Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, December 1, 2022 12:15 – 1:50 PM 1720/30 Global Cybersecurity Institute

Attendance: See Below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item No. 1: Call to Order; A. Newman (12:15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting called to order</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; A. Newman (12:15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item No. 3: Communication Officer’s Report/Approval of Minutes; L. Hall (12:18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Update:</strong> The 11/17 minutes were sent out and I received no corrections. I’d like to move to approve the 11/17 minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seconded (B. Dell)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VOTE:</strong> Minutes approved by acclamation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; A. Newman (12:19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Update:</strong> Next week’s hold is released. Our Communications Officer, Lauren Hall, may be moving on from Senate and we’d like to create a possible transition plan in the event Lauren has to leave Senate. Please be prepared over the break for a possible election and consider nominating yourself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We’re also putting together a list of all the policies that are under review this year and transmit that to the faculty for feedback. We’d appreciate you amplifying this particular newsletter and do your best to encourage people to get involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finally, today’s agenda was modified before we got here because we had to remove RIT Certified from the agenda given Ian Mortimer leaving RIT. Stephen Aldesley will provide more information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment (S. Aldersley):</strong> We were asked to set up a ... I was asked to meet with Ian about a week before his departure and he let us know where RIT Certified is and how it will likely develop. I asked to meet again and asked to be on the agenda. This is just by way of an update for Senate and it’s important that we stay up-to-date on the initiative. I think it has a lot of potential, not all positive. We’ll meet tomorrow with Dennis DiLorenzo and should have more information later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q (H. Ghazle):</strong> My understanding is that RIT Certified will report directly to the Provost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A - Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment (Mustafa):</strong> I was in the meeting with Stephen. To approve programs everything has to go through the Dean’s and everything has to go through a special SIS process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment (I. Puchades):</strong> We’ve already been having a lot of interaction with faculty at the college level, so it’s a little disturbing that we’re not getting a lot of answers about faculty will get paid, etc., We’re being asked to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
provide plans and syllabi and so forth without a lot of details.
S. Aldersley: I’ll bring that up tomorrow.

**Comment (A. Newman):** I’ll suspend this conversation for the time being but we can return to it in our discussion of shared governance. The final thing is that feedback on the Master Plan is due WHEN. We’ve already received feedback on lack of plans for the library,

---

**Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; E. Heyman (12:26)**

**Update:** This is our first day of Manager Training Review and we’ll also be talking to Bob Finnerty about communications and in particular timely communications. Hopefully we’ll have more updates on both soon.

---

**Agenda Item No. 6: Student Government Update; L. Dibble (12:27)**

**Update (SG rep delayed until 1:30):** This past week we had an intense Senate. We were doing some confirmations. We also confirmed our accessibility chair and we’re still working on by-laws. This coming week we’ll have to find a new Student Affairs Committee Chair. We’re having some turnover. We’re also having a ton of holiday events, so please support those.

---

**Agenda Item No. 7: ASSA Committee At-Large Member Nomination; H. Ghazle (12:26)**

**Background:** We had volunteers. We had Denton who was willing to serve and Denton is on board. Do we want to vote now or vote later? I will leave it to our esteemed chair.

**A Newman:** Are there any objections to voting him in now. No objections. Can we vote by acclamation? Or by waving flags.

**VOTE:** Y30, 0N, 0A, the motion to elect Denton is approved.

---

**Agenda Item No. 8:E24-Faculty Grievance Amendment; L. McQuiller Williams (12:29) Presentation files below**
Background: I'm here at the request of the President and Provost. They wanted me to request that Senate allow three friendly amendments to extend the timeline from 5 business days to 10 business days for each part of the process, since they are concerned that the people needed for this process might not be available on such short notice. See attached presentation for specific language. Happy to take questions at this time.

Q (B. Thomas): I just want to ask has this been through FAC already or did the President ask this to come straight to Senate?

A (L. Williams): This was on the President’s desk after being approved by Senate, so any amendment, friendly or otherwise, must be approved by the full Senate.

Q (S. Malachowsky): Were any other time frames discussed? Something in between the two?

