Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, April 13, 2023                        12:15 – 1:50 PM                           GCI 1720/30

Attendance: See Below

Agenda Item No. 1: Call to Order; A. Newman (12:16)

Meeting called to order.

Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; A. Newman (12:16)

Motion (NAME): S. Aldersley
Seconded (NAME): S. Johnson

- Approved by acclamation

Agenda Item No. 3: Communication Officer’s Report/Approval of Minutes; S. Aldersley (12:17)

- The draft minutes for the meeting of April 6th were distributed on Tuesday. Having received no suggested changes, I move they be approved.
- Approved by acclamation

April 6, 2023 Meeting Minutes

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

- A. Newman: Last year the Senate voted to approve a new policy, numbered E.36. The policy requires that the faculty governance body in each college hold at least one meeting per semester. I would like to ask each college to appoint one senator to give us a small report on what meetings happened and what was decided or done in those meetings. Please confer with your fellow senators and nominate one of your number and send their name to Tamaira and myself so that we know who to call on. These reports will be on next meeting’s agenda.
- The Executive Committee would like to hold a retreat to discuss the reorganization of the Senate committee structure that I proposed last week. Please let me know if you are interested in this approach.
- At University Council yesterday it was announced that the Shed is 138 days away from opening and that enrollment projections for the fall are positive.

Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; G. Harrington (12:21)

- The annual staff picnic will occur on Tuesday, May 17th.

Agenda Item No. 6: Student Government Update; L. Dibble (12:21)
Chris Ferrari, our representative on the Calendar Committee gave a presentation on proposals under consideration. And then we also had a bylaws presentation. Two senators who are reviewing our bylaws gave a presentation with proposed changes. We accepted a charge to look into building a skate park on campus.

Agenda Item No. 7: Academic Support and Student Affairs Committee End of Year Report; K. Leipold

The Academic Support and Student Affairs had two charges this year. The first was to investigate and make recommendations related to reasonable expectations for provision of academic accommodations. And the second was to review D.8, the policy on Student Academic Integrity and make recommendations regarding the deadline for faculty to notify students suspected of academic dishonesty.

On Charge #1, we looked at external benchmark universities and conducted an internal survey for which we got 118 responses. The committee spent some time together with Catherine Lewis, Director of the Disability Service Office, reviewing and categorizing the written comments from the survey regarding faculty satisfaction with the current accommodations process. Some of the comments expressed concern with the more diverse types of accommodations that are coming through and others requested more training and support and clearer guidelines. There are currently over 2,500 students receiving accommodations of one sort or another and this number is increasing, and we recognize that this is a growing challenge. Some of the suggestions had legal implications and cannot be implemented and we feel that the website would benefit from some clarifications regarding DSO policy.

○ C. Lewis: The Test Center has a specific series of use cases that relate to student needs, but it is not a place where all test accommodations must be facilitated. And that's a culture shift that we need to work through together. Because an accommodation approved by our department must be facilitated directly with faculty in the majority of cases. We absolutely have a capacity issue, but that cannot rest on the shoulders of the Test Center alone. So that's really where this collaboration needs to happen.

Our recommendation is to continue working on this charge with the collaboration of the DSO. We’d like to look at best practices in supporting students with accommodations, and also education around legal and bias issues as well. We do want to have a better understanding of faculty time spent providing accommodations outside of the classroom and outside of work, and we also want to look at the capacity issue in the DSO.

Our second charge relates to academic misconduct deadlines. Again, we looked at benchmarking data from the same 18 universities. We also collaborated with Jarron Mortimer, Director of the Center for Student Conduct and Conflict Resolution. Currently, the policy says that the instructor must notify the student in writing within three calendar weeks of the alleged incident. We weren’t clear whether that was the submission of the work or the discovery of the incident. So we are proposing that there be an RIT email of notification to the student within 14 business days of discovery of the alleged incident, clarifying that a business day means a day where the university is open to the public. That'll extend the calendar time through winter break and any other unforeseen closings of the university. This 14 business days was proposed by Jarron and it aligns with the Student Conduct timelines for those incidents as well.

