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

ASEC – Approved as Amended

New charges:

1. **Propose** a task force to explore governance questions regarding B2. Specific charges for this ad hoc committee/task force should include:
   
i. As the university grows, and as certain areas are tapped for increased growth while others are not, thereby having the number of faculty and resultant representation in governance influenced by the administration, it may be time for us to consider a structure that reflects a senate rather than a congress. Should each area have 2 representatives rather than a number based upon the population of faculty? Colleges/academic units under X faculty could be combined for the purpose of governance representation, e.g. SOIS and GIS.
   
ii. Consider and if deemed appropriate add a sentence to the general description of standing committees of senate stating the chairs of all standing committees shall be a faculty member.
   
iii. Consider providing guidance on the time between when a faculty member has been termed-off a committee and when they can be elected again. For instance, if a senator has served for 2 terms (6 years), does that individual have to be off senate for 1 term or 1 year before they can again be elected to serve again? And during that interim would the person be permitted to serve as an alternate or no?
   
iv. Assess the benefits of modifying B2.0 to state a requirement for the ASEC Treasurer is to be a liaison between academic senate and RABC.
   
v. Evaluate the possibility of adding new responsibilities to the Nominations Committee associated with oversight of senate processes, training for incoming senators, and succession plans for replacing outgoing executive committee knowledge.

2. **Explore**:
   
i. the use of PawPrints to allow charges for standing committees to be appropriately prioritized based on quantified faculty support;
   
ii. Implementing a regular internal evaluation process to determine Academic Senate’s effectiveness as viewed by its constituents;
   
iii. the benefits of shifting the cycle of 50% of all standing committees such that they start the review of new charges in the Spring semester, completing those charges at the end of the fall semester;
   
iv. the benefits of delegating the solicitation of charges to the outgoing chairs of each standing committee. Make appropriate recommendations for senate review.

Academic Affairs Committee – Approved as amended

Carryover charges:

1. AA3 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. To be split between AAC and FAC? The contact time per credit hour is clearly within the purview of AAC; the issue of faculty teaching loads would fall with FAC.

2. AA6 Per policy B05.0, review policy D01.6 – Protocols for Academic Centers (last reviewed in 2008). Senate agreed to move forward to next year in conjunction with Research & Scholarship Committee on 4/05/18.

3. AA9 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. Has not been returned to Committee from Student Government.

4. AA11 Draft policy to require that all media for courses be captioned in accordance with guidelines provided by the Provost and the Department of Justice. Specify a process to address student concerns regarding captioned media. And to consider implementation implications and edge cases (media heavy courses, assignment that include viewing videos).

5. AA7 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.

**New Charges:**

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

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

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

Clarity needed re timing: Does the clock (3 weeks) begin when the student submits the assignment/test/etc. or is this when the faculty member discovers the potential infraction? I believe the policy makes it clear that it is within 3 weeks of the date that the paper was submitted, test taken, etc. and not three weeks from when the faculty member becomes aware of the potential violation. Even so, there seems to be confusion about this point. For example, if it is a violation on the final exam and students have left for the end of the term, does the policy require the faculty member to communicate over the break? Clarity also needed with
regard to what is sent to the instructor’s academic unit head and Dean’s office. Is it just a copy of what the instructor sent to the student? If yes, then it should say that. If what is sent to the academic unit head and dean’s office contains additional information, the student should also receive whatever information is sent to the department head because the next steps in the process involve meetings between the student and the instructor, department head, and dean’s designee. There have been instances when the documentation has not been the same.

2. Per policy B05.0, review D01.3 – Undergraduate Dual Degree Policy – and either affirm with no changes; make revisions or edits through the appropriate review process; or recommended for decommissioning because it is obsolete or superseded by another policy.

3. Per policy B05.0, review D11.0 – Final Examination Policy – and either affirm with no changes; make revisions or edits through the appropriate review process; or recommended for decommissioning because it is obsolete or superseded by another policy.

