

Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

Regularly scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate of Rochester Institute of Technology

Thursday, May 2, 2024

12:15 – 1:50 PM

Slaughter Hall 2240/2230

Attendance: See Below

Agenda Item No. 1: Call to Order; A. Newman (12:16)
Meeting called to order.
Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; A. Newman (12:16)
Motion: S. Johnson Seconded: M. Anselm Approved by acclamation
Agenda Item No. 3: Communication Officer's Report/Approval of Minutes; S. Aldersley (12:17)
S. Aldersley: Good afternoon, everybody. Having received no suggestions for edits to the draft minutes. I move they be approved. Second: F. Deese Approved by acclamation April 25, 2024 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; A. Newman (12:18)
Welcome to the final meeting of this academic year. The first meetings of the Strategic Planning committee are being scheduled right now and work will start in June. By the time we return in fall I hope to have a much more detailed idea of how the Strategic Plan is coming together. With regard to the call for next year's charges, please make sure to use the Qualtrics Survey. Also please reach out to your constituents and remind them to submit any charges that are important to them. And please remind them also of the difference between university and college policies. University policies tend to be much more vague to allow for specific flexibility in the colleges. This summer, we are going to test out a new way of doing charges.
Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; B. Strowe (12:19)

We have two more meetings left on our agenda for Staff Council before we do our leadership elections in June. We're doing our representative elections right now, which close out next Friday. We do half our council each year. We're looking forward to onboarding our new members. We have our end of year staff appreciation picnic which happens the week after commencement. We've been extended an invitation to participate in the Strategic Planning Committee, the search for a new President and the Middle States Re-accreditation Committee. At this point we're preparing all our end of year transition documentation and our final reports ready for our last meeting at the end of May and recruiting new leadership for next year.

Agenda Item No. 6: Student Government Update; A. Shuron (12:20)

We're mostly working on transitioning to our next administration.

Agenda Item No. 7: CHST New Program Proposal: Occupational Therapy Doctor program (OTD); G. Thurston (12:31) *Presentation linked below*

The College of Health Sciences is proposing this program. It would be the inaugural Clinical Doctoral program at RIT, if it were to be approved. It reflects the fact that there are increasing shortages of healthcare professionals in occupational therapy. The national organization is moving towards requiring doctoral training. This program was presented to Graduate Counsel this spring and it's distinguished by leveraging many technological capabilities at RIT, involving artificial intelligence, virtual reality, etc. They have five categories of study including this last one, I mentioned, #5. They presented it to us in March. We thought it was a pretty good proposal, but needed a little bit of help, notably external letters of support and a complete application to the New York State Education Department. It came back to us in April with all questions addressed, and we voted unanimously to bring this to Faculty Senate for your discussion. We would like to move for its approval. We have a delegation including Chris and Kristen who can comment on specific questions that I'm not qualified to address with as much authority.

S. Aldersley: George, I looked at the program and I'm looking at slide #16 where it talks about new resources, and the first year requires 14.6 million dollars, and I'm wondering if you have any sort of indication from the Administration that that money will be made available?

G. Thurston: That didn't come up in our discussions, so I don't have any information on that.

K. Waterstram-Rich: When our Dean informed the administration of the cost to start the program, he was assured that they would have the money because they want the clinical doctorate program. So that's all I can tell you. We were assured that the money would be there.

H. Ghazle: The program is in existence. We have faculty already for the program. We don't have students. Due to the requirements for accreditation we have to have people in place to run this program. So I do see commitment from the Administration to support this program by having the faculty already who are trying to put the program together and move forward with all the logistics. So the support is there.

S. Aldersley: As a follow up, of that 14.6 million dollars, 13.9 million is for capital expenditures. Given the normal financial circumstances around here, I'm having a little difficulty seeing that that is going to be available.

H. Ghazle: Right now, in terms of this program, we have the personnel, and we've got the physical space. The university is allocating space to this program, even in this building. There are multiple offices, multiple spaces for labs and simulation labs, etc. So all of these things are being provided to the program before we accept students. The space has been allocated to the program and we're moving forward. So the question is is the 14.1 million dollars going to be there? So far the support is being provided to the program in terms of resources, whether personnel or physical space. As a matter of fact, some money has been allocated recently for equipment. I have worked with the director and the field coordinator of the program to look into simulation material and mannequins and so forth which is not cheap. But the university has provided that support. So, these things are taking place.

R. Zanibbi: Not knowing the discipline at all, is this a standard title?

C. Alfred: The degree designation ends up being OTD or Occupational Therapy Doctorate which is the standard way of expressing it.

R. Zanibbi: Are there other programs across the country with the same title?

C. Alfred: This is the standard terminology.

Motion to approve the Occupational Therapy Doctor program

Passed: 35:1:2

[CHST New Program Proposal: Occupational Therapy Doctor program presentation \(OTD\)](#)
[OTD Proposal Document](#)

Agenda Item No. 8: Student Government Presentation; D. Jones (12:22) *Presentation linked below*

I tried to make this presentation just a little bit different from the one I gave at University Council. I am this year's Student Government President, and I have my role for just a couple more days. Just in case you don't know how SG is made up, we have seven cabinet members, ten academic senators representing the ten academic colleges, and five community senators representing the different communities on campus. We have six committees plus one ad hoc committee and five RSOs. So in total, SG has about 34 members.