Those were our only two charges. However, last year the Committee recommended taking a look at the Climate Survey data to evaluate the experience of female students. We’d like to recommend that the committee return to that issue next year and look at the National College Health Survey data with a view to identifying specific marginalized communities where we might be able to help improve their classroom experience.

○ S. Aldersley: I am wondering how you would like to make your recommendation for charge #2 happen?
○ A. Newman: Would you like to make a motion to accept the recommendation.
○ K. Leipold: Yes.
○ J. Johnston: Regarding this modification, this could include someone discovering the integrity
issue after the semester has been completed. In fact, there are cases in which a student might provide a copy of a paper from a course they took a year ago and then they give it to a friend that person. Would this allow for the student who did something a year ago to still go through the academic integrity process? And would it allow for a grade change as a result of something that occurred outside of the present semester?

- K. Leipold: We discussed this and want to leave that possibility open in the case that it was extreme enough to warrant revisiting grades.
- J. Johnston: D.8 has so many open-ended ideas that if that’s the intention, I would encourage that there be some deliberate language in the policy that would allow a student to understand that they run that risk.
- S. Johnson: Can you clarify what you mean by “business days”?
- K. Leipold: The intention is to mean “class days.”
- S. Johnson: We hold classes on Saturdays.
- K. Leipold: The intention is Monday through Friday.
- L. Lawley: Can I suggest that it be changed so that a business day means a weekday on which the university would be open.
- S. Malakowsky: One of the things that comes to mind is the idea of discovery of an alleged incident being obviously different from the date of the incident. There’s a question of reasonableness here. Anyone can fabricate a discovery at any time. What does discovery mean, how do you prove that? How does a student prove that I discovered conduct on a particular day? Was there any discussion around that?
- K. Leipold: We felt that approximately three weeks after discovery was a sufficient amount of time to follow through on notifying the student.
- I. Pachades: Could we change the 14 days to 15? Fourteen implies two weeks.
- K. Leipold: 14 business days is almost three weeks, and we are just trying to stay with what Student Conduct is doing.
- I. Pachades: I think it creates confusion when you see that number 14. Words matter.
- J. Venkataraman: Isn’t there a definition of business day in the policy?
- L. Lawley: Yes, it’s in policy. It becomes an issue in the faculty grievance process because you have to count those days. I was able to find somewhere in the policy where it defines it, but I don’t want to dig it up right now.
- J. Venkataraman: Then why are we using a different definition here?
- L. Lawley: I think it’s a bad idea because this is a policy that we have control over as opposed to what the administration has control over. So I would prefer that we be specific in our own policy and not dependent on what HR tells us.
- A. Newman: So at this point, we're going to keep this as is without any more adjustments.
- J. Johnston: There is no Office of Student Conduct. It’s the Center for Student Conduct and Conflict Resolution.
- H. Ghazle: We need to be careful about what we change and what we do not change. Have you had any communication with the Ombuds office about this? No? Then I move to table this motion, not indefinitely, but I recommend that the committee have some communication with the Ombuds office before we bring this to a vote.
- L. Lawley: I second the motion to table.
- A. Newman: We will now vote on whether to carry on with the vote on the original motion, or if we would like to table it to bring it back on another day. All those in favor of tabling.
- H. Ghazle: Motion to table passes with 27 in favor, two opposed and one abstention.
- A. Newman: Now we come back to Charge #1.
- B. Thomas: I noticed in your first slide, that you only had 118 responses. We have over 1,000 faculty, so I wouldn't think that your results could be statistically significant. My second question relates to the procedures the DSO follows. I know you send out notices at the beginning of the semester about certain students needing accommodations, but can you clarify what happens when
A student says “I can’t come to class, I can’t take an exam, because I have a mental health problem.”

- A. Newman: Point of order. We're not here to sort out what the policies are or what the actual practices are right now. I can understand there's confusion. Could you comment on the number of survey respondents?

- K. Leipold: The survey went out at the end of fall semester from the committee representative of each college, asking for faculty feedback on accommodations and on academic misconduct. And honestly, your questions reinforce what we heard from a lot of faculty in the survey. It goes back to the need for more education, more information sharing.