A (L. Williams): Not at this time.

Q (S. Malachowsky): What’s the total time?

A (B. Dell): 95 days, so this would take it from 95 days to 110 days.

Comment (H. Ghazle): Part of the reason the process is long is that we want to provide the opportunity for informal and formal mediation processes before the formal grievance process begins. In terms of Bolaji’s question, it’s up to the Senate whether to approve or to send it back to the FAC.

Comment (S. Aldersley): One of the most common issues is the timeline. You never know when a grievance will come up and you want to avoid running into timelines over the summer. It’s hard to see how these changes will really impact the timeline that’s already in the original policy. I wonder if the Provost has looked downstream at the extent to which these changes will assist in having a grievance come to the committee in a timely matter?

A (L. Williams): I can’t speak to this.

Comment (J. Johnston): I just want to say that there’s a significant discrepancy between the faculty grievance process in that faculty have 90 days not including the summer to file a grievance. Staff have 10 days total, including the summer. So I would encourage Staff Council to amend their policy in light of these proposed changes.

Motion (H. Ghazle): to approve these changes on the Senate floor rather than sending them back to FAC with the addition that the Faculty Grievance Committee would be informed on this.

Seconded (L. Hall)

Discussion:

Q (S. Malachowsky): When is the next meeting of the FAC?

A (H. Ghazle): We’re meeting regularly.

A (S. Malachowsky): Is there a reason not to have the committee meet and just discuss these changes, including some kind of middle ground?

Comment (L. Williams): The co-chairs of FAC were both notified. One of the co-chairs preferred a compromise of 7.

Q (S. Malachowsky): When does this become valid? We do need to know when this becomes valid.

A (H. Ghazle): Currently, when there are cases the previous policy is being followed and not this one. Usually you can’t bring any changes to the grievance policy in mid-year, because there are active grievance processes going on. My thinking is that we should change this and it would go into effect.

Comment (J. Johnston): Precedent for this would be that Title IX, etc., goes into effect immediately. There’s some flexibility if the President and Provost would like this policy to take place on a particular day and apply the policy after that date.

Comment (C. Lutzer): We have not been told that approving this is urgent. Because it’s not urgent, I like the idea of pushing it to FAC so they can think about it carefully and come. I’m speaking in favor of holding off since this is not urgent.

Comment (B. Thomas): I don’t mean to speak for FAC, but I support voting.

Q (S. Malachowsky): Do we know what the co-chairs preferred or if they had an opinion?

A (L. Williams): One of the co-chairs was in favor of 7 days and one was fine with 10 days.

Comment (S. Aldersley): We need 100% clarification on when this goes into effect.

Comment (B. Thomas): The policy is that once it’s approved by the Senate it goes into effect immediately. There are some that can go into effect with the next academic year, but my understanding is that this would be effective immediately.
Comment (A. Newman): We can ask for a friendly amendment to have the policy go into effect January 1.
Comment (S. Malachowsky): So this has to be signed by the Provost and President? Yes? So one of the things I’ve questioned them on is that a lot of bills in other legislation clarify in the policy when it goes into effect and we should start doing that.
Comment (I. Puchades): I would like to speak to the fact that this adds 3 weeks to the overall process.
Comment (S. Bamonto): I’m a little concerned about the procedure. It seems like it’s most appropriate to send it back to the committee. Have the committee approve, come back with their suggestions.
Comment (M. Anselm): I’m just envisioning a scenario where because someone’s not available and it won’t pass that line and my grievance is tossed out. I don’t mind adding 15 days in order for my grievance to make it through the process. I support getting this done.
Comment (L. Hall): I’d just like to clarify that this adds at max 3 weeks. Most will probably get done much sooner. This just gives people additional time if that time is needed.
Comment (C. Lutzer): I don’t object to the 10 days; what I object to in principle is the history that we’re often brought things with a sense of urgency and without time to deliberate. So again, I’d like to send it back to FAC. I just want time.
Comment (R. Zanibbi): I’m sympathetic to moving forward in the process, but I worry about being able to represent my constituents.
Comment (H. Ghazle): I brought the motion to the floor. I look at my esteemed colleagues who object and I’m willing to withdraw my motion. It may be beneficial to put a timeframe on this. If we do this we need to ensure that we have a hard time limit so that all parties are ready to move forward once we approve. So there’s no motion on the floor.

