

Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, October 3, 2024

12:15 - 1:50 PM

Zoom

Attendance: See Below

Agenda Item No. 1: Call to Order; A. Newman (12:15)

Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; A. Newman (12:15)

S. Johnson: Motion to approve the agenda

K. Barone: Second

Approved by acclamation

Agenda Item No. 3: Communications Officer's Report/Approval of Minutes; S. Aldersley (12:25)

Motion to approve draft minutes of the meeting of 9/26 with the proviso that amended language for Charge motions #7 & #9 be inserted before the final minutes are posted.

Approved by acclamation

[September 26, 2024 Meeting Minutes](#)

Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; A. Newman (12:16)

Our October 10th meeting has been canceled. We are still looking at an October 17th meeting. primarily because Benefits would like to bring us an update. I'm going to wait a few more days just to think about whether we have a taste for that.

Once again, we haven't been able to complete our review of charges before the end of September which was our goal and I've been hearing from our standing committees about how much time is lost during this whole approval process. We will finish that today however. One of the reasons is that Senate has already had a lot of things to talk about this year. One of the things we plan to do shortly is to respond to each of the people who submitted charges and explain why their charge was either approved or not approved. Sometimes it was just because we got duplicative proposals.

Today, the Executive Committee will bring a motion to approve all of the previous continuing charges for each committee. There are also a number of committee suggestions for self charges. Since I want to keep an eye on the amount of work we actually send to our committees I'm going to recommend to committee chairs that they bring self-charges up only if they have time and only after they have wrapped up all of the new charges that Senate has approved.

In other news, yesterday we had our first college visit when we were invited to an all-college meeting in SCB. I'm happy to report we had some truly substantive conversations on a broad range of topics. We are hoping that will set a standard for each of our college visits this year. The goal is to introduce the work of Senate, touch on current issues and then stay and talk with faculty as much as they would like. We're also considering additional events where we bring together faculty from different colleges in the same meeting.

One final thing, RIT has jumped to #91 in the U S News and World Report rankings, so congratulations to faculty on that! Also Tom Golisano has given RIT an unrestricted gift of \$10m.

Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; Georgeanne Hogan (12:28)

No report

Agenda Item No. 6: Student Government Update; Joshua Anderson (12:29)

This weekend we had the student government global consortium where SG representatives from across RIT's global campuses came together here at RIT, and we showed them around campus and what student government at RIT is like. It was a lot of fun. We discussed three proposals from the FPAT Committee. We approved one about establishing a direct bus shuttle to the Rustic Village apartments, and the other two were tabled and sent back to the committee because there were so many amendments proposed. One was to ask RIT to stop giving parking tickets to students parked on the grass, and the other was to add more general parking spaces.

Agenda Item No. 7: Standing Committee Charges; A. Newman (12:31)

Charge #10. Proposed Language: Include in evaluations for lecturers, senior lecturers, and associate professors a portion akin to GCCIS's "progress toward tenure" for promotion to the next level.

S. Johnson: Moved

S. Aldersley: Seconded

There was no discussion.

Motion to refer Charge #10 as written to the FAC.

Approved: 32/0/2

Charge #11. Proposed Language: Consider and propose what the appropriate minimum number of tenure committee members ought to be for the committee as a whole to recommend approval of tenure.

Consideration of this charge was dropped in favor of a motion asking for immediate action on the part of Senate

Motion: Senate agrees to recommend a change to the language in E.5.III.C.2. from: "Recommendation for approval for tenure by the college tenure committee shall require a minimum 2/3 majority in favor as determined by secret vote." to "Recommendation for approval for tenure by the college tenure committee shall require a minimum of 5 of 7 members in favor as determined by secret vote."

The relevant paragraphs in E.5 were consulted to show all tenure committees at the University must have seven members irrespective of how many faculty any one college has.

S. Aldersley: Moved

S. Johnson: Seconded

Approved: 32/1/3

Charge #12. Proposed Language: Provide clarification and specification for the conditions for a change in a chair's term or the conditions for the removal of a chair including the definition of "extraordinary circumstances". Clarify the definition and weight of what a "formal consultation with faculty" might entail.