- L. Lawley: I have a concern because it's the DSO that says that an accommodation will be provided. It makes sense if the DSO is supporting the accommodation, but right now faculty have no input into the determination of accommodations, particularly if they're the ones who need to provide it. For example, if the student gets double time for taking an exam, that's not feasible for me to proctor myself, but if the DSO has approved it and I'm expected to do it, we have a problem. And so my feeling is if the DSO is going to require faculty to support an accommodation, then the DSO should be required to work with the faculty member to be sure that it is in fact a reasonable accommodation in that context.

- C. Lewis: First of all, I think it is important to clarify roles and responsibilities. It is indeed the purview of Disability Services alone to determine the accommodations a student needs on the basis of their disability. And to Dr. Bolaji's question as to the rationale for what accommodation is appropriate, it is confidential information which cannot be discussed with faculty. You do raise an important point about the need for collaboration between students and faculty about the provision of accommodations in certain contexts. That is indeed possible. When a faculty member receives a notification of accommodations, if they believe that accommodation is unreasonable pedagogically in the context of their class and not on the basis of disability, they are encouraged to reach out to my office to discuss it. In the end the DSO bears ultimate responsibility for determining that reasonableness, but we absolutely will do that in partnership with you.

- H. Ghazle: Let me give you a hypothetical. Assume I have a class at 3:30 in the afternoon. And then I have a student who needs to go to the DSO to take a test but the DSO closes at 4:30. So there's no way that the student can have double time to take the test. They can begin but they can't end.

- C. Lewis: They can start the exam earlier.

- H. Ghazle: I don’t want to go back and forth. I'm just giving you an example. There must be something we need to do. The number is increasing. I know you're not the one to blame. What is the next move here? Is there a plan to increase the resources for the DSO?

- C. Lewis: I would suggest that what this committee can most effectively engage with is not my department's capacity but faculty’s capacity to effectively administer the accommodations that we approve. I understand that faculty are stressed by the work that's involved in providing accommodations. We are seeing exponential rises in students with reasonable accommodations and disabilities. But the issue I think we need to grapple with is how we can give faculty more time. I think the words were used ‘outside of work’. I would critique that to say that the provision of accommodations is part of our jobs, and is not outside of work time. So how do we create more capacity for faculty to do that work within your day? That's the question I would ask.

- I. Pachades: It’s important to realize that faculty are working 60 to 80 hours and it's not in my plan of work to provide accommodations. If I teach three credit hours, I'm expected to teach those three hours and then I may have a research meeting right after that or I may have to travel to a conference right after that. Or I may have to participate in that committee after that. I’m not able to carve out the time, double time or extended time, or find a classroom. The way I would like to see this developing is to offer more capability to the DSO and not putting the burden on faculty whose time is already at a maximum right now.

- M. Anselm: I was approached by one of my constituents during finals last semester, and he was concerned about his mental health because he had a student with ‘unlimited time’.
C. Lewis: That is impossible.

M. Anselm: All right. I'll have to ask him again, exactly what he meant by that, but he was pulling his hair out. He didn't know what to do. He was teaching a class with 110 students and 20% of them had accommodations. And he didn't know how to deal with all of these students that needed whatever amount of time it was. So it is a serious concern. We hear about the mental health of students all the time, but who's considering the mental health of the faculty?

C. Lewis: I have deepest respect for the mental health of faculty and staff and understand that the need around mental health is pervasive among all of us, students and faculty alike. In terms of capacity for accommodations, my colleague in the middle of the table mentions you know, it's not in my plan of work to provide accommodations. I would suggest that's an educational component we need to discuss because it is indeed a mandate that faculty provide the accommodations we approve. It is the job of our office to determine, and the job of faculty to implement the academic accommodations that are in place.

J. Faber: Some of these points being discussed here are matters of policy and clearly Senate questions that we can discuss in a policy context. There is a procedural aspect to a lot of these things. As the report says there's a lot of work to be done here. It's also worth noting that some of these procedural questions, may fall before Senate but some probably don’t. We need to make sure that we have the right bodies and organizations on campus looking at these things. It's departments and colleges, and the Council of Chairs.

A. Newman: This may indeed be something that goes beyond Senate is doing, and other parts of the university may need to be brought in.