We got a lot done this year. My director of student relations and I went to RIT-Dubai where we attended the global consortium. This happens every year and varies by location. All the SGs meet up, and we talk for five days.. It's a lot of fun but we did actually do work there. We talked about some of the events we do on our campus and suggested maybe others implementing them on theirs. The RIT-Dubai SG is trying to implement our system on their campus and we've been talking with their tech team all year on how to manage that service on their campus.

You may remember that in the fall the D.19 policy came up here in Senate. It also came up in SG. The Administration wanted to make some changes, and one of the things they were going to eliminate related to the timeline that cases take. As soon as that came up in SG, we said 'absolutely not' and we advocated including that timeline somewhere within the policy. So it's actually in a separate document now so they can update it without it having to come to all the governance groups.

We also have an Elections Committee. Members are people that are not in SG itself, so it is completely separate. They have no ties to SG except that they're paid by us. They make elections run smoothly and fairly and have to follow a set of rules. They are the enforcers of those rules. Last year was the first official year that this committee was in place. So there were obviously some kinks in the road, and the election wasn't run as smoothly last year. So we updated all of our language surrounding elections, trying to make the rules more clear, while trying at the same time to make it so that any student on campus can participate in SG. You don't need to be like an RA and have all these resources, you can be a normal student. We also made the committee a little bigger, because we're really busy students and there's a lot going on. So we have five members on the committee, and then five alternates.

We used to have this position called the Director of Ethical Governing, which is the vaguest title ever to exist. Ethical governing, what does that mean? So we changed it to the Director of Collaboration and Inclusion, and made the job a little bit more DEI-focused to make sure we represent all students on campus through that role in our cabinet, and we changed the job description to require that the person work with the Disability Services Office. We also have a Director of Operations, essentially the chief of staff for SG. That was a calendar year position serving from January to December, which meant that the person transitioned between administrations. It didn't really work. The person felt really out of place in the new administration they were thrown into. So we changed that and made it an academic year position. So they serve just like everyone else in SG.

As you know, we had a bit of a mental health crisis in the fall and in response to that we created a Student Wellbeing Committee, centered around anything related to student well being, whether that be Counseling Psychological Services, case management, health promotions or Student Health Center. The function used to be in our Student Affairs Committee which had been a kind of catch-all committee with a really broad scope. So we helped to break down that by forming this Well-Being committee. They also partnered a lot with food-share this year, trying to get more donations. They ran an event with them, called Make your own Ramen. We gave out T-shirts. It was a lot of fun. It was one of our four successful events and it came out of our brand new committee. We did a lot on campus, too. We have our hands in everything. During orientation we held a tie-dye ice cream event. We hosted the Brick City Weekend speaker, Hank Green this year. We got him a hockey jersey as our gift to him. We did chocolate on ice. We did the same thing at Relay for Life and our SG team raised about \$2,000. We always run Donuts with Delegates which used to be called Dunkin with Delegates, but Dunkin Donuts got mad at us, so we changed it to Donuts with Delegates. But I don't always like donuts so then I changed it to Slices with SG,

and I got pizza sometimes, so that was really cool during our elections. It was a nice way to interact with our constituents there as well.

So sadly my SG time is done. But we have a lot of things that are continuing next year. We got \$10,000 from Austin McChord to put a little train on the red band in the SHED. We're going to sponsor a senior design project in the Kate Gleason College of Engineering next year. And they're going to build the train. So it's a train for students by students. Really cool. We realize that not everyone gets free printing on campus. And it was a big problem this year for us, so we're continuing conversations with RIT next year to try to get some centralized printing network which we would all benefit from on campus. Our Women Senator started working with Women and Gender Sexuality Resource Center for free menstrual products on campus. It was something that's come up here year to year, and we finally found a company that's willing to work with RIT to try to implement this. We will have a trial location in the SAU for the fall semester.

Thank you.

M. Laver: Just a comment. As some of you may know, I'm the Senate representative to SG, and even though you disenfranchised me this year, and made me a second class citizen, nevertheless if Senators could see what goes on in SG, you would be so impressed. I mean, it's not just fun and fellowship, but it's also some really serious topics that they tackle, and make their voices known. And they're in touch with their constituencies. It's really impressive to see. So you know, you and your cabinet are to be commended.

D. Jones: Thank you. Yes, I don't have a voting seat here so I took your voting seat away.

[Student Government Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 9: B 02.0 Votes; A. Newman (12:39) *Presentation linked below*

This was something we discussed two weeks ago, and we said we would bring it back today. We also have a surprise for everyone at the end. So please don't rush out really quickly.

As you know, there are a number of reasons why we've been addressing the Charter, one of which stems from the difficulty we've been having for the past two years in recruiting people to join the standing committees and then to stay for the entire length of their term. We must be working them too hard. In addition, there's just a general resistance from people to do their service. Also, we wanted to create a level of consistency in the Charter, we wanted to make sure we remove extraneous language that creates vagueness or contradicts different parts of the policy, and we wanted to bring consistency to the voting rights of non faculty members in our committees, because we previously removed voting rights from non faculty members in the Senate. We also wanted to make sure that the charter matched our current practices, so that we are not out of step with our own words, because that's in itself a little awkward. And we wanted to recognize the inclusion of senior and principal lecturers in the Senate population, because a lot of descriptions that we have still do not recognize the fact that our Senate is becoming increasingly populated by lecturers.