4. Per policy B05.0, review D13.0 – Diplomas and Degrees Certification Policy – and either affirm with no changes; make revisions or edits through the appropriate review process; or recommended for decommissioning because it is obsolete or superseded by another policy.

5. Update C22.0 Records Management Schedule to match the various division schedules (owners of the documents) for example the Academic Affairs supplemental schedule. Or just provide the links to the various retention schedules and not have a table that can be misleading.

EXAMPLE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Retention Period</th>
<th>Official Repository</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic advisement files</td>
<td>1 year after graduation/last date of attendance</td>
<td>Appropriate Academic Departments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

6. Survey whether the myCourses platform is adequate to accommodate different forms of assessment used by faculty.

Academic Support and Student Affairs Committee - Approved

Carryover charges:

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

New charges:

1. Evaluate RIT’s policy on junk email, with particular attention to whether junk email with a link labelled “unsubscribe” should continue to be unfiltered, given that the “unsubscribe” link could take the user anywhere.

2. Consider instituting Student Evaluations of Academic Advisors
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
to how to demonstrate this, as doing so could create additional criteria for tenure and
promotion, to the intent some candidate might advocate their work in the community meets
these criteria, and we may inadvertently push the criteria of scholarship, teaching and service to
the background. Discussion is ongoing and a final vote has not been taken.

7. FAC 10 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. This
policy was discussed briefly. FAC agreed to carry over this into the new academic year. In
addition, some members of the sub-committee are leaving the FAC and as such we plan to
constitute a new sub-committee to examine this in detail and present to the full committee.

8. Complete revisions to E20.0 and E21.0
   i. Special instructions for E20 include a removal of portion dealing with program review
      and having it placed in D01.0. This action would necessitate a simultaneous charge to
given to ICC to revise D01.0 to include program review and discontinuance. E20.0 draft
policy with FAC addresses the treatment of faculty in the case of program
discontinuance or reduction.
   ii. Further special instructions regarding E20.0 and E21.0 is 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.

9. Complete revisions to policy E5.0 and E6.0 entailing 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.

New charges:

1. Per policy B05.0, review E04.1 – Faculty Extra Service Compensation and Summer Employment
   Policy – and either affirm with no changes; make revisions or edits through the appropriate
   review process; or recommended for decommissioning because it is obsolete or superseded by
   another policy.

2. Per policy B05.0, review E12.7 – Outstanding Teaching Award for Non Tenure-Track Faculty
   Policy – and either affirm with no changes; make revisions or edits through the appropriate
   review process; or recommended for decommissioning because it is obsolete or superseded by
   another policy.

3. Review policy E7.0. Specifically, the timing of faculty evaluations and plans of work. In GCCIS
there has been a lot of talk and speculation that they might consider reviewing faculty on the
academic year (instead of the calendar year) now that HR has changed the date that merit
increases go into effect.

4. Review RIT policies regarding maternity leave and their application and make recommendations
for policy change or clarification or better training for department heads and deans. Perhaps
establish a task force to examine institutional bullying of junior, particularly female, pre-tenure
faculty as well as non tenure-track faculty.

5. Investigate benefits of changing the parking registration window for faculty such that it occurs
earlier in the calendar rather than late in the summer when many faculty take their long-
awaited vacations and go offline.

6. Review all RIT policy to ensure consistency regarding our commitment not to exclude or
discriminate against any faculty by reference to their degree or previous professional
background. Make recommendations where necessary to ensure consistency and compliance
with the principles of inclusion and non-discrimination. Specifically, consider the benefits and
liabilities associated with allowing an individual holding a law degree to participate in grievance hearings, and make a recommendation to the Academic Senate regarding whether to change current faculty grievance policy on this matter.

**General Education Committee- Approved**

**Carryover charges:**
Continue the audit/review of General Education student learning outcomes and courses.

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

**Global Education Task Force - Approved**

**Carryover charges:**
1. 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.
2. Review policy D7.0 and propose changes.

