

1 **Approved Standing Committee Charges – 10-04-2018**

2
3 **ASEC**

4
5 **New charges:**

- 6 1. Propose a task force to explore governance questions regarding B2. Specific charges for this ad hoc committee/task force should include:
 - 7 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.
 - 8 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.
 - 9 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?
 - 10 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.
 - 11 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.
- 12 2. Explore:
 - 13 i. the use of PawPrints to allow charges for standing committees to be appropriately prioritized based on quantified faculty support;
 - 14 ii. Implementing a regular internal evaluation process to determine Academic Senate’s effectiveness as viewed by its constituents;
 - 15 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;
 - 16 iv. the benefits of delegating the solicitation of charges to the outgoing chairs of each standing committee. Make appropriate recommendations for senate review.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38 **Academic Affairs Committee**

39
40 **Carryover charges:**

- 41 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

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

64

65 **New Charges:**

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

76

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

79

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

87

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

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

113
 114 **EXAMPLE:**

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

115
 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 6. Survey whether the myCourses platform is adequate to accommodate different forms of
 127 assessment used by faculty.

128
 129 **Academic Support and Student Affairs Committee**

130
 131 **Carryover charges:**

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

133
 134 **New charges:**

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

139 **Faculty Affairs Committee**

140

141 **Carryover charges:**

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

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

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

208
209 **New charges:**

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

234 hearings, and make a recommendation to the Academic Senate regarding whether to change
235 current faculty grievance policy on this matter.

236

237 **General Education Committee**

238

239 **Carryover charges:**

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

241

242 **New Charges:**

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

245

246

247 **Global Education Task Force**

248

249 **Carryover charges:**

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

255

256 **New charges:**

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

263

264 **Graduate Council**

265

266 **Carryover charges:**

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

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

287 **New charges:**

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

304 **ICC**

305
306 **Carryover charges:**

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

319 **New Charges:**

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

327 **Institute Writing Committee**

328

329 **Carryover charges:**

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

335

336 **New charges:**

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

349

350

351 **Long Range Planning & Environment Committee**

352

353 **Carryover charges:**

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

362

363 **New charges:**

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

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

383 Research and Scholarship Committee

384

385 **Carryover charges:**

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

389 This charge is motivated by the University classifying RIT reimbursement of travel if the person
390 is not presenting at the conference as income and asking them to pay income tax on the funds.
391 A top research university recognizes the critical importance of having research students attend
392 conferences, even when they aren't presenting something. Also RIT has instituted a policy that
393 if you do not submit your travel expenses within 60 days it will count as income for you
394 personally and charge you income tax. There are many issues with this but the most glaring is
395 whether RIT has the federal authority to declare when funds become income!

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

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

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

405 The hiring process for faculty is very rigid. For example, there is an unnecessary requirement to
406 interview every candidate before making any offers. Charge proposer writes, "for strong faculty
407 candidates in computing, offers are accepted about 20% of the time and many candidates are
408 lost to other offers early on".

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

411 Some concerns have been expressed regarding the RIT approach to accounting for NSF grants.
412 Charge proposer states that "the accounting rules for managing NSF funds are more strict at RIT
413 than required by NSF." He offers the example of how it is standard practice for faculty to be
414 working on their research projects year round and take a month of summer salary that
415 represents their effort on the grant. Yet SPA states their expectation that faculty have to be
416 physically present on campus for a specific month of the summer working on that grant. If NSF
417 does not expect this it is unclear as to why RIT enforces it. It may be valuable to learn the extent
418 to which the current procedures and mindset in some of the administrative departments is
419 harming research productivity. The charge is written to encourage administrative offices to
420 support the faculty, without adding unnecessary procedural barriers.