So we are going to be voting. And because last time there was a question about how the rationale had not been presented I also wanted to break this down into the rationale for each of the three motions that we are going to put before you.

The Executive Committee has been seeking greater access regarding faculty input and transparency into the budgeting and financial practices at RIT. As you know, two years ago, the RABC had a lot of issues trying to have regular meetings with F&A. So the Executive Committee picked up the process and started helping the committee have more conversations. Part of this is because we are always in conversations with various offices across campus, and we realized that if we could bring more information into our different committees, we would actually learn a lot. Similarly, we realized that our Long Range Planning and Environment Committee has also been struggling, because it's been not getting included in a lot of conversations, and so it makes sense to combine the two committees, because ultimately sustainability and strategic planning are tied up with funding. Ultimately, we need to have some way of making sure that people who are Senate representatives are in the room when discussions are taking place and decisions are being taken, and it's easier to get 11 people in than it is to get 22 people.

So the suggestion was that we combine the two. And then also try to build and maintain a connection between the newer version of RABC with the executive committee, which is what led to our second motion regarding the RABC and that is to include the Executive Committee Treasurer as a permanent member of RABC in place of one of the current at-large members. So we would be killing a couple of birds with one stone and make life a little bit easier. And finally, in order again not to be in conflict with our own rules, (there is no requirement for executive committee

members to be tenured), we would like to recommend the tenure requirement for RABC membership be removed. So the three motions that are in front of us today and we're happy to vote separately, if you'd like, are

Motion #1 to discontinue the Long Range Planning and Environment Committee and absorb its functions into the RABC

Motion #6, to include the Faculty Senate Treasurer as a member of the RABC, and

Motion #7, to adjust the membership requirements of the RABC to remove the term tenure.

R. Zanibbi: I propose that we do the motions in reverse order.

A. Newman: Fair enough.

I. Puchades: I'm concerned about the tenure factor and I guess my concern is, what power does this person have in this committee and how that might influence their decisions if they are not tenured.

A. Newman: I'm unclear about what you mean by 'power'.

I. Puchades: Is this just one more member on the RABC, or do they have the position of chair or a role in coordinating the committee? My question is about somebody who's not tenured making decisions that could affect the tenured population, because they're not here for the long run.

S. Aldersley: I would respond to that, Ivan, by saying that FAC is arguably at least as important as RABC, and we've had at least NTT co-chairs coaches on the FAC. I've not served on all committees, but as regards the committees I've served on, who gets to be Chair through either nomination or self nomination, it's irrelevant whether they're tenured or not, so I don't really see that bringing this committee into line with all the other committees with regard to tenure-track versus non tenure track is that significant.

H. Ghazle: I do feel for what Ivan is talking about in terms of the concern where somebody who is not tenured is trying to speak on issues which are confrontational. It could be problematic for people to speak their mind and say what they feel about certain situations. On the flip side, when we talk about faculty, we have to be accommodating, because faculty is not only tenure-track or tenured. Lecturers are also faculty. When you come to it, we're not talking about the rank of lecturer here, we're talking about senior or principal lecturers who already serve on Senate. We could always, of course, remove tenured and replace with voting members.

A. Newman: The original language is that the Committee shall consist of one tenured faculty member from each college, elected by their collegial faculty, and three tenured faculty members elected by the Senate as at-large members. Our goal is to just make sure that senior and principal lecturers should be able to be members.

M. Anselm: I almost assume that terminology was in there in the first place to indicate like workload balance. Right? If we allow non tenured members to be part of some of these committees, then department chairs would be putting them into these positions and things of that nature where, you know, they're supposed to be focusing on getting tenure, doing research. Service is great, but removing tenure from a lot of these committees makes more and more non-tenured faculty responsible for participating potentially. At least there's a message there that we accept everyone. So everybody should participate. But I think we, as Faculty Senate should be careful, because you know, as faculty our first priority is to do our research and get tenure. And we, as Faculty Senate should maybe say, well, we'd rather have tenured faculty in some of these high level committees that may require a lot of work and a lot of time, we should be protecting our non tenured faculty from being forced to work on these very high time consuming committees.

A. Newman: I have to point out this is the only committee that actually requires tenured faculty. All of the other committees are open to lecturers. I was on the FAC long before I got tenure. When we first brought it up, 18 months ago, the conversation was 'well the RABC is supposed to fight over the budget, and only tenured faculty will be brave enough to disagree with the Presidents and the Provost.

S. Malachowsky: I just want to note that in terms of the folks from around the university they're voted on right there. The treasurer would come from the Senate, I mean, that's a different charge. But I think in terms of receiving that pressure to serve, it's an election. So it's something that you agree to run for. It's not something that you're put into by your chair, I would hope not.

T. Worrell: I've never been on this particular committee. But I'm curious whether some of these matters that come up involve scholarship? My concern would be asking faculty that have two responsibilities of teaching and service, to make decisions on scholarship that may not be in their wheelhouse.