S. Aldersley: Moved

M. Ruhling: Seconded

S.Aldersley: This is a complicated issue. It's related to a grievance that occurred in the recent past, where committee members struggled with the relevant language in E.8, and it was proposed to ask Senate to attempt a clarification.

B. Thomas: I know chairs do serve at the pleasure of the Dean. Do the faculty have a say in their removal or not? Do faculty have any power in such matters?

A.Newman: If you look at Paragraph 3.2 of the Charter it says "the faculty has a responsibility to advise and make recommendations to the appropriate persons or bodies concerning other policies and decisions affecting university development and welfare. The faculty's advice and recommendations in such matters are offered to the deans, vice presidents, provost, or president as appropriate or as specified in university policy, or to the University Council in those matters which appropriately come before the Council. The subjects of the advice and recommendations include, for example, the appointment, retention, promotion, and tenure of individual faculty; the appointment of administrative and academic officers; faculty personnel policies; student responsibilities and discipline; the academic calendar; the setting of fund-raising priorities; the formulation of priorities for and review of the annual operating budget of the university; the development and expansion of the campus; and the expression of university views on matters of public concern."

S.Aldersley: Responding to Bolaji, E.8 accords faculty the right to give formal input, but I'm not sure I'd say that's equal to having power. In any case, the Grievance Committee wrestled with what might constitute "formal input."

Motion to refer Charge #12 as written to the FAC.

Approved: 36/0/2

Charge #13. Proposed Language: Motion for Senate to recommend to the Provost to create a uniform process for the annual evaluation of unit heads, chairs, associate deans and deans by faculty that is both quantitative and qualitative. Additionally, create a clear process through which the results will be disseminated to relevant stakeholders.

S. Aldersley: Moved

F. Deese: Seconded

There was a brief discussion as to whether this charge ought properly go to the FAC but the majority sentiment was in favor of giving the Provost the opportunity to act upon it.

L. Williams: I don't know what the Provost's take would be on this, but I think it is a good idea to give consideration to an annual evaluation, which would be distinguished from the comprehensive process that is already in place for Deans.

Motion to refer Charge #13 as written to the Provost's office for further action

Approved: 34/0/1

Charges #14-17. Proposed Language: The Senate recommends all AI charges be directed to the new AI Hub and its leadership. The Senate also proposes the appointment of a Senate representative to work with the AI Hub for a term of 3-years. The representative will share information with the Senate on an ongoing basis, minimally twice a year.

S. Aldersley: Moved

K. Barone: Seconded

A.Newman: Since the Provost has taken the lead on how RIT should work with AI by establishing the AI Hub, the Executive Committee recommends that all three AI-related charges be directed to the Hub via the Provost's office.

S. Johnson: So I think a 3-year term for the Senate representative is problematic because Senators serve for 3-year terms.

A.Newman: The Senate representative does not need to be an actual member of the Senate

S. Johnson: I think sending these charges to the Hub is a good idea. We don't want to be duplicating work that's already being done. Rather than asking a Senate committee to look into this, going directly to the people who are tasked with doing it by the Provost's office is the way to go.

S. Malachowsky: How much do we know about the AI Hub, and how faculty are represented? Because if we're talking about just adding one Senate representative, it could be that there already is a strong contingent of faculty there, or it could be they would be a lone voice in a huge room of non-faculty.

A.Newman: If there are already a lot of faculty involved and we add someone to represent Senate, the advantage will hopefully be that they will come back to report to Senate on a regular basis and will serve as a conduit to make sure Senate's concerns are being heard.

F. Deese: There's something kind of mysterious about this hub. I wish they would come to Senate and make a presentation, and maybe prove they're all human, because we don't really know. It seems like we're giving them a lot of power. Also a lot of AI issues are discipline specific, and I'm not sure that a centralized group can make determinations that are helpful with regard to all the different possible uses or misuses of AI at RIT.

C. Licata: I just wanted to jump in quickly to answer the question about the AI Hub. Actually, tomorrow there will be a newsletter going out from the director of the Hub, Chris Collison, giving the community an update. And one of those items is about the Hub Advisory Committee that he is putting together. It's not yet fully established. So I think your recommendation is very timely and I'm sure he will be very happy to come and update Senate at a time that's convenient for you.