---

**Academic Support and Student Affairs Committee**

**Agenda Item No. 8: RIT Certified; D. Di Lorenzo (12:56) Presentation linked below**

- Thank you for inviting me today. I am Executive Director of RIT-Certified. I just gave a longer presentation to the university community and I can share the recording if anyone would like to go a little deeper into this subject. The focus of RIT-Certified is workforce development. Over the past 18 months we’ve been developing our internal organization and doing external outreach and research into the needs of the regional job economy, working with employers to understand the intersection of their needs with RIT’s strengths. It's important to understand we are integrated into the institution and are charged with building and delivering our portfolio in partnership with the colleges and the faculty.

- The question we’re asking is how to create employer-validated training models that are impactful and aren't just about earning a certificate or a branding badge? As we're thinking about delivering workforce training for the evolving 21st century job economy, we want to be inclusive, flexible, original and bold. The expectation today is that in order to stay relevant people will need to continually upskill their competencies. One of the things we have to acknowledge is that one of the largest and fastest growing populations in the job economy are people with some college. I'm often asked about the high school graduate who doesn’t have a bachelor's degree, but who is looking for training in the middle and high skill arenas. We wouldn’t discourage them from seeking a bachelor’s degree, but there is clearly a market in this part of the job economy.

- According to the World Economic Forum, employers are looking at new educational pathways to the extent of looking to develop their own programs, not just to develop their talent in house, but to deliver in-skilling programs that can train people they’re looking to hire. But they realize they're not educators and their outcomes are inconsistent.

- The area of micro-credentials and certificates is the current Wild West of standards. In many ways, it’s an
unaccredited space. The demand to constantly stay relevant is going to be just as important for the post baccalaureate, early career professional as it is for the student first walking in the door. Employers are casting the widest net for talent and asking themselves questions about minimum requirements, a bachelor's degree versus identifying skill needs for a particular set of jobs. There are certain roles within organizations that will always require a bachelor's or a master's degree, but there is a shift going on in certain middle and high skill areas.

- RIT-Certified is focused on the regional economy where RIT has relevant strengths in manufacturing, health care, professional scientific and technical services and construction. We're looking to understand the full ecosystem of training and workforce development that exists in the community, from no skills to low skills to middle and high skills. Among the educational pathways we want to offer are non-credit courses, and foundational and mastery certificates. We’ve also inherited a portfolio of open courses within the edX environment that lead to professional certificates and micro-masters. In the next phase of development, we’re looking to develop partnerships with the colleges on master's degrees and degree completion, perhaps through SOIS. It's not necessarily a clear roadmap at this moment.

- The best way to describe our audience is they are anywhere between the ages of 18 and 65, having in common a desire for particular training. This slide shows our growing portfolio. It includes programs that are in development and courses that have already launched in certain areas. If you want the certificate, this is a recommended pathway, but courses are open to individual professionals if they just need the competency.

- Currently, there is a lot of funding available for workforce development and professional training. For example, we just received $1.6 million from NYS to develop programs in these five areas. How we use the open platform is a question we are grappling with now, but EdX has been successful. We have put an emphasis on the micro-masters because I think there may have been some confusion that it only counts for graduate credit at RIT but that's not true. Any edX learner who takes one micro-masters course can have that course evaluated and articulated into the university. We’ve spent the last six months trying to improve the rigor of micro-masters program assessment. We have been using our experience with the EdEx population as a guide to better understand professionals in the workforce. We are looking at growth in the long term. We have a five-year financial plan with RIT-provided start-up funding and we are expected to generate net contribution to the University and pay back the loan. The net will be allocated to the provost for university priorities. We have standard college level agreements that cover partnerships, whereby the colleges will receive a percentage back, free and clear of expense for reinvestment into their own priorities.

We have been very successful to date but only because of partnerships across the university and the willingness of colleges and faculty to flex and engage with us. programs that are coming.

- I. Pachado: Is this live or when does this go live?
- D. Lorenzo: We have about 20 courses live now that are out there for enrollment, some of them at various states. We get a lot of questions about how we find our audience. We’ve done a lot of brand marketing, highlighting our intent to do professional training and our active portfolio, and what's coming in this space. A lead today isn't necessarily about a transaction next month, it could be a year from now. Our goal is to build the largest lead database in order to continually re-market. We’ve received about 3500 leads in the last six months, people interested not only in the programs we're launching immediately, but in the prospective programs that are coming.