A. Newman: Do we have anyone from RABC?

S. Aldersley: The question of scholarship could come up in any committee. I've been on RABC for a long time, and I don't recall at any point that scholarship specifically has come up in and of itself. Sure budget impacts scholarship but your question makes sense to me, but I don't see in my experience on that committee that that's an issue.

K. Barone: As the Treasurer and a lecturer on the committee right now, I agree with Stephen. It comes up just on the periphery on any committee but in terms of being outside of our wheelhouse, having not participated fully necessarily in scholarship, the way you might say, I think, it has not come up as a problem and certainly there are plenty of other people on the committee to help fill in gaps where they might arise.

R. Zanibbi: I will confess I had concerns about dropping the tenure language last spring. But when I eventually became aware that we could ask lecturers to go through the immense responsibility of serving on the executive and any other committee, but not this, I was kind of shocked, horrified, embarrassed, and I immediately said, 'Sorry, yes, they can serve'. And they're here, too. And why would they be able to talk about anything else, but not the money, which is one of the hardest constraints on things that happen at this institution, I think they're over that.

Motion #7 - to adjust the membership requirements of the RABC to remove the term tenure.

Passed 31:1:4

We now move to Motion #6. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, we will vote.

Motion #6 - to include the Faculty Senate treasurer as a member of the RABC.

Passed 39:0:0

A. Newman: The final motion is to discontinue the Long Range Planning and Environment Committee and absorb its functions into the RABC. Before we discuss this, I need to say that once our votes are completed today we have to send the approved motions to the university faculty as a whole to have them vote on them as well. So this is the first step. Step Two is necessary before the changes can be made to Charter. So next year we're still going to have all of the committees functioning, no matter what we decide today.

M. Laver: I have nothing against the Long Range Funding Environment Committee. I'm sure they do wonderful work. I guess I would prefer that to read 'Discontinue the Long Range Planning & Environment Committee, full stop.' It's fine for us to say that we're going to absorb the functions of this committee into the RABC, but that committee has a lot of work. The things that the LRPEC does are going to get absorbed through the process of handing out charges to various other committees. So if we're looking to streamline committees, I think we should get rid of it. Not that I don't appreciate the committee, but I mean that seems to serve two functions at once.

E. Weeden: Were the current members of both of those committees asked their perspective on this motion?

I. Puchades: To Michael, I think we should specify that the functions are going to be absorbed into the new committee, and that was brought up, as we discussed with the current members of the committee what their thoughts were about. The main concern was that their focus was going to be lost if they were absorbed into this bigger committee that already has a lot of work to do. Who's going to look at the environment or who's going to look at long range planning? The LRPEC is actually a combination of two committees that at some point were different, so we're diluting more and more our commitment to the environment in one sense, and then we're also not really focusing on long range planning. We're going to be more focused on the year to year budget. I like that you did include that in the new revision of the RABC, so I think it should stay as the motion says.

A. Newman: I can add some context to some of the concerns regarding the conversations about these committees and even concerns about sustainability. Right now, the RABC has not been working on a year to year budget. That was one of the really big realizations from this year, particularly through the budget hearings, is if we try to talk about next year's budget, we're about two years too late. The conversations we're having today are talking about 2027 and 2028. I'm not going to be chair then. I'm not even going to be a Senator, but the thing ultimately is that these decisions are made in such big cascades that it's impossible for us to really make any difference if we deal with it here and now without having any sense of what's coming. This is one of the major reasons why continuity has been such a big issue. This has been a major reason why we want handover documents and why we want to record everything while we're doing it because ultimately we know RIT is a big engine, and it's slow. What you do today is not going to make you happy tomorrow. It'll make you happy a year from tomorrow, or two years from tomorrow. And that means we could be looking at the current moment and thinking "oh that's a terrible idea", but the reason why it's a terrible idea is that it was a decision that was made 3 years ago, and nobody thought about it. So the way we want to cultivate our committees and the way we want to manage feedback cycles has a lot to do with people who have a lot of context, not people who are currently serving on the committee because their individual realities are very different compared to people who have been on the committees for a few years who

have historical context. I spoke to Enid Cardinal, who was on the original version of the LRPEC, and she was talking about how sustainability should not be something that's sitting on some committee in a corner, it should be something that should be in the strategic plan and it has to be coming from Board of Trustees because they're the ones who have to invest money into it. And that means if anyone's going to follow up, it has to be people who were sitting in the room and look at the receipts and say, 'Hey, you said you would be putting this much money into sustainability in the next 3 years. Why aren't you?' We need those people to be watchdogs. Should we really be trying to get each of these offices to work with five separate committees because they all have their separate subject matters? Or can we just put a few well chosen people in the room who understand what we need to be doing and how we need to be represented.

Q. Song: I can see why you want to combine these two committees. You do need a Resource and Budget Committee to review any future strategy, but I'm not sure they can do so much. Yes, they're correlated, but they're different. Yes, you need someone to come and talk about plans that are being made and discuss whether the resources are available to do it but I think maybe LRPEC should be combined with some other committee, I'm not familiar with them all, but I do have some concerns about having it join the RABC, that is, unless you have plans to expand that committee with more members.