A.Newman: We will make time, especially because I know AI is at the forefront of a lot of people's minds. Perhaps if Chris Collison is available, we could activate the 10/17 meeting.

S. Malachowsky: I'm especially interested in knowing how the members of the hub have been charged, how faculty can get their questions addressed and how AI will be integrated with our other processes.

A.Newman: That officially wraps up our consideration of the new charges. Just to reiterate what I mentioned earlier in my report, committees will be expected to continue working on any charges carried over from previous years. If committees proposed new charges in their final reports last year, they're welcome to bring those to the Senate floor but only after they have completed their new charges.

Motion to refer Charges #14-17 as written to the AI Hub for further action

Approved: 32/2/4

[Standing Committee Charges](#)

Agenda Item No. 8: Sense of the Senate: DSO. (1:13)

A.Newman: Our topic of conversation today is the DSO. We're aware that the DSO has been an area of concern for faculty for many years. The Executive Committee has had several meetings with the director and also with AVP Shalitha Williams, and Chris Licata. I'd like to invite Chris to give an update.

C. Licata: The provost is very much aware of the concerns that have been surfacing this year, in particular around the flex plan and how it was rolled out, and what seems to be an overwhelming number of accommodations in some classes, and different kinds of accommodations than faculty have perhaps seen in the past. I'm going to use the term that has been used with me, that is, the burden placed on the time of faculty within the class having to appropriately respond to the question of what's reasonable and who decides what's reasonable. Also, how the interactive conversation occurs, particularly when there are academic and technical standards that may exist within a particular teaching and learning situation, or a course or a program, that would present challenges in terms of the accommodation that's been recommended. We've been working very closely with Shalitha and Shalitha with her DSO Team. Atia, I believe you received a memo yesterday or the day before from Shalitha to be sent to the senators? Has that gone out yet?

A. Newman: Not yet. It's not clear to me whether the proposals in the memo are a done deal, or whether there are still going to be edits or adjustments, and whether we have agreed to this and how we want to go forward with it.

C. Licata: From the point of view of the provost's office, we're good with the recommendations that have been suggested by Shalitha and her team. I think that Shalitha was reaching out to senators to ask you to provide any additional feedback from what you're seeing regarding the six or seven steps that she's laid out as the path forward to get us to a point where we can have a discussion about how to resolve the issues that have come forward. I believe Shalitha is here and perhaps she can comment in terms of the kind of feedback loop and anything else about the process that went into developing the steps that were outlined in the memo.

S. Williams: Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity for the conversation as well as your support, Chris. So I did propose seven action steps in order to begin to address the concerns that have been raised as they relate to the DSO. Those steps include a faculty advisory board. Also, discussion of any new releases would happen in the spring semester when the DSO would solicit feedback and do pilots before releasing anything new the following fall semester. Also, informed accommodations, meaning there is a dialogue with the faculty and departments and particular disciplines. Also a compliance escalation plan. I assumed responsibility for oversight of the DSO in January, and I recognize that some individuals are not aware of my role and my involvement in supporting the department. I want to be sure that people are aware of that so that I can become a resource in the process of communication with the DSO if and when a concern comes up. I've met with the Executive Committee a couple of times, and Atia has recommended a DSO presentation in the spring semester. I'm also proposing that we arrange one in the fall semester to be proactive, and to discuss what is occurring. In addition, attendance at the Council of Chairs and Associate Deans meetings as well as mutual training opportunities. I want to emphasize the idea of mutual. It seems that in the past it's been in one direction only. DSO is to train faculty. However, I believe there's value in the DSO understanding the intricacies of curriculum delivery and that should be a consideration as the DSO works with students. So this is what's proposed. In addition, I'm meeting with the Deans and asking for their assistance in soliciting names regarding this Advisory Board as well as the escalation communication. I want to hear directly from the deans who the individuals are who should be involved in these escalations: in order to ensure that what I propose will be followed by the different deans as well as the DSO team, should it be the program director, or perhaps the immediate supervisor?

