Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, October 20, 2022   12:15 – 1:50 PM   Zoom

Attendance: See Below

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

Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; A. Newman (12:15)
Motion (S. Malakowski)   **Seconded (S. Johnson)**

Agenda Item No. 3: Communication Officer's Report/Approval of Minutes; L. Hall (12:17)
The only updates are the approval of the minutes. The minutes from 10/13 were distributed last week. I would like to make a motion to approve.   **Seconded (S. Aldersley)**   **Vote:** Motion to approve the minutes passed by acclamation.

Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; A. Newman (12:16)
Background: OnePayroll was suspended, so please use this opportunity to discuss further with your constituents, update them, and get feedback.   Oct 14th Meeting with Jeff Harris BOT Chair. He reiterated that Faculty are an important part of the RIT Community and that RIT is not in financial straits.   Please reach out to your colleges for nominees for the Ad Hoc Committee on Freedom of Expression.   We also need a nominee for the Standing Committee on Sexual Harassment Prevention and Culture Change, if anyone is interested, please reach out to me.

Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; Brendon Strowe (12:19)
Update: We were grateful to be a part of the OnePayroll conversation and we also had an update on benefits and we're working to improve

Agenda Item No. 6: Student Government Update; L. Dibble (12:20)

Update: We had Brick City this weekend, which we've put a lot of work into and had a lot of volunteers. We now have a full Senate after we filled the SG rep from College of Science.

Agenda Item No. 7: One Payroll; Newman (12:22)

Background: Given this week's announcement that OnePayroll is suspended, this would be a great time to have some conversations about concerns, questions, and so on.

Comment (J. Venkataraman): I wanted to forward a concern from a constituent about the effect this will have on grant applications and funding, particularly over summer. Right now the model is straightforward with the 9 month calendar and I assume the new payroll schedule would be more confusing since dates won't overlap with calendar dates. This would affect all sponsored research.

Comment (I. Puchades): It seems like the Faculty Senate needs to take a more proactive role in this discussion, since the way we get paid is actually in policy. Perhaps we need a committee or some form of formal collaboration.

Comment (E. Granberg): My understanding is that in the original planning for OnePayroll the original team was not aware of the existing policy. When they did realize that in the spring, they were in touch with the Faculty Senate chair during that period of time. The confusion that emerged is that the Senate took the vote not to approve the policy, so there's an open question of how that kind of a situation gets handled. There are differing points of view on that and the Office of Legal Affairs is in the process of determining that procedure.

Comment (S. Aldersley): The President's email to the faculty this morning said that there would be more interaction and I think it would be good to formalize that relationship.

Comment (L. Lawley): Senate Executive Committee had planned to bring a resolution today about OnePayroll and shared governance. Given the breaking news we'll be reformulating that resolution on issues around shared governance. In terms of getting feedback from people, we were in "putting out fire mode" until today, but moving forward we will be thinking about where this needs to happen. There are Senate committees that should play a role in this. It's definitely the role of Senators to communicate with their constituents and we now have time to think about how to do this. I want to commend all the Senators who went out and got information from their constituents and got them to fill out the survey and I congratulate all of us for being part of this process.

Comment (S. Malachowsky): I want to acknowledge Liz herself and also Atia and Dr. Granberg. Being relatively new to executive committee, I know there's a lot of work that went into it.

Comment (I. Puchades): I want to ask Dr. Granberg to clarify what she said about the policy decision about payment.

A (E. Granberg): The current policy setup is that the President has to approve any changes the Senate makes, but it's not clear what happens if the Senate *declines* to make a change. In the event OnePayroll comes back, we need to know how to handle disagreements when the Senate votes one way and the administration has voted another.

Comment (L. Lawley): I went through, I think B.05, to see how policy changes work. It seems clear that if we actively vote to change something that can be overridden, but it's not clear what happens if the decision is to keep things the same way. Can the President or the BOT essentially act unilaterally to change policy? That's not clear now. And that's not just E.04 that would be affected, but many other policies.

Comment (B. Thomas): I'm assuming that Bobby Colon will be working with Faculty Affairs? My hope will be that the FAC will work with Legal and have a real conversation and present to the Senate.

Comment (L. Lawley): I just want to reiterate that this is not just about E.04, but about what is governance vs. administrative policy and what the policy says about what can be affirmatively changed. I wouldn't want this

conversation to be only between FAC and Legal. Give Ex Comm. a few days to catch their breath for a minute until we can figure out a strategy for how to think about how governance happens at this university.