A. Newman: No, we are not planning to do that. We don't want to put more pressure on the colleges to staff committees than already exists.

Hamad: We have discussed this plenty of times on the Executive Committee and now, listening to everybody's comments here, what is the likelihood of coming up with a different name that will include both of them? What if we come up with a name that includes both budget and long range planning, maybe strategic budgeting, or something like that, because resource allocation is just one part of budget. I would be happy to make a friendly amendment.

S. Aldersley: To answer Qian's point, in the Senate meeting last week, when the FAC gave their report, they happened to mention that on one of their charges they had asked members of the LRPEC to come in and help them, and I think that going forward that would be possible for any committee. You have your set members, but if you do need more people, there are ways to go about getting them in order to work on your charges. So I don't think it's impossible to bring more people in if necessary. We have a precedent for that.

A. Newman: That's true, plus right now we only have one at-large Senator per committee, but anytime a committee chair is overwhelmed, they can absolutely ask for more at-large members, so the element of participation and particularly workload management becomes then more flexible, because all of our senators are elected by their constituents. Ideally, every single person here is committed to the wellbeing of their own constituents, but also to RIT. So in theory, we should all be pleased with the idea of 'Hey! We always have somebody willing to step in and help

E. Weeden: Responding to Hamad, I think a name change might be suitable, but I think the larger issue is the sense that the RABC is already loaded, and that we don't want to lose the perspective of long range planning and environment. So, I suggest going along with Qian's idea of potentially expanding the RABC, and then having a formal subset for long range planning and environment so that that aspect doesn't get lost.

R. Zanibbi: Anything that is really strategically sensitive or important will hopefully come to the body as a whole. I don't know that the working committee that does most of the frontline work and communicates with administrators has to be expanded. I do think anything important that will affect the faculty as a whole should come here. That's how we operate. I don't know that expanding the committee will improve on that. The other thing is I think a budget and planning committee is a fairly common name for a committee, especially if we're budgeting five years out. So maybe we call it the Budget and Planning committee, and planning, of course, would cover environment. But when big issues come along, they should come here.

Q. Song: I do see the correlation. Planning and budgeting should go together.

J. Lanzafame: I'm on the LRPEC. So a couple of points. First, if we get bogged down in name changes, we're going to be here for years. More important than a name change is how the responsibilities are enumerated in the charter. Second, LRPEC had essentially zero charges this year and in the four years I've been there it has not executed a single charge to completion and that is in part because its name is a fiction. When there's a strategic plan to be written the LRPEC does not get handed that job. And when Senate representation is required it goes through ExCom, not through long range planning. That's not to say there isn't room for people to talk about long range planning, environment and sustainability issues, but that has just not been an effective role of the LRPEC. As long as we could go back and institutional memory, Elizabeth Hane, I don't know if she's here mentioned chairing it 15 years ago, and having the same problem. And Edith Cardinal, who, ex officio, sits on this committee, says that ever since long range planning was merged with sustainability and environment, it's been a problem because there is no

clear part of policy that exists by charter in that committee, and so those functions remain important, but they're going to get coordinated through ExComm as they are currently.

A. Newman: Case in point: right now, the new strategic plan committee is going to be set up and nobody came to me and said, 'Hey, where's the LRPEC?' They came and said, 'Hey, can you participate in the appointment process for the Strategic Plan Committee membership?' And that's how it is because they don't want to work with 11 to 14 or 15 people. Anyone who's been on a committee of more than 20 people, you know the bigger the committee, the less work actually gets done. So when something is seriously going to be done, it'll be done through these smaller committees. Which means unfortunately that the LRPEC gets to do very little.

S. Aldersley: Talking about historical perspective, when I chaired the equivalent committee to the RABC in the eighties, it was called the Priorities and Objectives Committee. So what's in a name?

H. Ghazle: Point of order. There is a motion on the floor, and there are two friendly amendments. I will withdraw the one I made. Are we still going to go with Richard's?

A. Newman: Richard, are you still proposing your friendly amendment for the name change?

?: Do we have to decide right now?

A. Newman: If it's an amendment, we have to vote on it, but if you want to withdraw it, we can come back to it later.

R. Zanibbi: If my friendly moment is voted on and it's turned down, we can still vote on the original motion, right?

A. Newman: Yes.

R. Zanibbi: Then, I propose it.

A. Newman: Okay. So there's a friendly amendment to the motion. Which is to change the name of the merged committee from the RABC to the "Budget and Planning Committee."

So right now we're only approving the amendment. Oh, wait! Do we have a second?

S. Aldersley: Seconded.

A. Newman: So there is a motion on the floor to change the name of whatever this committee ends up being to the Budget and Planning Committee. All those in favor, please raise your flag.

Motion passes 32:2:4

A. Newman: Now we have the original motion here, which is to discontinue the LRPEC and absorb its functions into the RABC, now renamed the Budget and Planning Committee

Motion passes 31:0:7

S. Johnson: So anywhere in policy right now, where RABC is mentioned, are we going to have to come back and vote on all of those?