MOTION (S. Malachowsky): I move we put this on the next agenda. That gives us a hard deadline.
Seconded (S. Johnson)

Comment (B. Thomas): Next agenda is in January. FAC is done for this semester. So we’re pushing this into next semester.

VOTE: 25 yay, 4 nay, 3 abstain.

Q (M. Abushagur): will this go directly to the FAC?
A (A. Newman): They’ll be asked to present at our first meeting next semester.

E24 Presentation

Agenda Item No. 9: Shared Governance Discussion; A. Newman (12:56)

Background: The Executive Committee has been drafting a resolution of shared governance and there are a lot of things that come up in the process and we wanted to bring some of those topics to the Senate so that we can cover a variety of topics that need to be discussed as a body. I’d like to start by re-educating us because through the OnePayroll process some of us have argued that this is not something that the Senate should be involved in, given that it’s an administrative decision. I wanted to clarify that in our Charter in B2 it discusses particular areas where we are expected to provide our advice. This to me indicates that we are perfectly within our rights to discuss topics relating to OnePayroll, the Master Plan, and RIT Certified. It is emphatically our job to be involved in these conversations. Many of the decisions around OnePayroll were made over the summer when faculty were not on contract. This brings up the question of whether some members of the ExComm should be in paid positions with responsibility for meeting people over the summer. This relates to questions about whether we want a longer term for the Ex-Comm Officers. I understand that this could require potential charter changes as well.

I will leave it to any of our Senators to speak.

Q (R. Zanibbi): I found the part about the annual operating budget of the university interesting. Have we ever done this?
A (B. Thomas): We have not. At RABC we had Jim Watters come present to us and we were shocked.
Comment (R. Zanibbi): I think ¾ of the issues the committees I work on run up against is the question of “what is the budget?” And I never felt like that was a question we could ask. If we actually had a say and focused on … That issue has hobbled many promising initiatives, because we just couldn’t get clarity on the budget.

Q (I. Puchades): As a matter of historical perspective, when were these policies put into effect?

Comment (L. Hall): Shared governance is the important principle, but I also want to bring up the practical costs here. Faculty are asked to do enormous amounts of labor on these issues only to find out that their labor was completely ignored. This happened with the Master Plan Subcommittee, who only found out after conducting faculty surveys and writing a report, that the Master Plan Report was already completed and none of their input was used.

Comment (B. Thomas): I agree with Lauren and the others. I was on the Faculty Grievance Committee and we wrote a report and I have no idea what the President did with that report. The feedback process needs to work both ways. We need to know what actions, if any, are being taken on our report. I was talking with Jim Waters and he kept talking about research and I asked him “what research” and he’s actually talking about infrastructure. But that’s not what we mean by research. Research costs money as an upfront investment. You’re asking the Faculty to do upfront unpaid labor.

Comment (S. Aldersley): This is a great topic that should have been discussed years ago. I’m looking at B2. It is the faculty’s responsibility to organize ourselves on whatever lines we need to. Nothing says that we have to be paid for it. We shouldn’t be paid for this. The meeting yesterday with the RABC and Jim Watters was a waste of time. The communication lines are not set up to achieve the outcomes faculty need. It would be good to hear what the Provost says about active governance.

Comment (S. Malachowsky): My sentiment is that people are pretty frustrated in general. I don’t think it’s just pandemic aftershocks.

Comment (L. Manlu): I would like to suggest that since we meet every week and we have all these documents. I wonder if we can have some kind of workflow that we could set up. If we could put it in one file that people could...

Comment (I. Puchades): I think as a general feeling of what we’re getting from this conversation is that we need to be educated about our governance responsibilities but that the administration also needs to be educated about how the process works. I’m wondering if we could have new training for new Senators on our responsibilities, voting processes, policies, and so forth.