- 421 5. **Identify the gaps between current graduate student quality and needed graduate student**
 422 **quality for graduate programs across campus.**
 423 This charge was proposed so as to create awareness of the importance of graduate student
 424 quality and potential for high level research. Specifically, the charge proposer recommends a
 425 description of the current state given that student quality is a driver for research success at RIT.
 426 For which programs is the gap smallest and largest and how can RIT provide resources to enable
 427 more successful recruitment of top-level incoming graduate students? What are the best
 428 practices in those departments where the gap is smallest and graduate student research
 429 productivity is highest?
- 430 6. **Per policy B05.0, review policies C02.0 and C03.1.**
 431 Policy B05.0 requires that policies be reviewed on a five-year cycle with one of three outcomes:
 432 i) The policy is reviewed and affirmed as accurate as written, ii) The policy is revised using the
 433 appropriate review and approval process or iii) The policy is recommended for decommissioning
 434 (it may no longer be applicable or obsolete).
- 435 C02.0 – Misconduct in Research and Scholarship (shared responsibility with VP for Research, last
 436 reviewed 1996)
 437 C03.1 – Agreement for Commissioning of Educational Materials (shared responsibility with VP
 438 for Research and ILI, Last reviewed 2007 to correct department names)
- 439 7. **Review policies Misconduct in Research and Scholarship C02.0 (last review (LR) 1996),**
 440 **Agreement for Commissioning of Educational Materials C03.1 (LR 2007), Policy for the**
 441 **Protection of Human Subjects in Research C05.0 (LR 2011), Protocols for Academic Centers**
 442 **D01.6 (LR 2008), according to policy B05.0.**
- 443 According to Policy B05.0, Development, Review, Approval, And Promulgation Of University-
 444 Level Policies, all policies are reviewed on a 5-year cycle with one of three outcomes:
- 445 1. Reviewed and affirmed – this means the policy was reviewed and there are no changes
 446 needed. The policy history is updated to reflect this determination.
 - 447 2. Reviewed with edits – this means the policy was reviewed and non-substantive edits are
 448 needed, i.e., the name of a department needs to be corrected. The policy history is
 449 updated as appropriate.
 - 450 3. Reviewed and revised – this means the policy was reviewed and substantive revisions
 451 are approved. The policy is updated as appropriate.
- 452 8. **Consider tactics to strongly advocate for more student fellowships and work with**
 453 **Development to promote the increase in endowment for graduate fellowships.**
- 454 9. **Make a recommendation as to how the RSC should be involved in evaluating proposals where**
 455 **the number of proposals submitted from one university is limited (e.g. NSF Major Research**
 456 **Instrumentation).**
- 457 10. **Make recommendations for new policy or a default agreement addressing faculty affiliation**
 458 **with a given Center for Research Excellence (CRE) / Major Research Laboratory (MRL). Propose**
 459 **policy which will allow the CRE/MRL to can modify such an agreement as long as it is made**
 460 **transparent to the RIT community.**
 461 See background from Academic Affairs Committees from 2015-16 and 2016-17.
- 462 11. **Identify ways to develop and improve the holdings of research materials (books,**
 463 **journals and other materials, print and electronic formats) of the RIT Libraries in order**
 464 **to support the needs of faculty and students as RIT continues to gain in stature as a**
 465 **research university.**

466 Given RIT’s strategic commitment to improving its research profile and student success, review
467 benchmark data comparing the Wallace Center’s capacities and resource base for supporting
468 this commitment. Report the review of the data to the Senate during the spring 2017 semester
469 and, if appropriate, make a recommendation.

470 ***

471
472 **Background:**

473 As RIT enlarges its academic portfolio, including the addition of more Master’s and Ph.D.
474 programs and the corresponding faculty positions to support those programs, the resources
475 provided by the RIT Libraries lag behind the needs of faculty and students.
476 Identification of the need for additional space and staffing at the Wallace Center is described in
477 the April 2017 report “Expanding the Core: Renovation and Expansion of The Wallace Center
478 (TWC) at RIT.”
479 (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
480 needs, an analysis of library materials themselves was not provided. The Information Services
481 Department (interlibrary loan) acquires documents, articles, papers and books that not held by
482 the library for faculty and students. No library will ever maintain on site every resource needed.
483 However, multiple faculty requests repeated for the same resources, increases in
484 Ph.D. programs requiring in-depth resource coverage of those fields, and major resources
485 required by new programs that are not presently supported here indicate the need for an
486 examination of the library’s current portfolio of resources, its ability to maintain those
487 resources, and an analysis of the financial support needed to raise the level of those resources
488 to reflect the research needs of RIT. As a secondary point to this charge, faculty input on the
489 enhancement of existing services and collaboration opportunities provided by RIT Libraries, and
490 the identification of desired services not present may be gathered and analyzed. This
491 information will be utilized in the examination of future spaces and staffing needs.
492 The Director of RIT Libraries will be able to provide information concerning historical materials
493 funding, benchmarking data on the amount of materials dollars per student FTEs, and an
494 analysis of commonly requested resources by RIT faculty. A description of the current state and
495 future trends of publishing and access models can also be provided. In addition, specific input
496 from program directors and chairs on the library resources required for the success of those
497 disciplines—including accreditation—can be gathered. A survey of faculty may also be
498 conducted to provide more granular feedback. This information will be compared to existing
499 library resources.
500