J. Lanzafame: I really appreciate what is almost a quantum shift in the way we're trying to integrate the DSO with the Faculty Affairs side of things. My question is about the DSO's relationship to the Faculty Affairs side of campus, because part of the issue is that the DSO is under Student Affairs. and while the appropriateness of accommodations is a legitimate negotiation, putting the accommodations into practice occurs on the Faculty Affairs side of things. Have you thought about how the two sides can collaborate?

S. Williams: In my experience, the DSO has been in Student Affairs to provide student support directly. And there's been a collaborative relationship with the faculty and the Academic Affairs team to ensure that the application of these accommodations is appropriate. What I would like to see is an iterative process back and forth to ensure that faculty do feel they have the support, knowledge and resources needed in order to execute and support students.

J. Lanzafame: Let's assume all the accommodations I'm handed are legitimate. There still can be an incredible burden on faculty time. There's testing center issues, and some of those can be alleviated, possibly on the Faculty Affairs side of the ledger.

C. Licata: It's not only how the accommodation is determined to be reasonable that needs the interaction that Shalitha talked about, and some of the steps that she's outlined. But as you point out it's also a question of resources. And so we need to understand from faculty if there are other ways to do this more efficiently. If there's an accommodation that needs to be granted. and we don't have the bandwidth, let's just say, or we don't have the technology to provide it, how then do we mobilize the resources that are needed in an effective way? We're hoping it's going to be not just a discussion of what is reasonable in terms of an accommodation, but also what is reasonable in terms of how we deliver that accommodation. So there's two sides to that equation.

I. Puchades: I believe last year we had a task force that worked pretty hard for the entire year and came up with some plans and options to provide additional resources to the DSO. I don't see any of those ideas in this plan moving forward, so it seems that now we're back at square one.

A. Newman: I don't believe it was a task force so much as it was the ASSA that sought to figure out the sticky problem of managing an increasing number of accommodations in the context of the resources that are currently available. The recommendations that were brought forward were rejected. I believe that's something that we are going to have to keep going back to.

S. Aldersley: I welcome Dr. Williams' comments. I think they're going to help move things forward in a more positive light. But there has to be a recognition that resources are central to this issue. You can't keep on making new demands on faculty or on any group on campus without consideration of what resources are required. So I hope the Provost's office is going to be open to making requests for additional resources wherever they might be necessary in order to make the relationship between the DSO and faculty smoother than it's been in the recent past. You can't keep asking for more without giving additional resources.

C. Licata: We're going to do whatever we need to do to try to advance the idea that resources are central.

It's like the mental health crisis we saw on campus a number of years ago. If you recall, we needed to increase the number of resources there as well. And, Ivan, to your question about the recommendations from the ASSA from last year, I believe that Shalitha is going to be a member this year of that subcommittee.

S. Williams: Yes, the kickoff meeting is next week, and I will be participating.

C. Licata: So I think we'll have a really good direct link there to both the recommendations and the action that needs to happen and I appreciate Shalitha's willingness to be engaged in this way.

A. Newman: I'm looking forward to a productive relationship with the DSO and with Student Affairs in general. I feel like there are a lot of times where it can be too easy to forget we're both working for the same goals. But as much as we are looking out for our students, I want to make sure we are also supporting the mental and physical health of our faculty. People get sick when they overdo it, and that's problematic.

Just as a final thought, I had a detailed conversation with the Office of Legal Affairs about what counts as reasonable from a legal perspective, and I'm going to try and paraphrase Evan Thompson. The core concept of what I got from the conversation is that if it doesn't cost the institution too much money, then it doesn't count as being an unreasonable accommodation. So I think it might be a good idea for our joint groups, Shalitha and Chris, Student Affairs and Faculty Affairs, to really start to think about how much money it costs to take hours of faculty time. I think maybe we should, as a group, start to calculate the actual monetary value of every time we assign accommodations, because if we don't, there will be no way for RIT to push back from a legal perspective and say, 'these accommodations are unreasonable'. And then faculty members will be stuck, bearing the burden and doing the work for free.

