Approved Standing Committee Charges – 10-04-2018

ASEC

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

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.

6. 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

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**

**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)
inorporates 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

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

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

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

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

Carryover charges:

1. Investigate whether RIT has the authority to classify travel reimbursement for students and faculty to conferences, or other travel associated with research, as income and therefore taxable, independent of when the request for reimbursement is made.
   This charge is motivated by the University classifying RIT reimbursement of travel if the person is not presenting at the conference as income and asking them to pay income tax on the funds. A top research university recognizes the critical importance of having research students attend conferences, even when they aren’t presenting something. Also RIT has instituted a policy that if you do not submit your travel expenses within 60 days it will count as income for you personally and charge you income tax. There are many issues with this but the most glaring is whether RIT has the federal authority to declare when funds become income!

2. Identify policy, make appropriate changes and propose such amendments with a view to reducing RIT’s reliance on original copies of paper receipts used in travel reimbursements.
   Insisting on original copies of receipts is burdensome on the staff and a waste of time and therefore money. Also, many retailers are moving to fully e-receipts, so clearly those original receipts are not on paper. It is understood that other universities accept scans of receipts without issue. This may be motivated from a fear of being audited but it likely costs more money to be 100% compliant than to pay a minor fine for minor infractions.

3. Identify best practices for hiring research-intensive faculty. Make recommendations as to further action by senate if hiring policy restricts the ability to land top faculty.
   The hiring process for faculty is very rigid. For example, there is an unnecessary requirement to interview every candidate before making any offers. Charge proposer writes, “for strong faculty candidates in computing, offers are accepted about 20% of the time and many candidates are lost to other offers early on”.

4. Identify best practices for SPA to respond to the needs of Research Faculty as opposed to the research faculty needing to respond to pre-established accounting preferences.
   Some concerns have been expressed regarding the RIT approach to accounting for NSF grants. Charge proposer states that “the accounting rules for managing NSF funds are more strict at RIT than required by NSF.” He offers the example of how it is standard practice for faculty to be working on their research projects year round and take a month of summer salary that represents their effort on the grant. Yet SPA states their expectation that faculty have to be physically present on campus for a specific month of the summer working on that grant. If NSF does not expect this it is unclear as to why RIT enforces it. It may be valuable to learn the extent to which the current procedures and mindset in some of the administrative departments is harming research productivity. The charge is written to encourage administrative offices to support the faculty, without adding unnecessary procedural barriers.
5. **Identify the gaps between current graduate student quality and needed graduate student quality for graduate programs across campus.**

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

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

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

   - C02.0 – Misconduct in Research and Scholarship (shared responsibility with VP for Research, last reviewed 1996)
   - C03.1 – Agreement for Commissioning of Educational Materials (shared responsibility with VP for Research and ILI, Last reviewed 2007 to correct department names)

7. **Review policies Misconduct in Research and Scholarship C02.0 (last review (LR) 1996), Agreement for Commissioning of Educational Materials C03.1 (LR 2007), Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research C05.0 (LR 2011), Protocols for Academic Centers D01.6 (LR 2008), according to policy B05.0.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

11. **Identify ways to develop and improve the holdings of research materials (books, journals and other materials, print and electronic formats) of the RIT Libraries in order to support the needs of faculty and students as RIT continues to gain in stature as a research university.**
Given RIT’s strategic commitment to improving its research profile and student success, review benchmark data comparing the Wallace Center’s capacities and resource base for supporting this commitment. Report the review of the data to the Senate during the spring 2017 semester and, if appropriate, make a recommendation.

***

**Background:**
As RIT enlarges its academic portfolio, including the addition of more Master’s and Ph.D. programs and the corresponding faculty positions to support those programs, the resources provided by the RIT Libraries lag behind the needs of faculty and students. Identification of the need for additional space and staffing at the Wallace Center is described in the April 2017 report “Expanding the Core: Renovation and Expansion of The Wallace Center (TWC) at RIT.” (https://www.rit.edu/academicaffairs/sites/rit.edu.academicaffairs/files/memos/TWCLibrary_Narrative_Updated_06-08-17.pdf) Since this report’s purpose was to address physical space needs, an analysis of library materials themselves was not provided. The Information Services Department (interlibrary loan) acquires documents, articles, papers and books that not held by the library for faculty and students. No library will ever maintain on site every resource needed. However, multiple faculty requests repeated for the same resources, increases in Ph.D. programs requiring in-depth resource coverage of those fields, and major resources required by new programs that are not presently supported here indicate the need for an examination of the library’s current portfolio of resources, its ability to maintain those resources, and an analysis of the financial support needed to raise the level of those resources to reflect the research needs of RIT. As a secondary point to this charge, faculty input on the enhancement of existing services and collaboration opportunities provided by RIT Libraries, and the identification of desired services not present may be gathered and analyzed. This information will be utilized in the examination of future spaces and staffing needs. The Director of RIT Libraries will be able to provide information concerning historical materials funding, benchmarking data on the amount of materials dollars per student FTEs, and an analysis of commonly requested resources by RIT faculty. A description of the current state and future trends of publishing and access models can also be provided. In addition, specific input from program directors and chairs on the library resources required for the success of those disciplines—including accreditation—can be gathered. A survey of faculty may also be conducted to provide more granular feedback. This information will be compared to existing library resources.

**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.

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 improving 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**

**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. 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 a professor. The rationale is based on several experiences 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.