501
502 **New charges:**

- 503 1. Review RIT’s decision-making principles and practices regarding Professional Leave, and whether
504 present budget allocations are sufficient to advance RIT’s agenda of improving its standing as a
505 university that supports and rewards research. *Collaborate with FAC as primary.* We ask that
506 this review address the following specific aspects:
 - 507 i. Assess and evaluate whether RIT’s professional leave budget is resourced sufficiently to
508 achieve its research aspirations.
 - 509 ii. Make explicit and transparent the principles behind any professional leave policy and
510 consider whether these principles would benefit from additional recommendations.
 - 511 iii. Assess the patterns of distribution of professional leaves across the colleges in the last
512 five years to determine how these distributions might differ by college and discipline.

- 513 iv. Consider whether the decision criteria for allocating and distributing professional leaves
514 are based on transparent principles and, if they are not, to recommend those principles.
- 515 v. Recommend an appeals process that allows colleagues who have been denied
516 professional leave to request clarification and reconsideration beyond the initial
517 “explanation” already provided by committee on Professional Development Leave.
- 518 Background: During the past several years there has been a perception, if not an actual
519 practice, of a growing level of competition for the granting of academic/professional leaves, and
520 an increase in the number of denials of academic/professional leave requests by the University.
521 A system of competition that results in increasing denials of requests for research-related
522 professional/academic leave, on its surface, is antithetical to RIT’s initiatives towards improve
523 our research portfolio and visibility on a national and international level. If such a system is now
524 being used, faculty need clear and explicit explanations of the rationale for such a system, and
525 the principles and practices used for making such decisions, and should be offered a possibility
526 for an appeal process when requests have been denied.
- 527 2. Evaluate the pros and cons of RIT adopting an open access policy for scholarly research from RIT
528 faculty and staff. Make a recommendation based on those findings. Background for this charge:
529 The existence of an Open Access Policy is one the criteria that the Sustainability Tracking
530 Assessment and Rating System (STARS) evaluates. There are some parties on campus that are
531 interested in adopting such a policy and there are others that have concerns. I think it makes
532 sense to have AS evaluate the pros and cons and make a determination.
- 533 3. Identify ways to develop and improve the holdings of research materials (books, journals and
534 other materials, print and electronic formats) of the RIT Libraries in order to support the needs
535 of faculty and students as RIT continues to gain in stature as a research university.
- 536 Rationale: RIT libraries have been reducing holdings such as electronic journals over the last
537 number of years, likely due to budget constraints. One example of the impact is that President
538 Munson has addressed GCCIS about expanding publishing in the area of pedagogy, yet RIT
539 libraries eliminated educational technology journals prior to 2014. ILL, sometimes referenced as
540 a path requires individual submissions per article (so potentially 10-30 typed submissions per
541 journal issue) and waiting periods for each article. Interdisciplinary work often requires reading
542 across multiple journals and hundreds of articles and editing submissions to journals requires
543 fast turnaround access to articles. If we wish to advance in research, we need access to journals
544 and other materials. While holdings in areas such as IEEE and ACM are plentiful, crossover areas
545 are missing such as education, digital humanities, social sciences. Another example is that
546 research universities typically have access to a variety of “jobbers” such as Taylor and Francis,
547 which we do not have access to at RIT. I would argue that library holdings are one of the key
548 areas to help us expand our research.
- 549 4. Create guidelines to promote consistency across RIT in evaluating interdisciplinary scholarship.
550 Consider the following areas:
- 551 i. Treatment of PI and co-PI status: treat as equivalent on interdisciplinary grants
552 or assign proportional grant credit versus giving all credit to PI and PI’s college.
- 553 ii. Disregard author ordering on interdisciplinary publications.
- 554 iii. Recognize interdisciplinary publications as equivalent to disciplinary work.
- 555 5. Propose institute-wide mechanisms to share departmental resources for interdisciplinary
556 research groups
- 557