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

**Graduate Council- Approved**

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

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

5. GC Charge 7: Review policy D12.0 (Graduation Requirements), specifically where it concerns the
20% limit of graduate transfer credits in Section V, Subsection C. Identify the origins, and
impacts on this limitation to graduate education. Make recommendations for change in policy as
necessary.

New charges:

1. Investigate Policy D05.0 VI Repeating Courses to raise low grades, Section B. Graduate Students
and Policy D5.0 – VII Grade Point Average. Make recommendations for repeating courses and
for the calculation of Program Grade Point Average (PGPA) for graduate programs. The
committee should consider the following:

• Why are graduate grades done differently than UG grades?
• Why are graduate grades averaged for all course attempts?
• Why not count the most recent grade received for a course, for which the student has made
multiple attempts, similar to UG grades?
• It is very difficult to recover from a bad grade, if a grade of a second attempt with an improved
grade is averaged with the first one. Are RIT graduate students at a disadvantage when applying
for jobs or for PhD programs, because of the way we calculate graduate grades?
• Should this policy for graduate grades be reviewed and benchmarked with other universities?

Based on the findings and on suggested modifications, to D05.0 VI, make changes to D5.0 VII for the
calculation of Program Grade Point Average (PGPA) for graduate programs.

ICC- Approved

Carryover charges:

1. ICC Charge 2 – Work with the Honor’s program to revise policy D1 to clearly outline curricular
processes with regard to the Honors Program.
2. ICC Charge 3 – Work with Faculty Affairs to revise policy on discontinuance of academic
programs (E20.0)
3. ICC Charge 4 – Brainstorm, rank-order and propose to Senate approaches to increase flexibility
of RIT’s undergraduate degrees.
4. Study undergraduate curricular proposals from a university-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. (carry over)

New Charges:

1. Review RIT policies that impact undergraduate curriculum that are brought to the committee’s
attention and propose revisions as appropriate to the Academic Senate.
2. Review and make recommendations on the guidelines, process and how UG certificates can be
pursued and awarded.
Institute Writing Committee

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

New charges:
1. Draft a third section of D01.5 University Writing Policy addressing graduate writing, after completing an investigation of the current state of writing in graduate programs, which includes a working subgroup comprised of at-large key RIT stakeholders (e.g., Wallace Center delegate, Writing Commons Coordinator, Graduate Education delegate, etc.) and an investigation into graduate student experience. This policy should i) provide a clear directive as to how graduate programs participate in graduate writing support and improvement; ii) modify such policy such that full buy-in from graduate programs is accomplished, based on discussions from IWC1.
2. Add graduate writing to IWC’s oversight and evaluate formulation 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.
3. Provide estimates as to the cost of supporting graduate student writing based on findings from IWC1.

Long Range Planning & Environment Committee

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

New charges:
1. Investigate the status restroom facilities in the academic buildings, including how many bathrooms/stalls by gender, gender inclusive status, condition (e.g. worn, broken, not working), last renovation, and building usage (faculty/staff/students). Make recommendations as appropriate in relation to campus welfare, e.g., priority for renovations.
2. Update and clarify charge LRPEC5 with clearer, more actionable language and a longer period of study with a dedicated taskforce and funding to accomplish charge. Consider the charge in the context of a larger, better funded, longitudinal research study with dedicated researchers, full institutional support, and a commitment to act upon its findings. Use specific language to update the charge based on direct feedback from current stakeholders and suggest that additional research is needed to fill in the gaps of knowledge that we have identified.
3. Review current parking policies and processes, such as:
   i. the number of reserved spaces sold in relationship to available spaces
   ii. EVehicles
   iii. Construction implications
   iv. Consider moving spaces for motorcycles to unreserved slots
   v. New fine policies (such as what is the impact on low income students)
   vi. Non-reserved space availability
   vii. Handicapped parking