A. Newman: No. It will be a cascade.

[B 02.0 Votes Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 10: Faculty Senate Executive Committee Presentation; A. Newman (1:13)
Presentation linked below

I wanted to make sure that we gave our end of year report, because I think it's important for you to know what's been going on with the Executive Committee and the things we've been involved with over the past year, as well as what's coming next year.

As you may have noticed, our priorities have been pretty singular in many ways, but we've been involved in a lot of stuff. Workload, compensation, facilities and resources have been a big set of topics for us. We've made a lot of noise about it. We've also done a lot of stuff in order to make sure that we were trying to communicate and increase transparency, and of course, in the process of doing that, have actually put in a lot of new organizational things as well, which we're pretty happy about. So first, let's talk about the proactive representation of faculty interest. First and foremost, of course we reviewed our policies, which was just straight up. These are the policies that were approved this year, and the thing that was a little bit bigger in blue right now is E. 6. Because that had been the big messy policy which first went through the Executive committee, where we reintegrated the eight different versions of previous edits and put it into one place and then shepherded it through the Provost and President's offices and then finally took it to FAC, where they were able to start working on it in February. So one of the reasons why the FAC has had to wait on some of their charges this year has been because we had to take it through the process of at least making sure they were starting off from a good clean point, because otherwise it would just create much more confusion. So anyways, we did some things that were a little bit outside of what previous executive committees have done.

First we got to participate in the new provost search. We had one person who was part of the search committee. Besides that, we were one of the interviews for the finalists that came on campus which was a new experience. It was very exciting for us, but it also allowed us to really explore the broad elements of what somebody might be looking for and make sure that RIT presented itself as a community that is very interested in shared governance. We also participated in the new faculty orientation last summer. At that point we weren't part of regular programming but we will do this year. We did a new Senate orientation, and we carried on from Josh's creation of spreadsheets, and pushed it a little bit further, and now are keeping track of a lot more things just overall. We also had college cohorts, which was invented by Sam, and college visits, which again, something that we heard has not been done before. But all of this was part and parcel of our effort to really start to connect.

S. Aldersley: Can you go back to the previous slide? Just for people who are new to Senate, I know we have people coming on board and to explain that slide, you may or may not know that every five years every policy that Senate has jurisdiction over needs to be reviewed and brought up to date where necessary. So that's why that list is still so long, and it will be equally long, probably next year, because another set of policies will be up for review. So I just wanted to give that as a background to people who may not know why the executive committee is so focused on those issues.

A. Newman: We also were part of a few other committees. The Middle States Re-accreditation Committee we actually joined in the second half of the year. I just joined the Strategic Planning committee. The COACHE Steering committee, three of us have been on that since the year before. The Board of Trustees meetings happen three times a year, maybe four, and they are full-day meetings, so they tend to be kind of exciting and boring at the same time. Besides that, we also dealt with a bunch of specific issues like One Payroll. There was some concern that it might come back because HR offered it to staff earlier this year as an optional thing that they could do which immediately meant that we were bombarded with emails afraid that they're bringing it back! But no, no, we've talked to them but we'll reconfirm and we did. In addition, we've been working with the new director of benefits because of this weird issue of benefits not being correctly applied, so that some faculty were being rejected for things that we actually have a right to have. So we had a couple of months of pretty interesting conversations with them. And of course you all remember the GLEAN issue at the beginning of the year, which was also a very exciting set of meetings for us where we got to have some pretty good conversations, and I got to learn a lot about laws. Also, the return of faculty professional travel funds has been a big thing that we've been bringing up. We've also been trying to bring up a lot of issues about teaching workloads in the SHED and we have represented a lot of concerns about classroom facilities to a lot of different people. Also, accessibility of mid-tenure reviews for candidates, lecture promotional pathways, and individual concerns for lecturers have all been brought up. We've been discussing a lot about the COACHE survey with the Provost and the RIT budget. We've also appointed representatives to the new software system purchases and the CourseLeaf curriculum management system, as well as the Oracle replacement purchase. Also, we've had a lot of very good conversations with Parking and FMS because I know that a massive hot button topic for faculty all the time. I can't list all the individual meetings we've held, but we've tried to make sure we've covered all of the big topics that have come to us, either through email or on the Senate floor, and to maintain communications in as many directions as possible.

For me personally, my general workload is slightly different. I do get a course release for this per semester. Besides just running the meetings, I have a lot of face-to-face meetings and I do the President's address in the fall. The other thing I do a lot is working with our standing committee and ad hoc committee chairs and anyone who is interested in communicating with me. Then, there's making sure we know when things are due, and discussing what needs to be discussed. If somebody's having trouble getting responses from an office which happens a lot, I tend to be the person who reaches out and tries to facilitate a conversation and get people in front of the right people to try and make sure they get what you need. Because ultimately everything is interconnected, the more we can help other groups be represented, the more we are then able to be represented ourselves. Because a lot of people say their

individual colleges don't implement policies as soon as they're approved, I also instituted regular Deans updates. The revised policies are on the website, but nobody checks to see if the Deans are aware. So now they have no excuse and the Deans know what is happening on Senate, and these are the things we're looking at and new language will be coming. So these are some of the things that we do. And then of course I'm on the University Council Executive Committee.