---

Agenda Item No. 10: Old Policies; A. Newman (1:14)

Background: That brings us to our main topic, which is old policies. We’ve been trying to track which policies need to be reviewed and set up a better and more transparent workflow for Senate. Tamaira’s spreadsheet had tons of red marks indicating that we have a lot of policies that need to be reviewed. I want to make sure we’re tapping into our collective memories to see if any have been reviewed even if they have not been edited and also that we can keep people updated more in the future. It would also allow our standing committees to prioritize, by providing a living calendar for keeping policies up to date. I’m asking for a taskforce to help do this.

Do we have any comments?

Q (M. Anselm): Can we ask our constituents if they can help with this or should it be Senate?
A (A. Newman): Better for it to be filtered through a smaller group. Former Senators could, of course, help.

Comment (J. Venkataram): It’s a good idea to set up that committee. I’m willing to serve on the taskforce. I also had a document for Faculty Affairs that had all the updates. So charges and final reports are the best way to do this.

Comment (A. Newman): Thank you for volunteering for that, Jayanti. I’m going to ask people to think about this
over winter break. One option is that we could choose one full day of our Senate meetings to think about how to best organize ourselves moving forward. Should we write it specifically into our Charter that the Ex Comm is expected to work over the summer, for example? Is having a full meeting devoted to organization something we’d like to do.

Q (R. Zanibbi): Is there any way to find out which of the resources listed in our charter are in fact accessible to Senate or at least the Ex Comm? I worry that we’ll have that meeting and not know what we have access to and what we don’t. For example, can we in fact access the operating budget, as the Charter indicates? I’d be interested in understanding why, if we can’t.

A (A. Newman): The Charter is, in effect, RIT law, so we should be able to hold them to that agreement.

Comment (R. Zanibbi): One of the biggest sources of frustration is that we’re in this asynchronous information situation. So one side has a lot of information and the other side doesn’t have any. We should know what can be seen and what can’t be and if not why not. This isn’t a zero sum game. We both win when faculty have the resources to govern effectively.

Comment (A. Newman): This has come up in other contexts, where faculty are permanent members of the community, compared to administrators, who typically leave at fairly regular intervals. If there’s no further discussion, one of the goals we have is to bring policies under review up as quickly as we can to get them reviewed and out the door.

Agenda Item No. 11: New Business; A. Newman (1:27)

Worrell: Note from constituents in Liberal Arts asking if we can issue a statement of support for Chinese students on campus, given the conflicts going on in China, as we have done for other international students, and asking faculty and staff to be aware of additional stress on Chinese students during this time.

Comment (A. Newman): LaVerne, do you have background on this?
Comment (L. Williams): This is the first I’m hearing of this.
Comment (C. Lutzer): It might be because we have a campus in China, so possibly we don’t want to rock the boat.
Comment (A. Newman): I will reach out to Jim Myers about this, to see what else might be going on. Maybe this is just something for the Senate to do.

SG Update can start now that Leah is here (See SG update above)

Q (I. Puchades): Will RIT continue the vaccination mandate for new students for next year? Other colleges are dropping it but RIT is still keeping ours. Current vaccination rates are only around 60% in that age group, so there will be a lot of unvaccinated students.

A (A. Newman): Pandemic update group was scheduled to meet tomorrow, so I can raise it with them.

Question (B. Lapizco-Encinas): I had a question from constituents. The White House issued a mandate that research using federal funds has to be available via Open Access. So we’re wondering if the university has any plans to support Open Access publishing, given this mandate as well as the direction most European universities are moving.