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

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

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

Background: During the past several years there has been a perception, if not an actual practice, of a growing level of competition for the granting of academic/professional leaves, and an increase in the number of denials of academic/professional leave requests by the University. A system of competition that results in increasing denials of requests for research-related professional/academic leave, on its surface, is antithetical to RIT’s initiatives towards improve our research portfolio and visibility on a national and international level. If such a system is now being used, faculty need clear and explicit explanations of the rationale for such a system, and the principles and practices used for making such decisions, and should be offered a possibility for an appeal process when requests have been denied.
2. Evaluate the pros and cons of RIT adopting an open access policy for scholarly research from RIT faculty and staff. Make a recommendation based on those findings. Background for this charge:
The existence of an Open Access Policy is one the criteria that the Sustainability Tracking Assessment and Rating System (STARS) evaluates. There are some parties on campus that are interested in adopting such a policy and there are others that have concerns. I think it makes sense to have AS evaluate the pros and cons and make a determination.

3. 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.
Rationale: RIT libraries have been reducing holdings such as electronic journals over the last number of years, likely due to budget constraints. One example of the impact is that President Munson has addressed GCCIS about expanding publishing in the area of pedagogy, yet RIT libraries eliminated educational technology journals prior to 2014. ILL, sometimes referenced as a path requires individual submissions per article (so potentially 10-30 typed submissions per journal issue) and waiting periods for each article. Interdisciplinary work often requires reading across multiple journals and hundreds of articles and editing submissions to journals requires fast turnaround access to articles. If we wish to advance in research, we need access to journals and other materials. While holdings in areas such as IEEE and ACM are plentiful, crossover areas are missing such as education, digital humanities, social sciences. Another example is that research universities typically have access to a variety of “jobbers” such as Taylor and Francis, which we do not have access to at RIT. I would argue that library holdings are one of the key areas to help us expand our research.

4. Create guidelines to promote consistency across RIT in evaluating interdisciplinary scholarship.
Consider the following areas:
   i. Treatment of PI and co-PI status: treat as equivalent on interdisciplinary grants or assign proportional grant credit versus giving all credit to PI and PI’s college.
   ii. Disregard author ordering on interdisciplinary publications.
   iii. Recognize interdisciplinary publications as equivalent to disciplinary work.

5. Propose institute-wide mechanisms to share departmental resources for interdisciplinary research groups

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

Carryover charges:
1. RABC 3: Build a 3-5 member steering committee, who will make a recommendation of the duties and composition of an Ad Hoc Committee to address the 50th percentile, overload and benchmarking for faculty compensation. The steering committee should provide a well-defined scope for the AD Hoc committee and suggest the number of members and what groups should be represented (administration, faculty) in the Ad Hoc Committee. ASEC agreed on 8/30/18 that the RABC and RSC may need to work in conjunction moving forward.
2. Draft an Activity-Based Budgeting model, first forming a task force consisting of RIT stakeholders and outside experts. The task force shall be charged with developing the parameters and weightings for an appropriate allocation formula. Furthermore, we recommend that two sets of weightings be developed by the task force—a current set that results in minimal change to current allocations, and a future set that will represent where we want to be and will be phased in gradually. The transition to the new model should happen over a period of 2-3 years. (On May 10, 2018, the motion was made: The Senate commends the work done by the RABC on the
budget model, and charges the RABC for AY 2018-19 to return with a specific ABB model for the Senate’s consideration. Seconded. No objections. APPROVED by Unanimous Consent.)

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

2. Propose policies or guidelines for overhead sharing to remove barriers to interdisciplinary work and incentivize interdisciplinary work across colleges. Background: When externally sponsored interdisciplinary research projects cross organization boundaries, disagreement on how to split of overhead return between deans and colleges can become an impediment. Practices vary across the colleges making it more difficult for faculty to get credit for interdisciplinary sponsored research.