M. Ruhling: I think one thing that would be very helpful to me and the faculty in the College of Liberal Arts is making sure we understand what is legally required and what is merely an interpretation. I would really appreciate some clarification of that. For example, if a faculty member is asked to provide an accommodation for a student that doesn't fit their pedagogy, are they legally bound to follow it? Or are they legally able to say, 'No, I'm sorry that won't work.' This is a legal issue as well as a policy issue. I think we need some real clarification on that difference.

A. Newman: That's a very good question, and maybe that's something where we invite the Office of Legal Affairs to come and talk about it with the Senate.

R. Olson: In that same vein, there may be some value to examining the specific language in the accommodations that we receive and clarifying it. Just as a specific example, an accommodation I receive reasonably frequently now is that all information needs to be communicated in writing to students. And the language specifically indicates that I must communicate all information that is going to be on tests to students. I interpret that to mean things like due dates. But the way the language is written is very ambiguous and creates more problems.

S. Williams: I appreciate that comment. The DSO team is undertaking a review of the language used in accommodations to ensure that it can be interpreted as something that's actually doable. I think the team

would say they're speaking from their own expertise, but sometimes it doesn't always land in the same way. They've acknowledged that, and do plan to review the language they're using, as it relates to accommodations.

A. Newman: Thank you so much. That wraps up our first ever Sense of the Senate segment. I hope this is going to be a valuable addition to our agendas. I know there are bound to be more topics that everyone feels strongly about, that maybe don't come up as regularly as they should. In any case, for me, today's conversation has been very valuable. I think it will help get a lot more buy-in from faculty across the university, as well in terms of how we can move forward and how we can continue to improve.

Agenda Item No. 9: New Business; A. Newman (1:33)

P. Padmanabhan: There's a new SRS policy where faculty are now forced to put graduate tuition into externally funded grants. It's a big concern that this was not announced to us. It just appeared on the SRS website, so you would only know if you were trying to submit a proposal and suddenly your budgets look different. We designed a survey within KGCOE and we got a lot of angry responses from faculty. Again, there's no rationale, and we really wanted some accountability from administrators. We don't know where it's coming from.

A. Newman: This must be an administrative policy, right?

B. Thomas: I don't know whether it's an administrative policy, but I agree with the people from engineering. I had a conversation with my SRS person over my budget. I don't have graduate students but we had to really fight with them not to take money from my budget to pay tuition for the graduate students I don't have.

A. Newman: They can't possibly be making you do that.

B. Thomas: Exactly, but he said that's the new policy and we argued for quite some time. I agree, this needs to be discussed.

R. Zaniibbi: Thank you for raising this. We had the same issue in Golisano. Dan Krutz, one of our alternate senators, contacted me to ask if I had seen the policy and whether I knew the process by which it was approved and, like everyone else, I didn't. And there's this question whether as stakeholders in this case, faculty input should have been sought. What I'm not clear on is whether it's an administrative policy, but regardless it's problematic. Traditionally, we only charge some percentage of tuition to cover the time our graduate students are in classes, not 35% a year flat rate.

A. Newman: This is incredible, and then it goes up by 5 to 6% every year right?

R. Zaniibbi: I interpreted that as the base tuition amount. I didn't think that meant the actual 35, 40, 45.

Wow! So that becomes really problematic. It literally reduces the number of students we can hire on a grant. We already struggle. We're not an institution where there's a lot of discretionary free money for Ph.D students lying around. It's a real problem, especially if we're aspiring to grow research. It literally decreases the number of students we can recruit.

S. Malachowsky: This raises an interesting question as to whether to use undergrad or grad students on grants, especially for things like programming projects. I prefer our undergrads over grads, just based on their raw programming skills. It adds another wrinkle of complexity. Can I use undergrads to avoid paying this? You're getting this weird internal competition between grad students and undergrad students. It definitely warrants a discussion.

S. Aldersley: This sounds reminiscent of the situation we have with the DSO where policies are being made that directly affect faculty, but faculty have not even been told about it or asked for their input. So I think maybe the message needs to go back to the Provost, who can then alert his colleagues at that level of administration that if you're going to change a policy or introduce a policy that impacts the way faculty operate, you really need to ask them before you actually enact the policy. You'd think any well-run organization would automatically do that, but apparently that doesn't happen at RIT.