Comment (M. Liu): I think one of the main things we learned from faculty feedback is that faculty would like a lot more feedback about even administrative policies. What we're looking for down the road is how we assess faculty concerns.

Comment (A. Newman): This is a good reminder that the biggest part of a Senator's job is to be in touch with their constituents on upcoming changes, benefits presentations, and so on.

Comment (S. Aldersley): I hope that one of the features of the document that you come out with is that it's better if the Senate is not in a reactive mode. So if we can emphasize that, it will be a much better process for everyone.

Comment (L. Hall): I'd like to clarify that one structural issue we face is that many benefits, payroll, and human resources decisions are made over the summer, when faculty are not on contract. Ex-comm. does not receive any kind of summer stipend and therefore we need to rethink how we compensate Ex-Comm. for summer work coordinating with administration and staff on these important decisions.

H. Ghazle: I also want to recognize Tracy Worrell and Keri Barone for their work on the survey.

L. Hall: I also want to thank my CLA colleagues, who sometimes get a reputation for being difficult, for taking the document Liz put together and playing such an important role in starting this conversation.

Comment (A. Newman): Finally we have a discussion of a shared Slack workspace.

Comment (L. Lawley): There were a lot of concerns in that OnePayroll email conversation about whether email is the most appropriate place to have those conversations. My colleagues realized that Slack could be an important tool. The document I'm sharing here is on the Senate Google Drive. Slack won't be a required tool; it's just an additional tool for having shared discussions. It allows people to extend the conversation beyond what we can do in a Senate meeting without having to do it in an all faculty email conversation. It also allows people who didn't want to be part of that conversation originally to go back and get caught up in a way that's much harder over email. The separation of channels by committee, etc., and ability to thread replies really helps clarify conversation and you can also set a reminder. Overall, I would encourage people to use Slack for more of these governance conversations.

Comment (I. Puchades): I worry that this will add to communication overwhelm.

Comment (A. Newman): Understood. This is not required.

Comment (B. Thomas): I do hope we don't have situations where people who don't sign onto Slack are cut out of these conversations. I don't want to put anything anywhere I can't control.

Comment (L. Lawley): There's no mandate that everyone be part of every conversation. Senate meetings aren't really enough time to get the deliberation and feedback we need, so this is yet another way to have a conversation. No one is being excluded, but no one is forced to use it.

Agenda Item No. 8: Standing Committee Charges: A. Newman (12:53)

Background: For the DEI Charges, but we haven't been able to get in touch with Elisabetta. We already approved the first charge.

J. Venkataraman: There were two other charges which were carryover charges and I don't see them. Those were the ones I questioned last time.

Comment (A. Newman): Ok, we'll need to locate those. Up next, we just have a few FAC charges left. We have one carryover charge and many suggested charges. Do we have a motion to approve charge #2?

Motion to approve (H. Ghazle)
Seconded (Mustafa)

Vote: FAC charge 2 (plans of work) approved by acclamation

FAC Charge 3: Annual evaluations, including chair evaluations

Comment (S. Aldersley): What is the selection mechanism among these charges? The FAC cannot do everything here.

A (A. Newman): You as Senators can ask to prioritize particular charges. I won't go through and prioritize now, but if any one college feels strongly about something being review now, it's within the FAC's purview to figure out their own priorities.

Motion (C. Lutzer)
Seconded **(J. Venkataraman)**

Vote: FAC Charge 3 approved by acclamation.

Charge 4: Teaching evaluations
Move (M. Reed)
Seconded (S. Bamonto)

Q (J. Venkataraman): The rationale seems confusing.
Comment (L. Hall): the rationale only goes to the committee, so we only need to vote on the language in the charge itself.

Comment (S. Aldersley): I'm concerned about the committee getting to choose which charges they look at. I won't vote for these even though I think they are excellent.

Q (J. Venkataraman): To respond to Stephen, it is up to the committee to decide how to prioritize the charges, so I think it works pretty well. They're not working in isolation, they're looking for Senate input as well.

A (S. Aldersley): This is unique because there are so many charges. The Ex Comm. is supposed to identify which of the charges are most relevant.

Comment (A. Newman): If the committee has questions about how to prioritize, they can reach out to me or the Ex Comm. Do we have any objections to approving by acclamation?

Vote: Charge 4 approved by acclamation.

Charge 5: Lecturer rank
Do we have a motion to approve this charge?