558 **Resource Allocation & Budget Committee**

559 **Carryover charges:**

560

- 561 1. RABC 3: Build a 3-5 member steering committee, who will make a recommendation of the
562 duties and composition of an Ad Hoc Committee to address the 50th percentile, overload and
563 benchmarking for faculty compensation. The steering committee should provide a well-defined
564 scope for the AD Hoc committee and suggest the number of members and what groups should
565 be represented (administration, faculty) in the Ad Hoc Committee. *ASEC agreed on 8/30/18 that*
566 *the RABC and RSC may need to work in conjunction moving forward.*
- 567 2. Draft an Activity-Based Budgeting model, first forming a task force consisting of RIT stakeholders
568 and outside experts. The task force shall be charged with developing the parameters and
569 weightings for an appropriate allocation formula. Furthermore, we recommend that two sets of
570 weightings be developed by the task force—a current set that results in minimal change to
571 current allocations, and a future set that will represent where we want to be and will be phased
572 in gradually. The transition to the new model should happen over a period of 2-3 years. (On
573 May 10, 2018, the motion was made: The Senate commends the work done by the RABC on the
574 budget model, and charges the RABC for AY 2018-19 to return with a specific ABB model for the
575 Senate’s consideration. Seconded. No objections. APPROVED by Unanimous Consent.)
576

577 **New charges:**

- 578
- 579 1. RABC should investigate and estimate the expected financial implications of waiving
580 undergraduate tuition for course credit for undergraduate research at a level higher than first
581 semester of research for a professor. The rationale is based on several experiences from a
582 faculty member when students had to max out their credits for various reasons (i.e. changing
583 majors, having transferred, wishing to repeat classes), but still wished to conduct research
584 leading to publications or providing experience for job applications or graduate school
585 admissions. Their work fully deserved credits, but they could not afford the extra tuition
586 required. If a student is in the honors program, this tuition is waived - so it is clear that this has
587 a protocol. The problem is with those students who are productive students, yet for whatever
588 reason did not gain entry to honors. it is often the case where some of the best researchers in
589 the lab are not the highest performing students in class-work, so this could be a further
590 consideration. There could be restrictions on the tuition waiver for credits based on maintaining
591 a certain gpa (for example a 3.0, or 3.2). There could be a restriction that this must be at least
592 the second or third semester of research and a caveat where the mentor has certified that this is
593 not just an introductory semester (what we call shadowing) in his or her lab. There could be a
594 restriction that research in summers does not qualify. The rationale is further centered in the
595 high impact of undergraduate research on the scholarship aspect of Science and Technology at
596 RIT. This research serves not only the student but advances the professor's success and the
597 success of the school or center they are in. It is becoming clear that undergraduate research is a
598 hallmark of RIT's excellence. Such a policy could even be used as an advertising aspect to draw
599 in a prospective student who might be interested in research "on the bench" as part of his or
600 her education. It would advantage grant applications such as the NIH R-15 AREA grants, for
601 which a detailed description of undergraduate research at RIT is required, and is a section of
602 which the reviewers take particular note. *ASEC agreed on 8/30/18 that the AAC and RABC may*
603 *need to work in conjunction moving forward.*
- 604
- 605 2. Propose policies or guidelines for overhead sharing to remove barriers to interdisciplinary work
606 and incentivize interdisciplinary work across colleges. Background: When externally sponsored
607 interdisciplinary research projects cross organization boundaries, disagreement on how to split
608 of overhead return between deans and colleges can become an impediment. Practices vary

609 across the colleges making it more difficult for faculty to get credit for interdisciplinary
610 sponsored research.