A. Newman: What a day for the Provost not to be here! But Chris and Laverne are, so I hope you will take these conversations back. I feel like administrative policies are seen as an easy solution to a difficult problem. Like, we need to do this, let's just do it, put it in an administrative policy, and let the chips fall where they may. But I would think that Phd. and graduate programs are a very high priority for administrative leadership. Surely, if something were to essentially cripple these two areas of potential growth for RIT, it would be a matter of great concern

R. Zanibbi: To Sam's point about undergrads versus doctoral students, when you're training a Ph.D student, you're trying to train a subject domain expert, somebody who can become professor or research scientist or historian, or whatever on their own. That's a different goal. And you need money to support that, because that's how they survive. It's a four or five-year commitment. Software development, at least in my lab, is almost always undergraduates. You're right, they're good at that. The expertise to become somebody who does modeling is more advanced. So there's not really a tension. It's two different groups of people. As for administrative policies, I'd like to ask whether they require any approval from stakeholders?

C. Licata: The difference between an administrative policy and a governance policy is exactly what Richard's question centers on, and that is that there is no defined approval path outside the unit within which the administrative policy resides.

P. Padmanabhan: It's important to have a discussion, but is there something we can do? In one of the comments we got, somebody demanded that this be put on hold indefinitely until it was properly discussed. I don't know if we have any sort of power to do that. Maybe the AVP of Research is involved, or is it the Provost? There are lots of stakeholders here, and maybe we should invite them to the Senate on October 17th.

A. Newman: That's a good idea but Ryan Rafaele has refused to come to Senate because he was not pleased the last time he came. We can certainly ask the Provost to come and talk to us about it, and maybe transmit these concerns to Dr. Rafaele.

B. Thomas: It's very likely there will be somebody on the Senate who's a member of RSC. When I was a member of that committee, I noticed that Ryan felt comfortable to come there to speak. Was this new policy presented to the RSC?

N. Eddingsaas: This has been something Ryan has wanted for a long time. It was not brought up in RSC as something that was coming through. If I had to make a guess as to where it's come from, it'd be from Ryan. Maybe the Provost as well, I don't know. But it wasn't discussed in RSC and the RSC did not approve it.

S. Aldersley: No disrespect to Chris, but I don't think Senate is asking for the right of approval of administrative policies. But faculty should be able to expect some information sharing and ability to input into policies that are going to impact our lives significantly. Just from a point of view of good governance, I think the university might want to consider that when administrative policies are clearly going to impact faculty lives, Senate should be invited to weigh in before they're actually promulgated, and nobody knows why or where they came from, and what was behind the decision.

A. Newman: Things like this have probably been happening for a long time, but the more we push for transparency, the more we realize how much better things are when information is shared. I think inviting administrative bodies and offices to join in is a good next step because the more we can work as a single force, the more we will make gains as a university overall.

B. Lapizco-Encinas: I completely agree. This affects how faculty do their work but it also affects the University. A couple of weeks ago at University Council, it was mentioned we are getting very close to becoming an R1 institution and the only parameter where we are lacking is the number of Phd students that we graduate. I believe you need a 3-year average of around 70 and we are in the high sixties. Putting this extra burden on grants is going to decrease the number of students that we can graduate, the very thing that we need to become R1. It's just decreasing our chances of becoming an R1.

A. Newman: I agree. I know the President is happy that we hit number 91 and that we are very close to hitting R1 status. It would be a big shame if an awkwardly timed policy ends up ruining that momentum.

R. Zanibbi: Having been here for a number of years, the actual policy on how remission is done has changed a lot, and I've never seen an official policy. This was the first time I've seen it. Some of us were told to give very large amounts at certain points, because there's this maximum allowable 50%. I've written and had grants funded at that level for every year. And then people told me I was a fool. So there's a need for clarity around this issue aside from the policy itself.

S. Aldersley: On the issue of R1, I hope Senate will be able to discuss compensation at an upcoming meeting soon. When we become an R1 institution maybe we'll stop comparing ourselves to the R2 institutions that currently comprise 53% of our benchmark. If we aspire to become an R1 institution, we

should be setting faculty salaries at that level, especially as it's only at the 50th percentile.