Motion (H. Ghazle)
Seconded (S. Malachowsky)

Q (J. Venkataraman): I thought this issue has been charged before.

Vote: Approved by acclamation,

Charge 6: Deadlines for awards, promotions, etc.

Motion S. Bamonto
Seconded (A. McLaren)

Comment (J. Venkataraman): Do I understand that faculty are not going to be asked to put their proposals together over the summer? This will make it hard for committees to do their work.

Comment (S. Malachowsky): I would say that application packets can be submitted at an earlier date while on contract, but if you prefer to submit later you can.

(H. Ghazle): Again, we're asking the committee to discuss these issues. So let's see what this committee comes up with. I move to approve the charge by acclamation.

Vote: Motion approved by acclamation.

Next charge was already assigned, so we're up to #8 require full professors...

Motion (L. Hall)
Seconded (M. Liu)

Comment (A. Newman): Objections to voting by acclamation?

Q (C. Lutzer): I have a question about 8. When we talk about external committee representatives we're talking about one college to another, not external experts?
A (A. Newman): Yes, that's correct.

Q (B. Thomas): Is this requiring full professors for all search committees?

A (J. Faber): Policy requires that one member of each committee be from a different department and some colleges will use associates and in some places if there's a hire that needs to be expedited they require a full professor. This will allow expedited searches to run without delay.

Vote: Approved by acclamation

Charge 9: Outstanding service
Motion: L. Hall
Seconded: H. Ghazle

Vote: Approved by acclamation

Comment (C. Lutzer): It's not a charge in its current form, it's a statement. Perhaps change to "consider the creation of annual awards."

Q (R. Zanibbi): is there a concern that we might need more service to recognize service?
A (C. Lutzer): It may just be that the committee comes back and does that.

Vote: Motion is approved by acclamation

Charge 10: Non-TT periodic leave of absence for sabbatical.

Motion: C. Lutzer
Seconded: S. Bamonto

Comment (C. Lutzer): The term "locations" should be avenues or something else. Friendly amendment to replace.

Comment (M. Liu): Rationale makes sense to me. I would like to include lecturers in the proposal.
Comment (A. Newman): Lecturers are included in NTT.

Motion (C. Lutzer)

Vote: Approved by acclamation.

(A. Newman): That wraps up Faculty Affairs and allows us to move to the Research and Scholarship Committee. RSC had a bunch of new charges and carryover charges. There are two new charges.

RSC Chart #9: Clarify university policy regarding evaluation during leave term(s)

Motion (R. Zanibbi)
Seconded (M. Abushagur)

Vote: Approved by acclamation

Comment (A. Newman): We move now to RABC Charges. We have one: transparency on budget, posted and disseminated materials.

Motion (R. Zanibbi)
Seconded (J. Olabisi)

RABC Charge #2: Investigate and recommend updates to policy C03.0 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY POLICY, Section VII to broaden the avenues of distribution of revenue generated by the licensing of IP developed by RIT employees.
Motion (H. Ghazle)
Seconded (R. Zanibbi)

Vote: Approved by acclamation

Comment (A. Newman): Moving on to Ex Comm. Charges

Ex-Comm. Charge 1: Establish rules for either a minimum number of Alternates each College will be expected to elect to represent them.
Motion (S. Bamonto)
Seconded: (M. Abushagur)

Vote: Approved by acclamation

Charge 2: Consider amending B02, 11.1 to allow for some means of choosing a UC member in cases where none of the College's senators nor Alternates can serve in the role.
Motion (C. Lutzer)
Seconded (J. Olabisi)

Vote: Motion approved by acclamation

Charge 3: Codify the existing structure and mission of the Parking and Traffic Advisory Group.
Motion (L. Hall)
Seconded (J. Olabisi)

Vote: Motion approved by acclamation

Charge 4: Establish term lengths for the representatives from the governance groups on the Isaac L. Jordan Sr. Pluralism awards.

Motion (L. Hall)
Seconded (C. Lutzer)

Vote: Approved by acclamation

Charge 5: Determine policy related to requiring faculty to use personal devices for work purposes.

Motion (C. Lutzer)
Seconded (A. McLaren)

Vote: Approved by acclamation

Comment (A. Newman): Going back to the DEIC, these are charges that are continuing and that the committee wanted to bring back 2 and 3. So we're officially done with all our charges. Thanks everyone!