S. Malachowsky: It's been my pleasure to be vice chair, and primarily to act as backup to Atia in many ways. It's been great to have the opportunity to serve, and that's been a pleasure for me. As far as regular activities are concerned, Inaudible. In terms of representing Senate, there have been a lot of areas that I've attended, either as backup for Atia, or in addition to Atia, for instance, at meetings of the Board of Trustees. I was on the Provost Search committee, so if you really like Dr. David, then you're welcome. If you don't, then there were a lot of other people on the committee. I'm honored to be carrying the mace this year, and I look forward to searching the bottom of it to find out where Simone's gold is buried. There's the Administrative Council. There's just been a lot of things.

H. Ghazle: Thanks so much. There are some people behind the scenes that help you do the work, but sometimes we forget to acknowledge them and there's one person I would like to give a wonderful round of applause to is Tamaira, for being there for us at all times. Tamaira, I greatly appreciate your help and support at all times. Also I would like to thank our colleague Josh Faber, hiding in the corner there, who started many of our spreadsheets. We took those charts and spreadsheets, and we've expanded them. As you know, we have over 400 faculty members we have to place on committees and even this morning, I need a representative to serve on an expedited tenure committee. Oh, no. Where do I get someone from? So you connect and you do whatever you can, but I can tell you it's enjoyable and challenging, because at the end of it, when you accomplish what you need to accomplish, you feel so good. But it's a big task and then there's looking at who's voting, and who's standing for elections in the colleges. There's always a concern about recruiting volunteers. Sometimes, colleges have a hard time identifying and electing people. As you may know, E.24, the Grievance Policy, has been updated and one of the changes in it is the training of the committee which we need to do in collaboration with the Provost's office. So we created this training for the members and the alternates and delivered it a few weeks ago. I'm on many committees. But I'm very honored to serve our faculty and at the same time be part of our highly respected Senate. I think you guys have done a great job. Last, thank you so much for entrusting us to move on for next year and continue the work that we've done.

S. Aldersley: I would like to second the motion that Tamara is an invaluable member of that group, and you wouldn't get minutes if it wasn't for her very solid assistance on making sure that the audio recording and transcript are available. We had five newsletters this year, one shy of what I had hoped. As Hamad and Keri discovered when they substituted for me a couple of weeks ago, we do not have a reliable and effective means of recording what happens in this body. And I sincerely hope my colleagues on the Executive Committee will improve things in that regard next year. I really think we need to. I don't like listening to the audio and thinking, you know, I know who said that, but I don't know what they said. It's something that really ought not to be happening. I want to thank Bolaji for taking the lead on helping senators understand that it really helps if you identify yourself before you speak. Otherwise it's been a great year. I think the Executive Committee and the Senate as a whole have achieved a lot this year, and I'm looking forward to achieving even more next year.

K. Barone: The Executive Committee would like to thank Dr. David for recently approving a budget increase from \$10,000 this year to \$12,500 next year to cover the cost of Senate operations. We really appreciate that. Costs included the 19 Senate meetings and eight college visits we held this year, plus one-time tech and branding expenses. We did purchase an iPad, and to Stephen's comments, at the top of the list next year is going to be resolving the mic issue and figuring something out to make things easier for minute-taking. The Executive Committee has also been approved to receive a small summer stipend, since even though all of us are off contract in the summer, we're here nonetheless.

A. Newman: Thank you. Just to wrap this up quickly, because I want to get to the fun thing we have planned as New Business, we have a bunch of stuff that we're going to do over the summer and we'll bring you up to date as quickly as possible. We are participating in new faculty orientation this time. We're doing an introduction, so people know we exist, and besides that, we're going to be picking back up on a number of things like making sure the COACHE survey actually has some solid outcomes. Then of course there's the President search and the strategic planning committee.

[Faculty Senate Executive Committee Presentation](#)

Agenda Item 11: New Business; A. Newman (1:38)

A. Newman: It's very important to note that as Hamad said, there are many people who do a lot of work without getting necessarily noticed, and to that end, we've actually made a set of awards. They're a little hokey, but you know, we figured it would be really nice to actually recognize people for the work they've done. So first, we have some senators who are leaving us this year, and I wanted to make sure that we gave them a little bit of recognition for their time on Senate. So to start off with, we've got Susan Bamonto from COLA, Josh Faber from COS (who's termed out, but we hope he'll come back), Dina Newman from COS, and Larry Kiser from GCCIS. Next we have awards for senators with perfect attendance: Amit Ray, Basca Jadamba and Annemarie Ross. We also have awards for three cohorts which stood out as having the highest attendance: CHST, GCCIS and NTID. Then we have a few specialized ones which are just fun, because we couldn't help it. The first one, Bolaji Thomas for the most abstentions. The second is for the most artistic flag painting, Pam Kincheloe. Then for the coolest use of Robert's Rules, Michael Laver. It was a great moment which we will never forget when he introduced us to the caucus rule. And then we have awards for our standing committee chairs. Do we have any standing committee chairs here? Yes, Nathan Eddingsaas - you get an award for suffering all year!