- I. Pachado: You talked about how it's managed internally. Are these courses on a computer server that get sent out to students? Are faculty managing this?
- D. Lorenzo: Yes, absolutely. Our courses are facilitated by faculty. We use Brightspace which you know of as MyCourses. Courses are developed very much like online courses. Some of them might be self-paced with facilitation, some may be synchronous with faculty engagement. Assessment is all overseen by faculty and our course developers, who may be practitioner faculty adjuncts, maybe full-time faculty, but absolutely, faculty have to be at the center of the experience.

- S. Aldersley: You mentioned you have several master's degrees and master's programs in the process of development.
- D. Lorenzo: I wouldn't say development, under consideration. We just executed our first
agreement with CHST. It’s a mutual partnership, with RIT-Certified taking on responsibility for helping re-envision the curriculum to be more aligned with the market, for example, how to do outreach to the workforce population and modularize the degree so that working professionals have greater access to it. So we have Healthcare Systems Management that we just executed and we just kicked off our collaboration on curriculum review. In the next four weeks, we’re going to build a financial and enrollment model including setting an alternative tuition strategy because we have to think about some of the tuition models that we’re competing with. We’ve had very productive conversations with the Saunders School on the Business Analytics degree. I just met with their chair and faculty. We want to make sure the faculty in the departments understand they still own the curriculum. We’re here to support and where there is struggle in the market we may be able to help inform some change for greater exposure, especially how to integrate educational practice and experiential engagement in a way that is most effective in the online environment.

○ S. Aldersley: Could you describe the highlights of how your agreement with CHST came to happen, both from the point of view of talking with the college administration and with the college faculty.

○ D. Lorenzo: The director of that program approached us and asked if there was a possibility for partnership. We had a series of meetings with the program faculty to understand what their challenges were and we did a competitive analysis externally to see if there is room in the market for growth in healthcare systems management at the masters level. This is a degree that has ten students in it right now. How can we bring that degree to a sustainable enrollment? Is there a market for that? After doing the analysis, we went through iterative conversations with the dean and the program chair. After several rounds of negotiation, we brought the faculty back together and once we came to mutual agreement, we moved ahead. Anyone could have walked away at any point, because this is truly about partnership.

○ S. Aldersley: So if I'm the Dean of CHST, why would I want to deliver this degree through RIT-certified as opposed to the normal way we've been doing?

○ D. Lorenzo: Because 1) you're going to get support regarding how to develop the curriculum for employers in a more directed way, 2) we have a marketing engine in our noncredit and that's a symbiotic relationship so we can give you greater exposure, and 3) we have a dedicated team working with faculty on better educational practice in the online environment and modularity for the workforce audience that can help you scale from a perspective of quality.

○ H. Ghazle: I'm going to go into the financial aspect as well. Where's the pay?

○ D. Lorenzo: We are taking on the burden of the full cost of the delivery of the degree. The risk is with Certified and the Provost’s Office. The college is receiving 10% to reinvest before we even make net on its own individual priorities outside of the degree. That is how the college level agreement works.

○ H. Ghazle: It seems to me that most of the work falls on the shoulders of the faculty.

○ D. Lorenzo: Well, of course. When you say the fall on the shoulders of the faculty, I would need clarification.

○ H. Ghazle: I have courses in my degree. I already have a curriculum. I already have the outline, the syllabi. You're going to come to me and say, we're going to help you modify what you've got to help with marketing. But the faculty you are working with you are the experts. So the faculty are going to say I will partner with you to get what we want which means there is additional work that's being done by a faculty member.

○ D. Lorenzo: You're asking a very important question that we all have to acknowledge, so let's talk about development work versus delivery work. Using Healthcare Systems Management as an example, they already have a curriculum and faculty delivery. If we go into redevelopment, we've built a compensation model of add-pay for that, but the assumption is they're going to continue to deliver in the way they've been doing. Except that instead of having three students or six students, they're now delivering it to 20. So from a delivery perspective, we're not looking at this as additional. From a development or re-development perspective, we do acknowledge there is some work involved. Every faculty group is approaching this differently. How the work is distributed
gets discussed in conversations with your department chair and with your dean. Is it on load? Is it off load? Those are all very careful considerations we are making to ensure we are not overburdening any one faculty member.