Comment (A. Newman): Thanks for sharing that. I know that within RIT Dr. Stephen Jacobs has carried out a major initiative for Open Access. I can also bring this to the Provost’s attention.
### Agenda Item No. 12: Adjournment; A. Newman (1:35)

**Adjourned**

### Attendance December 1, 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship to Senate</th>
<th>Attended</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship to Senate</th>
<th>Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abushagur, Mustafa</td>
<td>KGCOE Senator</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Malachowsky, Sam</td>
<td>Treasurer, GCCIS Senator</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrion, Amy</td>
<td>ALT CAD Senator (Fall 2022)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>McLaren, Amy</td>
<td>CAD Senator</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldersley, Stephen</td>
<td>SOIS Senator</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Newman, Atia</td>
<td>Chair, CAD Senator</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anselm, Martin</td>
<td>CET Senator</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Newman, Dina</td>
<td>COS Senator</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babbitt, Gregory</td>
<td>COS Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td>Olabisi, Joy</td>
<td>SCB Senator</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamonto, Suzanne</td>
<td>CLA Senator</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Osgood, Robert</td>
<td>ALT CHST Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barone, Keri</td>
<td>CLA Senator</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Perez Sanchez, Alejandro</td>
<td>CAD Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boedo, Stephen</td>
<td>ALT KGCOE Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td>Puchades, Ivan</td>
<td>KGCOE Senator</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Tamaira</td>
<td>Senate Coordinator</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Reed, Mary Lynn</td>
<td>COS Senator</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler, Janine</td>
<td>ALT NTID Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reisch, Mark</td>
<td>ALT CAD Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiavaroli, Julius</td>
<td>ALT GIS Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ross, Annemarie</td>
<td>ALT NTID Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford, Denton</td>
<td>CAD Senator</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Shaaban, Muhammad</td>
<td>ALT KGCOE Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D’Amanda, Elisabetta</td>
<td>CLA Senator</td>
<td>Excused</td>
<td>Sheffield, Jr., Clarence</td>
<td>ALT SOIS Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deese, Franklin</td>
<td>CAD Senator (Fall 2022)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Song, Qian</td>
<td>SCB Senator</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dell, Betsy</td>
<td>CET Senator</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Sparkman, Torrence</td>
<td>ALT SCB Senator</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Excused</td>
<td>Other Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dibble, Leah</td>
<td>Student Gov’t Rep</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Thomas, Bolaji</td>
<td>CHST Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddingsaaas, Nathan</td>
<td>COS Senator</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Tobin, Karen</td>
<td>NTID Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faber, Joshua</td>
<td>COS Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Tsukernik, Olga</td>
<td>ALT COS Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillip, Carol</td>
<td>ALT CAD Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td>Van Aardt, Jan</td>
<td>ALT COS Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gehret, Austin</td>
<td>NTID Senator</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Venkataraman, Jayanti</td>
<td>KGCOE Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghazle, Hamad</td>
<td>Operations Officer, CHST Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Villasmil, Larry</td>
<td>ALT CET Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gottlieb, Owen</td>
<td>ALT GCCIS Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td>Warp, Melissa</td>
<td>ALT CAD Senator (Spring 2023)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granberg, Ellen</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Excused</td>
<td>White, Phil</td>
<td>ALT GCCIS Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall, Lauren</td>
<td>Communications Officer, CLA Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Williams, Eric</td>
<td>GIS Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazelwood, David</td>
<td>NTID Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Worrell, Tracy</td>
<td>ALT CLA Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heyman, Emily</td>
<td>Staff Council Rep.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Zanibbi, Richard</td>
<td>GCCIS Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsieh, Jerrie</td>
<td>ALT SCB Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zlochower, Yosef</td>
<td>ALT COS Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jadamba, Basca</td>
<td>COS Senator</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Dan</td>
<td>CET Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Scott</td>
<td>GCCIS Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan, Anne</td>
<td>Spring 2023 CAD Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kincheloe, Pamela</td>
<td>NTID Senator</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiser, Larry</td>
<td>GCCIS Senator</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kray, Christine</td>
<td>CLA Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapizco-Encinas, Blanca</td>
<td>KGCOE Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laury, Dino</td>
<td>NTID Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawley, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Vice Chair, GCCIS Senator</td>
<td>Excused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, James</td>
<td>ALT CET Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu, Manlu</td>
<td>SCB Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutzer, Carl</td>
<td>COS Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma, Yunn-Shan</td>
<td>ALT CLA Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpreters: Nicole Crouse-Dickerson and Denise Herrera

Student Assistant: Paulina Hudspeth

Presenters: LaVerne McQuiller Williams