Comment (S. Aldersley): I want to put it on the record that leaving charges to the committee to pick and choose is not within Robert's Rules. Robert's Rules empowers the Executive Committee in consultation with the Senate to send charges to committees, so leaving it up to standing committees does not seem compatible with that procedure. I just want to state that for the record.

A (A. Newman): Understood. It is not within Roberts Rules, however our charter specifically states that the Executive Committee must, in consultation with the Senate, assign charges to each standing committee. It does not give us the power to decide what is an "acceptable" amount of work for each committee. In my opinion, that should be up to each committee to decide for themselves.

Agenda Item No. 9: New Business; Newman (1:51)
N/A

Agenda Item No. 10: Adjournment; Newman (1:51)
Motion to adjourn

Attendance October 20, 2022

Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended		Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended
Abushagur, Mustafa	KGCOE Senator	x		Ma, Yunn-Shan	ALT CLA Senator	
Adrion, Amy	ALT CAD Senator (Fall 2022)	x		Malachowsky, Sam	Treasurer, GCCIS Senator	X
Aldersley, Stephen	SOIS Senator	x		McLaren, Amy	CAD Senator	x

Name	Role	Present		Name	Role	Present
Anselm, Martin	CET Senator	x		Newman, Atia	Chair, CAD Senator	x
Babbitt, Gregory	COS Senator	x		Newman, Dina	COS Senator	x
Bamonto, Suzanne	CLA Senator	x		Olabisi, Joy	SCB Senator	x
Barone, Keri	CLA Senator	x		Osgood, Robert	ALT CHST Senator	x
Boedo, Stephen	ALT KGCOE Senator	X		Perez Sanchez, Alejandro	CAD Senator	
Brown, Tamaira (sub-Kerry Hughes)	Senate Coordinator	X		Puchades, Ivan	KGCOE Senator	x
Butler, Janine	ALT NTID Senator			Reed, Mary Lynn	COS Senator	x
Crawford, Denton	CAD Senator	X		Reisch, Mark	ALT CAD Senator	
D'Amanda, Elisabetta	CLA Senator			Ross, Annemarie	ALT NTID Senator	
Dell, Betsy	CET Senator			Shaaban, Muhammad	ALT KGCOE Senator	
Deese, Franklin	CAD Senator (Fall 2022)	X		Sheffield, Jr., Clarence	ALT SOIS Senator	
Dibble, Leah	Student Gov't Rep	X		Song, Qian	SCB Senator	
Eddingsaas, Nathan	COS Senator	X		Sparkman, Torrence	ALT SCB Senator	X
Faber, Joshua	COS Senator	x		Thomas, Bolaji	CHST Senator	X
Gehret, Austin	NTID Senator	X		Tobin, Karen	NTID Senator	x
Ghazle, Hamad	Operations Officer, CHST Senator	x		Tsukernik, Olga	ALT COS Senator	
Granberg, Ellen	Provost	x		Van Aardt, Jan	ALT COS Senator	
Gottlieb, Owen	ALT GCCIS Senator	x		Venkataraman, Jayanti	KGCOE Senator	x
Hall, Lauren	Communications Officer,	x		Villasmil, Larry	ALT CET Senator	

Name	Role			Name	Role	
	CLA Senator					
Hazelwood, David	NTID Senator	x		Warp, Melissa	ALT CAD Senator (Spring 2023)	
Heyman, Emily (sub - Brendon Strowe)	Staff Council Rep.	x		White, Phil	ALT GCCIS Senator	
Hsieh, Jerrie	ALT SCB Senator			Williams, Eric	GIS Senator	x
Jadamba, Basca	COS Senator	x		Worrell, Tracy	ALT CLA Senator	x
Johnson, Dan	CET Senator	x		Zanibbi, Richard	GCCIS Senator	x
Johnson, Scott	GCCIS Senator	x		Zlochower, Yosef	ALT COS Senator	X
Jordan, Anne	Spring 2023 CAD Senator					
Kincheloe, Pamela	NTID Senator	x				
Kiser, Larry	GCCIS Senator	x				
Kray, Christine	CLA Senator	x				
Lapizco-Encinas, Blanca	KGCOE Senator	x				
Laury, Dino	NTID Senator	x				
Lawley, Elizabeth	Vice Chair, GCCIS Senator	x				
Lee, James	ALT CET Senator	x				
Liu, Manlu	SCB Senator	x				
Lutzer, Carl	COS Senator	x				

Interpreters: Nicole Crouse-Dickerson and Philip Ynzunza

Student Assistant: Paulina Hudspeth