, broken, not working),
- 367 last renovation, and building usage (faculty/staff/students). Make recommendations as
- 368 appropriate in relation to campus welfare, e.g., priority for renovations.
- 369 2. Update and clarify charge LRPEC5 with clearer, more actionable language and a longer period of
- 370 study with a dedicated taskforce and funding to accomplish charge. Consider the charge in the
- 371 context of a larger, better funded, longitudinal research study with dedicated researchers, full
- 372 institutional support, and a commitment to act upon its findings. Use specific language to
- 373 update the charge based on direct feedback from current stakeholders and suggest that
- 374 additional research is needed to fill in the gaps of knowledge that we have identified.

- 375 3. Review current parking policies and processes, such as:
376 i. the number of reserved spaces sold in relationship to available spaces
377 ii. E Vehicles
378 iii. Construction implications
379 iv. Consider moving spaces for motorcycles to unreserved slots
380 v. New fine policies (such as what is the impact on low income students)
381 vi. Non-reserved space availability
382 vii. Handicapped parking
383

384 **Research and Scholarship Committee - Yet to be approved & returns for vote 10/4/2018**

385
386 **Carryover charges:**

- 387 1. Per policy B05.0, review policy C02.0 – Misconduct in Research and Scholarship
388 2. Per policy B05.0, review policy D01.6 – Protocols for Academic Centers (last reviewed in 2008).
389 Senate agreed to move forward to next year *in conjunction with Academic Affairs Committee on*
390 *4/05/18*, which includes investigating whether Research Centers need more formal structure
391 and autonomy to better be able to support the research they undertake. Do we need a parallel
392 structure to departments, with Center Directors acting as department chairs, etc.?
393

394 **New charges:**

- 395 1. Review RIT's decision-making principles and practices regarding Professional Leave, and whether
396 present budget allocations are sufficient to advance RIT's agenda of improving its standing as a
397 university that supports and rewards research. *Collaborate with FAC as primary.* We ask that
398 this review address the following specific aspects:
399 i. Assess and evaluate whether RIT's professional leave budget is resourced sufficiently to
400 achieve its research aspirations.
401 ii. Make explicit and transparent the principles behind any professional leave policy and
402 consider whether these principles would benefit from additional recommendations.
403 iii. Assess the patterns of distribution of professional leaves across the colleges in the last
404 five years to determine how these distributions might differ by college and discipline.
405 iv. Consider whether the decision criteria for allocating and distributing professional leaves
406 are based on transparent principles and, if they are not, to recommend those principles.
407 v. Recommend an appeals process that allows colleagues who have been denied
408 professional leave to request clarification and reconsideration beyond the initial
409 "explanation" already provided by committee on Professional Development Leave.
410 ~~vi. Review and make suggestions regarding changes to current budgeting practices on~~
411 ~~professional leave to ensure they further both the teaching and research/scholarship~~
412 ~~mission of the university.~~

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

- 422 2. Evaluate the pros and cons of RIT adopting an open access policy for scholarly research from RIT
 423 faculty and staff. Make a recommendation based on those findings. Background for this charge:
 424 The existence of an Open Access Policy is one the criteria that the Sustainability Tracking
 425 Assessment and Rating System (STARS) evaluates. There are some parties on campus that are
 426 interested in adopting such a policy and there are others that have concerns. I think it makes
 427 sense to have AS evaluate the pros and cons and make a determination.
- 428 3. Identify ways to develop and improve the holdings of research materials (books, journals and
 429 other materials, print and electronic formats) of the RIT Libraries in order to support the needs
 430 of faculty and students as RIT continues to gain in stature as a research university.
 431 Rationale: RIT libraries have been reducing holdings such as electronic journals over the last
 432 number of years, likely due to budget constraints. One example of the impact is that President
 433 Munson has addressed GCCIS about expanding publishing in the area of pedagogy, yet RIT
 434 libraries eliminated educational technology journals prior to 2014. ILL, sometimes referenced as
 435 a path requires individual submissions per article (so potentially 10-30 typed submissions per
 436 journal issue) and waiting periods for each article. Interdisciplinary work often requires reading
 437 across multiple journals and hundreds of articles and editing submissions to journals requires
 438 fast turnaround access to articles. If we wish to advance in research, we need access to journals
 439 and other materials. While holdings in areas such as IEEE and ACM are plentiful, crossover areas
 440 are missing such as education, digital humanities, social sciences. Another example is that
 441 research universities typically have access to a variety of “jobbers” such as Taylor and Francis,
 442 which we do not have access to at RIT. I would argue that library holdings are one of the key
 443 areas to help us expand our research.
- 444 4. Create guidelines to promote consistency across RIT in evaluating interdisciplinary scholarship.
 445 Consider the following areas:
- 446 i. Treatment of PI and co-PI status: treat as equivalent on interdisciplinary grants
 447 or assign proportional grant credit versus giving all credit to PI and PI’s college.
 - 448 ii. Disregard author ordering on interdisciplinary publications.
 - 449 iii. Recognize interdisciplinary publications as equivalent to disciplinary work.
- 450 5. Propose institute-wide mechanisms to share departmental resources for interdisciplinary
 451 research groups

454 **Resource Allocation & Budget Committee – Yet to be approved & returns for vote 10/4/2018**

456 **Carryover charges:**

- 457 1. RABC 3: Build a 3-5 member steering committee, [who will make a recommendation of the](#)
 458 [duties and composition of an Ad Hoc Committee to address the 50th percentile, overload and](#)
 459 [benchmarking for faculty compensation. The steering committee should provide a well-defined](#)
 460 [scope for the AD Hoc committee and suggest the number of members and what groups should](#)
 461 [be represented \(administration, faculty\) in the Ad Hoc Committee. ASEC agreed on 8/30/18 that](#)
 462 [the RABC and RSC may need to work in conjunction moving forward.](#)
- 463 2. Draft an Activity-Based Budgeting model, first forming a task force consisting of RIT stakeholders
 464 and outside experts. The task force shall be charged with developing the parameters and
 465 weightings for an appropriate allocation formula. Furthermore, we recommend that two sets of
 466 weightings be developed by the task force—a current set that results in minimal change to
 467 current allocations, and a future set that will represent where we want to be and will be phased
 468 in gradually. The transition to the new model should happen over a period of 2-3 years. [\(On](#)
 469 [May 10, 2018, the motion was made: The Senate commends the work done by the RABC on the](#)

470 budget model, and charges the RABC for AY 2018-19 to return with a specific ABB model for the
471 Senate's consideration. Seconded. No objections. APPROVED by Unanimous Consent.)
472

473
474

475 **New charges:**

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