**RIT Certified Presentation**

---

**Agenda Item No. 9: Resource Allocation and Budget Committee End of Year Report; B. Hartpence (1:27) Presentation linked below**

- Good afternoon. I thought I would spend part of today talking to you about the concerns of the RABC. But before I do that I'm going to skip ahead to the charges because they are actually pretty easy. We're working on an Operations Manual. We were asked about COVID. We lost travel budgets and we lost staffing positions, which don't look like they're coming back. I'm not going to talk much about ABB because the Provost has already presented on it. The origin of ABB at RIT isn't clear. Maybe it came from the RABC, or maybe it came from elsewhere. There's a task force working on the details, and a formula has been proposed. The Committee itself is split on the matter. Some of the members are more business oriented and interested in where the dollars are going and some of us are more interested in funding initiatives or worrying about loss of budget to a particular department. Finally, the only thing that perhaps you haven't seen is something on C.3.0, the policy governing intellectual property. We were approached by faculty from Imaging Science who would like to have some flexibility with what is termed soft money. They have a proposal and we met with Dr. Watters and Dr. Rafaelle. There was some discussion as to a proposed text, which has now gone over to Legal to make sure we're not crossing any boundaries that we shouldn't. Theoretically by the end of the semester we'll have a more formal proposal.

- This slide describes the committee’s mandate. If you were on the RABC, what would you need to have in order to accomplish these goals? Being on the RABC is a bit like playing a game of frustration or maybe being a mushroom because we feel like we're in the dark quite a bit. There are three or four sources of frustration. Transparency is the major bugaboo. Our mandate says we're supposed to know something about the budget. But when you listen to a presentation from F&A, the slides aren't made available. The presentation may be recorded but it's only available for a week before it disappears. When we ask for the slides, we're told we'll get back to you. I have had a request into Finance and Administration for a month. I keep tickling. Hey, how about those numbers? Oh, yes, we're putting it together. We'll get back to you. This week. I was supposed to get numbers back on the finances for academic affairs for the last couple of years. Oh, yes, we'll have that for you. This week. Let's sit down and go over it. Will I ever get it? Probably not. And this brings us to some of the other sources of frustration.

- Historically there have been different approaches to the budget process. RABC used to have a seat at the table, but we got away from that. We've talked to Jim Watters several times. But do we ever get details? No. Doesn't happen. How are we supposed to have any idea what's going on with the budget when we don't get spreadsheets? When we ask for something, it should be forthcoming. Here's one of the things that we believe though it's not written anywhere: we have this feeling that they know the membership of RABC turns over. So if we just hold them off a little bit, give them a few breadcrumbs. We'll get back to you next week, you know, we're really busy. And then the committee members rotate off and it's gone. And the new set comes in and the process starts all over again. There are a couple of committee members who argue, look, they gave us some data. They're more forthcoming than they used to be and the budget process is changing. That's a more rosy view than the one I'm describing here. But having a seat at the budget meetings would be a very positive thing. The Administration would learn what the faculty have to say, would glean an idea of some objections, some ideas, some feedback. And that might improve the budget as a whole. The darker side of the RABC says, they don't want us to know what's really going on.

- This brings us to the One Payroll thing and the Shed and the directing of classes over there instead of
where you are. Interestingly enough, last year, the RABC was asked to look into mechanisms by which the faculty might generate revenue for the Institute. We spent a lot of time talking about all the ways that faculty might bring money in. The big one, of course, was the presentation you just listened to before me. But the very fact that they would ask leads us to question what is really going on, what don't they want us to know?

● How many of you read the RABC report from 2021? So the process goes something like this: charges come in over the summer. The Senate ExComm reviews them, and sends them down to the committees, and then the committees review them and send them back and then they're formalized. And we work on them all year, and then we write another end-of-year report. And I hope that you all are going to spend your summer poring over our report and going ‘Oh my God. Look at the effort these people put into it. No doubt they should get some level of feedback for their efforts next year. Our first order of business as the Academic Senate should be to bring all of those committees that gave us their final reports and say, ‘This is what we thought of your report. And this is what's going to happen as a result of all this fine work that you've done.’ Probably not going to happen.