J. Faber: On behalf of myself, Pamela Kinchelo and Susan Bamonto. We were all elected to the Academic Senate back in 2018 and a few things have changed since then. Pamela and I were elected to the Executive Committee. We must have volunteered in February of 2020, and got elected in March, thinking it would be kind of not too exciting, but an important service for university. Some things happened shortly afterwards that changed the nature of the job. Not everything was perfect during the pandemic, but to the extent that RIT weathered it fairly well, part of the reason was that we had a strong executive committee for that year, and the next year, which met with the provost on a regular basis. I think we were successful most of the time. We made sure that the faculty voice was heard and appreciated, and that there was constant discussion about the direction that RIT would take in what certainly seemed to be the most challenging time that any of us can remember. So on behalf of the two of us, Clyde Hull, Tim Engstrom, Austin Gehret and Atia Newman, it was certainly interesting times that we lived through, but I like to think we weathered it about as well as could be. And since I'm leaving, I think everyone here deserves to be able to pat themselves on the back for their continuing hard work. Always remember, thank the Executive Committee, because they do a ton of work both in front of and behind the scenes. Remember to always give the Provost a piece of your mind, so he can stand on his toes and stay sharp. And I'd be remiss not to say thanks, as always, to the interpreters for always being here and all their hard work, the committee chairs and the people who always show up here and thanks, as always, Tamaira, for running the show.

A. Newman: If there is no more new business, thank you all for a wonderful year.

Agenda Item No. 12: Adjournment; A. Newman (1:46)

Attendance 5/2/2024

Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended	Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended
Abushagur, Mustafa	KGCOE Senator		Lanzafame, Joseph	COS Senator/LRPEC and ASSAC Rep	X
Adrion, Amy	ALT CAD Senator		Lapizco-Encinas, Blanca	KGCOE Senator	X
Aldersley, Stephen	Communications Officer/	X	Laver, Michael	CLA Senator	X

	SOIS Senator				
Anselm, Martin	CET Senator	X	Lee, James	ALT CET Senator	
Bamonto, Suzanne	CLA Senator	Excused	Liu, Manlu	SCB Senator	Excused
Barone, Keri	Treasurer/CLA Senator	X	Malachowsky, Samuel	Vice Chair/ GCCIS Senator	X
Boedo, Stephen	ALT KGCOE Senator		McCalley, Carmody	ALT COS Senator	
Brady, Kathleen	ALT NTID Senator	X	McLaren, Amy	CAD Senator	X
Brown, Tamaira	Senate Coordinator	X	Newman, Atia	Chair/CAD Senator	X
Butler, Janine	NTID Senator	X	Newman, Dina	COS Senator	X
Capps, John	CLA Senator	X	Olles, Deana	COS Senator	
Chiavaroli, Julius	ALT GIS Senator		Olson, Rob	ALT GCCIS Senator	
Chung, Sorim	ALT SCB Senator	X	O'Neil, Jennifer	ALT CET Senator	
Crawford, Denton	CAD Senator	X	Osgood, Robert	ALT CHST Senator	
Cromer, Michael	ALT COS Senator		Puchades, Ivan	KGCOE Senator	X
Cui, Feng	ALT COS Senator		Ray, Amit	CLA Senator/ICC Rep	X
David, Prabu	Provost	X	Ross, Annemarie	NTID Senator	
Davis, Stacey	ALT NTID Senator	X	Shaaban, Muhammad	ALT KGCOE Senator	
Deese, Frank	CAD Senator	X	Sheffield, Jr. Clarence	ALT SOIS Senator	
Dell, Betsy	CET Senator	X	Song, Qian	SCB Senator	X
DiRisio, Keli	CAD Senator		Staff Council Rep	Brendon Strowe	X
Eddingsaas, Nathan	COS Senator/RSC Rep	X	Student Government Rep	Alex Shuron	
Faber, Joshua	COS Senator	X	Thomas, Bolaji	CHST Senator	X
Fillip, Carol	ALT CAD Senator		Tobin, Karen	NTID Senator	Excused
Ghazle, Hamad	Operations Officer/CHST Senator	X	Tsouri, Gill	KGCOE Senator	X
Ghoneim, Hany	ALT KGCOE Senator		Ulin, Robert	CLA Senator	Excused
Hardin, Jessica	ALT CLA Senator		Van Aardt, Jan	ALT COS Senator	
Hazelwood, David	NTID Senator	X	Warp, Melissa	ALT CAD Senator	

Hsieh, Jerrie	ALT SCB Senator	X	Weeden, Elissa	GCCIS Senator	X
Jadamba, Basca	COS Senator	X	White, Phil	ALT GCCIS Senator	
Johnson, Dan	CET Senator	X	Williams, Eric	GIS Senator	X
Johnson, Scott	GCCIS Senator	X	Worrell, Tracy	ALT CLA Senator	X
Kincheloe, Pamela	NTID Senator	X	Zanibbi, Richard	GCCIS Senator	x
Kiser, Larry	GCCIS Senator	X	Zlochower, Yosef	COS Senator	X
Krutz, Daniel	ALT GCCIS Senator				
Kuhl, Michael	KGOE Senator	X			

Standing Committee(s) Represented: (ICC, LRPEC, RSC and UWC)

Interpreters: Emily Gilster-Call and Philip Ynzunza

Presenters: George Thurston and Darcie Jones