H. Ghazle: Before we adjourn, we've lost a couple of people on the professional leave committee (E.18). I believe the committee is getting ready to convene in mid-October, so if you are willing to serve as a replacement, please let me know as soon as possible.

A. Newman: Also, we don't yet have a chair for the Research and Scholarship Committee, so members of that committee, please consider stepping up.

Agenda Item No. 10: Adjournment; A. Newman (1:50)

Attendance 10/3/2024

Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended	Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended
Adrion, Amy	ALT CAD Senator		Lanzafame, Joseph	COS Senator	X
Aldersley, Stephen	Communications Officer/ SOIS Senator	X	Lapizco-Encinas, Blanca	KGCOE Senator	X
Anselm, Martin	CET Senator	X	Laver, Michael	CLA Senator	X
Barone, Keri	Treasurer/CLA Senator	X	Lee, James	ALT CET Senator	
Beck, Makini	ALT SOIS Senator		Malachowsky, Samuel	Treasurer/ GCCIS Senator	X
Boedo, Stephen	ALT KGCOE Senator		McCalley, Carmody	ALT COS Senator	X
Brady, Kathleen	ALT NTID Senator		McLaren, Amy	CAD Senator	
Brown, Tamaira	Senate Coordinator	X	Newman, Atia	Chair/CAD Senator	X
Capps, John	CLA Senator	X	Newman, Christian	GCCIS Senator	X
Chiavaroli, Julius	ALT GIS Senator		Olles, Deana	COS Senator	X
Chung, Sorim	SCB Senator	X	Olson, Rob	ALT GCCIS Senator	X
Cody, Jeremy	COS Senator	X	O'Neil, Jennifer	ALT CET Senator	
Coppenbarger, Matthew	COS Senator	X	Osgood, Robert	ALT CHST Senator	
Crawford, Denton	CAD Senator	X	Padmanabhan, Poornima	KGCOE Senator	X
Cromer, Michael	ALT COS Senator		Puchades, Ivan	KGCOE Senator	X
Cui, Feng	ALT COS Senator		Ray, Amit	CLA Senator	X
David, Prabu	Provost	Excused	Reinicke, Bryan	ALT SCB Senator	
Davis, Stacey	NTID Senator	X	Ross, Annemarie	NTID Senator	X
Deese, Franklin	CAD Senator	X	Ruhling, Michael	CLA Senator	X
Dell, Betsy	CET Senator	X	Sanders, Cynthia	ALT NTID Senator	
DiRisio, Keli	CAD Senator	X	Shaaban, Muhammad	ALT KGCOE Senator	
Eddingsaas, Nathan	COS Senator	X	Song, Qian	SCB Senator	X
Fillip, Carol	ALT CAD Senator		Staff Council Rep	Georgeanne Hogan	X
Ghazle, Hamad	Operations Officer/CHST	X	Student Government	Josh Anderson	X

	Senator		Rep		
Ghoneim, Hany	ALT KGCOE Senator		Sweeney, Kevin	ALT SCB Senator	X
Hardin, Jessica	ALT CLA Senator	X	Thomas, Bolaji	CHST Senator	X
Hartpence, Bruce	ALT GCCIS Senator		Tobin, Karen	NTID Senator	X
Hazelwood, David	NTID Senator	Excused	Tsouri, Gill	KGCOE Senator	X
Jadamba, Basca	COS Senator	X	Van Aardt, Jan	ALT COS Senator	
Johnson, Dan	CET Senator	X	Warp, Melissa	ALT CAD Senator	
Johnson, Scott	GCCIS Senator	X	White, Phil	ALT GCCIS Senator	
Kavin, Denise	ALT NTID Senator	X	Williams, Eric	GIS Senator	X
Kray, Christine	CLA Senator	X	Worrell, Tracy	ALT CLA Senator	
Krutz, Daniel	ALT GCCIS Senator		Zanibbi, Richard	GCCIS Senator	X
Kuhl, Michael	KGCOE Senator	X	Zlochower, Yosef	COS Senator	

Interpreters: Nicole Crouse-Dickerson and Jennaca Saeva

Student Assistant: Nilay Vaidya