○ A. Newman: Before you really lose faith on this, this was actually on our agenda to do as an executive committee. The plight of the RABC has not been lost on us. And in fact, one of the recommendations that has been floated to the Senate right now is to place the ExComm treasurer on the RABC as one of the at-large members so that they can have a more direct line, both to the provost’s office and ideally to F&A to facilitate the work of your committee.

○ B. Hartpence: I think that's a really good start. I have been a senator. I know what it's like to be in this room. As a senator I thought my job was to report back to my college. So that's what I did every time we got done with a meeting. But it's easy to lose track of all this stuff. But I do think and almost everybody on RABC feels like we get lost. End of the year comes, we write a report. We're done.

○ I. Pachades: I appreciate your presentation. It was entertaining. But please keep in mind that some of the committees bring up policy changes, recommendations, they make motions. And those are meaningful outcomes. That’s not something we could do as a big group. That's why we have committees. One of your recommendations here is to somehow make getting the budget an enforceable request. Perhaps you could make a motion to that effect. I don't think it's a waste of time.

○ B. Hartpence: I didn't call it a waste of time. We have a number of people who are more aware of things than they were previously. As a former chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, I know that committee generates a lot of policy changes but the RABC is rather different. We don't normally generate a lot of policy. We are supposed to be the liaison between F&A and the rest of the faculty. We’re supposed to discuss various financial issues associated with the university but not necessarily generate policy. I'm not sure that we can write into policy, “F&A, thou shalt provide line-item budget sheets in the form of Excel documents to the RABC.”

○ I. Pachades: It's already in there.

○ L. Lawley: I'd like to make a suggestion to the committee, which is that you have the ability to come to the Senate and say we would like the Senate to strongly recommend making this request, so that the request comes with the weight of the Senate as a whole rather than just from the committee. That would be an alternative to making a motion to set policy. When you feel like you're not getting the responses that are appropriate for the committee, if you bring that to the Senate, it becomes visible that there's a problem. And so the request for it then has a little more heft.

○ B. Hartpence: The membership of the RABC has hundreds of years of experience at RIT. I think what you've all sort of focused on is the criticism of the Senate process. But I agree that a request from the Senate comes with more weight attached to it. I'm not sure though that it carries enough weight for F&A to say, ‘My goodness, I’ve got to get this over there toot sweet.”

○ L. Lawley: I have been here long enough to realize that, but it does make it more visible. There's more accountability. And, you know, it gets raised. The Provost comes to these meetings, the senate executive committee has an opportunity to meet with the President.
C. Hochgraf: As a past chair of the RABC, I support the need for more transparency. Because errors do occur, and they can only be seen if you have a second set of eyes. I'd also like to say that you may have noticed that your travel budget seems to have disappeared. There's lots of stuff that affects faculty on a daily basis. Maybe you're noticing more students in your class, fewer support resources. That budget affects faculty’s day-to-day life. And so when the RABC chair comes to Senate and says, I need help, they're really saying I want to help you to make sure you can go to a conference, that sort of thing. That money is going somewhere and unless we get visibility, it's going to get worse.

H. Ghazle: Thank you for raising the concerns. The executive committee has been addressing this issue and I think there have been some discussions on how we can make the process better and allow the RABC to get the information that it needs to do the things that it’s supposed to do. So I'm very optimistic but at the same time, we have to be realistic.

B. Hartpence: We did have a couple of meetings this year, so I'm cautiously optimistic that things will change for the better. Perhaps what we should do is sit down and say what really should the RABC be doing?

A. Newman: I think one of the things the Senate needs to do is review our systems to see which are effective and which are not. We’re not good at managing our resources. There are approximately 150 people on our standing committees and we have no good way of either managing them or carrying their work over from year to year. Every standing committee has merit and there's a good reason why it exists. But there's possibly room for us to really rethink what our priorities are. For me personally, as chair, I think that the mandate of the RABC to liaise with our Finance and Administration is very important, even if it's only theoretical right now. We may not be able to fix it here but it’s something that we need to pursue.

