Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, September 29, 2022 12:15 – 1:50 PM 1710/1720/1730 Global Cybersecurity Institute

Attendance: See Below

Present: M. Abushagur, A. Adrion, S. Aldersley, M. Anselm, G. Babbitt, T. Brown, D. Crawford, E. D'Amanda, B. Dell, F. Deese, L. Dibble, N. Eddingsaas, J. Faber, A. Gehret, H. Ghazle, L. Hall, D. Hazelwood, B. Jadamba, D. Johnson, S. Johnson, P. Kincheloe, L. Kiser, B. Lapizco-Encinas, D. Laury, E. Lawley, M. Liu, C. Lutzer, S. Malachowsky, A. McLaren, A. Newman, D. Newman, J. Olabisi, R. Osgood, A. Perez Sanchez, I. Puchades, M. Reed, Q. Song, W. St. Jean (for E. Heyman), B. Thomas, K. Tobin, J. Venkataraman, E. Williams, R. Zanibbi
Absent: S. Bamonto
Excused: K. Barone, E. Granberg
Presenters: (In Order of Presentations) J, Johnston/A. Meyer, S. Thompson, J. Lanzafame/M. Indelicato
FS Student Assistants: Paulina
Interpreters: N. Crouse-Dickerson, P. Ynzunza
Tech Crew

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 (L. Lawley): **Seconded (H. Ghazle)** Motion is approved.
Agenda Item No. 3: Communication Officer's Report/Approval of Minutes; L. Hall (12:16
Update: On the topic of communications, we encourage Senators to use the Newsletter as one way to communicate with your constituents, but we also strongly encourage Senators to discuss how best to communicate Senate news with their own constituents. There are a lot of really important issues coming up, including issues relating to OnePayroll, and we would like to ensure that Senators are maintaining timely communication with constituents in their colleges. Please let the Ex-Comm know if there is any way we can help facilitate that process. Second, for new Senators we'd like to clarify the role of alternates. If you are here as an alternate in the stead of your elected Senator, you have voting privileges. But if you are here simply to attend the meeting and your College Senators are present, you should not be voting. Similarly, Senators should ensure that alternates are available and present if they have to miss a meeting. Thanks! Finally, as always, please identify yourself when you comment for the minutes. The 9/15 minutes were sent out on 9/24 and we need to approve them. Receiving no feedback, I'd like to make a motion to approve the minutes 9/15. **Motion (L. Hall)**: Approve the minutes **Seconded (M. Abushagur)** **Comment (A. Newman)**: are there any objections to approving by acclamation? Hearing no objections, the

motion is passed.

VOTE: minutes approved by acclamation

Approved 9/15/2022 Minutes

Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; A. Newman (12:18)

Update: Interesting set of things to share. I had a meeting with chairs of standing committees. On the note of communication, we discussed the need for greater communication between Senators and their constituents, particularly on issues relating to OnePayroll. Standing committees need feedback from the faculty, and Senators are the primary way that feedback gets from faculty to committees. I recently learned from Martin Anselm (Senator CET) that their Senators put out their own version of the minutes to their college, so please reach out to discuss how you might do something similar with your own college.

Coming up on October 14th, the new chair of Board of Trustees is scheduled for a meeting with stakeholders on campus and President Munson will join us on Oct 27, 2022to present the RIT Master Plan to Faculty Senate.

And we don't have a Senate meeting or Senate-related event next week, so you're welcome!

Finally, when we discuss charges later today, we haven't ranked charges, but if there's something you would like to prioritize, please let us know.

Q (B. Thomas): I have a question on OnePayroll. Last year we had a question about benefits and Judy DeCourcey gave a presentation. Those on RABC can't even understand how OnePayroll works; there's no clarity on what we're supposed to tell our constituents and how to communicate this issue.
A (A. Newman): that's one of the reasons we've asked Ellen to come speak.
N Eddingaas): We got a letter from RIT explaining this and it's fairly well laid out, including the options. What I would tell my constituents is to look at that letter and go from there.
L Lawley): Did everyone receive the letter sent to all Senate with a Google Doc. I will ask Tamaira to send it out again. I wrote up a several page document on this because HR's documentation is misleading on this. We're losing one paycheck in 2023 and we won't get the final paycheck until 2024. We do not make up that difference until we leave RIT and then we get a final paycheck for our last two weeks after we have left. What they're saying is that we can borrow money against our future paycheck and pay it back interest-free, but that's not the same thing as saying we don't lose at all.
Comment (S. Aldersley): It's a problem that this arrived on the Senate desk after it was already decided, and that's not how it should work.

Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; W. St. Jean (12:23)

Update: We had meetings with facilities and discussions about the Day of Reconciliation. We're also having meetings on OnePayroll and meetings on FoodShare.

Agenda Item No. 6: Student Government Update; L. Dibble (12:25)

Update: We have had a lot coming up these past few weeks, facilities are being refreshed this year. If you need to contact any of us, the website is updated and contact info is on there. We discussed Brick City Homecoming and we filled our Senate slots. We're looking for a COS Senator. Finally, we're looking at better ways to support non-STEM students and we're hoping to bring people from global campuses. PawPrints include calls for more swingsets, calls to admit fewer students, calls for better AC/heating, better lighting in parking lots, and bringing back COVID dashboard.

Agenda Item No. 7: Standing Committee At-Large; H. Ghazle (12:30)

Update: We're trying to fill a bunch of committees and we need these to be filled. Now we're reaching out to colleges. I'm asking you all to help fill these committees. We have the LRPE Committte (Long Range planning and environment); we're looking for an at-large committee member. Can we identify someone during this meeting?

Comment (I. Puchades): I volunteer.

Motion (Ghazle): to elect Ivan Puchades to the LRPE Committee
Second (B. Thomas)

VOTE: Election of I Puchades approved by acclamation.

Comment (H. Ghazle): We have a lot of colleges asking for external members for tenure committees in various colleges and those have been hard to fill. Thank you for your assistance in helping fill all these roles.

Agenda Item No. 8: Faculty Affairs Committee Report; H. Ghazle (12:36) *Document linked below*

Update: We wish we had the chair and co-chair of the committee here, but they're teaching. We had a very exciting and busy year. We met every week for 1.5 hours each week. We formed subcommittees for each charge and came back to the full committee for eight total charges. The report can be accessed on the Google Drive (link below). Important highlights included an approved Faculty Grievance Policy (E24.0) that included a mediation component to make is less adversarial, got rid of Plans of Work in the evaluation process, created process for significant life events in the evaluation process, looked into optimal representation on Faculty Senate via benchmark institutions, and discussed changes to lecturer rank and titles.

Q (L. Lawley): Are you going to address the fact that the policy that we approved hasn't been implemented?
A (H Gahzle): We as a committee did our work and now it's up to the administration to implement and the Faculty Senate to follow up, so perhaps Ex Comm can follow up. At the time there were no concerns by administration, but issues came up later. Board of Trustees wanted to take a look at it and the Audit Team looked at it too. We can discuss this in more detail later.

FAC Presentation

Agenda Item No. 9: Ombuds Office Introduction; J. Johnston/A. Meyer (12:50) *Document linked below*

Background: We'd like to do a brief intro to the Ombuds Office. We're a confidential, neutral, independent and informal office. We help people navigate difficult conversations and conflicts. We also facilitate various dispute resolution processes, so you can come ask a question about how a specific process works anonymously and we'll work to find that information out for you. We attend all governance meetings, we talk to HR weekly, and we try to be informed about relevant policies and procedures.

Post-COVID, entire community seems a little less patient with each other, so this is all the more reason to address conflict early and try to make it more relaxed.

Q (B. Thomas): We now have a new grievance process, so can you be subpoenaed?
A (J. Johnston): RIT doesn't have a subpoena process for its grievance process, but in terms of legal subpoenas, we don't keep notes and we have nothing that can be formally subpoenaed. Ombuds are usually not

subpoenaed because we're informal and we don't have written documentation. RIT policy is clear that we cannot break our confidentiality, so RIT would not ask us to do that in the grievance process. Additionally, we are purely voluntary and are therefore separate from any formal grievance process. We're fully voluntary, so working with the Ombuds isn't required by any formal grievance process, for example.
Comment (D. Crawford): If you had a boilerplate summary I would include it in my syllabus.
A (J. Johnston): We can do this.
Q(J Olabisi): A colleague mentioned that there was a leak from an Ombuds consult, though you discussed that you have to disclose if there's a threat of harm. I don't know what this person disclosed, but I'm wondering if there are other situations in which confidentiality would be broken?
A (J. Johnston): OUr confidentiality is the most important part of our position. I hadn't heard those concerns, but that imminent harm is the only issue. There are, however, some situations in which we've had groups come in, so could someone in a group of people share something else? That's possible.
Q (S. Malachowsky): You mentioned that you provide trends to the President, but could you provide some of those trends to the Faculty Senate?
A (J. Johnston): I'm not sure we would interject unless there was something we felt we could add, like we did with the academic dishonesty revision debate, because I had experience on how that might work in practice.

Ombuds Presentation

Agenda Item No. 10: General Education sub-committee Report; S. Thompson (1:04) *Document linked below*

Update: New charges included revisions to the Perspectives such as adding Diversity as a Perspective. the committee is responsive to this but we also want to make sure that the change would be rigorous and not merely lip-service. We would need to define diversity and determine what we want students to get out of this new Perspective. We plan to work with external consultants on this issue. We have an extensive brainstorming chart (see linked docs). We probably need to rethink GE across the board. We're also working on assessment issues and carryover work from previous terms. We've updated the GE website. Suggestions for charges for the upcoming year include contributing to the implementation of a course management system for GEC approvals and records. Right now our system is extraordinarily complex because right now it includes sending PDFs around for multiple signatures. We would really appreciate the investment in a curriculum management system.

GEC Presentation

Agenda Item No. 11: Long Range Planning and Environment Committee Report; J. Lanzafame and M. Indelicato (1:16) *Document linked below*

Update: We had four charges last year, first dealt with the library, second dealt with the master planning issue, third was related to COVID-19 and future preparation, and fourth was related to the parking situation. Full presentation is linked below.

Please send any questions to Mark or Joe.

LRPE Presentation

Agenda Item No. 12: Standing Committee Charges; A. Newman (1:31) *Document linked below*

Background (A. Newman): We have a lot of charges to get through. The first is the Academic Affairs Charges and everyone has seen these, so hopefully we can have discussion and vote on them as a block. Are there any objections to voting on these charges as a block? The first charge was rewritten and the three other charges are continuing charges from last year.

"Make recommendations to address the problem of insufficient time for instructors to submit grades after the last final."

Motion (L. Lawley): to approve charge
Seconded (L. Hall)

Are there objections to voting by acclamation? None? The motion passes.

VOTE: The charge "Make recommendations to address the problem of insufficient time for instructors to submit grades after the last final" is approved by acclamation.

Motion (L. Lawley): I move to move the charge from Academic Affairs to Academic Accommodations
Seconded (I. Puchades)

Q (E. Williams): If the charge reads "make suggestions" what does that mean for policy?
A (L. Lawley): The committee can decide on what level their recommendations will come; either as suggestions or policies as motions from the committee.

Q (J. Venkataraman): On the deadline there's already a deadline of 3 weeks.
A (A. Newman): Committees get copies of the rationale, so the goal is to extend this past three weeks, but we already voted on this.

Objections to voting by acclamation?

Motion (L. Lawley)
Seconded (L. Hall)

Objections to approving this charge by acclamation?

Comment (A. Newman): We're through the ASSA. Next up is the Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC)..

L. Lawley: Move that shorter version of charge #1 be approved.
Seconded (L. Hall)

Suggested language: "Review and make recommendations related to campus policies pertaining to pandemic(s) both current [covid; monkeypox;..] and future, to improve transparency and ensure fairness for all RIT communities impacted by them."

Discussion:
Comment (Thomas): the use of the term pandemic doesn't seem to fit, scientifically.
Comment (L. Lawley): I had originally made the suggestion to remove the term "pandemic" and remove specific diseases. I move to strike the language in square brackets.
Seconded (E. Williams)

Q (E. Williams): I'm not aware of any governance policies relating to the pandemic, so are we developing policies? The administration has made these decisions.
A (H. Ghazle): We have communications, not policies, so perhaps we need to change this language.
(S. Malachowsky): Is there anything other than policy that can be changed by Senate anyway?

(L. Lawley): I added a revision to clarify "campus policies" instead of "academic policies."
A. Newman: We've already moved to strike "COVID" and "monkeypox"

L. Lawley: I'd like to amend my motion to include the edited language.
Seconded (L. Hall)

I Puchades: What about health emergencies that aren't pandemics?
J Faber: On that note, what we really want here is something like "significant disruptive events" or events that substantially change campus procedures.
S. Malachowsky: Why broaden it? I thought the point was to have this relate specifically to pandemics.
L. Hall: I think "significant disruptive events" is more suitable.
H. Ghazle: We have a motion on the table here, so we should look at the changes and vote on the changes.

VOTE: Motion to approve changes to the language to read "Review and make recommendations related to campus policies pertaining to pandemic(s) both current and future, to improve transparency and ensure fairness for all RIT communities impacted by them," approved, **25 yays, 3 nays, 3 abstentions.**

Comment (A. Newman): Now we can move to vote on the charge, if there's a motion.

Comment (B. Thomas): The language is still unacceptable to us.
Comment (S. Malachowsky): Significant disruptive event is still too broad.
Comment (A.Perez Sanchez): I think it should be significant disruptive events that affect campus policies is what we're really looking at here.
Q (M. Anselm): What about something like a significant infectious disease event?

Motion to table (L. Hall)
Seconded (J. Olabisi)

Committee Charges

Agenda Item No. 14: Adjournment; A. Newman (1:52pm)

Motion to adjourn