B. Hartpence: I can't disagree with things that have been said here.

H. Ghazle: One thing that I have noticed this year, it’s almost as if this entity is against this entity. We need to find common ground and all work all together as a team and look at the welfare of this university that we are all members of. It becomes very disruptive when we don't have common goals that we can cherish and work on. Sometimes, Senate is seen by administrators as obstructionist. The question is, how can we change that and say, ‘No, we're not, we want to be part of the process to ensure that sound decisions are made for the benefit of all.’

Resource Allocation and Budget Committee Report

Agenda Item 10: New Business; A. Newman (n/a)

Not enough time

Agenda Item No. 12: Adjournment; A. Newman (1:50)

- A. Newman: On that note, and hopefully with a little bit of hope going towards the RABC, this meeting is adjourned.
## Attendance 4/13/2023

<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></td>
<td>Lee, James</td>
<td>ALT CET Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrion, Amy</td>
<td>ALT CAD Senator (Fall 2022)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Liu, Manlu</td>
<td>SCB Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldersley, Stephen</td>
<td>Communications Officer/ SOIS Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Lutzer, Carl</td>
<td>COS Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anselm, Martin</td>
<td>CET Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ma, Yunn-Shan</td>
<td>ALT CLA Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babbitt, Gregory</td>
<td>COS Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Malachowsky, Samuel</td>
<td>Treasurer/ GCCIS Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamonto, Suzanne</td>
<td>CLA Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>McLaren, Amy</td>
<td>CAD Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barone, Keri</td>
<td>CLA Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Newman, Atia</td>
<td>Chair/CAD Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boedo, Stephen</td>
<td>ALT KGCOE Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td>Newman, Dina</td>
<td>COS Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Tamaira</td>
<td>Senate Coordinator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Olabisi, Joy</td>
<td>SCB Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler, Janine</td>
<td>ALT NTID Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td>Osgood, Robert</td>
<td>ALT CHST Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiavaroli, Julius</td>
<td>ALT GIS Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Perez Sanchez, Alejandro</td>
<td>CAD Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford, Denton</td>
<td>CAD Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td>Puchades, Ivan</td>
<td>KGCOE Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D’Amanda, Elizabetta</td>
<td>CLA Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Raymond, Amit</td>
<td>CLA Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deese, Franklin</td>
<td>CAD Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Reed, Mary Lynn</td>
<td>COS Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dell, Betsy</td>
<td>CET Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Ross, Annemarie</td>
<td>ALT NTID Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dibble, Leah</td>
<td>Student Government Rep</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Shaaban, Muhammad</td>
<td>ALT KGCOE Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddingsaas, Nathan</td>
<td>COS Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Sheffield, Jr. Clarence</td>
<td>ALT SOIS Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faber, Joshua</td>
<td>COS Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Song, Qian</td>
<td>SCB Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillip, Carol</td>
<td>ALT CAD Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sparkman, Torrence</td>
<td>ALT SCB Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gehret, Austin</td>
<td>NTID Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Thomas, Bolaji</td>
<td>CHST Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghazle, Hamad</td>
<td>Operations Officer/CHST Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Tobin, Karen</td>
<td>NTID Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granberg, Ellen</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Tsukernik, Olga</td>
<td>ALT COS Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazelwood, David</td>
<td>NTID Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Ulin, Robert</td>
<td>CLA Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heyman, Emily (sub Gabrielle Harrington)</td>
<td>Staff Council Rep</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Van Aardt, Jan</td>
<td>ALT COS Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsieh, Jerrie</td>
<td>ALT SCB Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Venkataraman, Jayanti</td>
<td>KGCOE Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Dan</td>
<td>CET Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Villasmiil, Larry</td>
<td>ALT CET Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Scott</td>
<td>GCCIS Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Warp, Melissa</td>
<td>ALT CAD Senator (Spr 2023)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kincheloe, Pamela</td>
<td>NTID Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>White, Phil</td>
<td>ALT GCCIS Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiser, Larry</td>
<td>GCCIS Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Williams, Eric</td>
<td>GIS Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kray, Christine</td>
<td>CLA Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td>Worrell, Tracy</td>
<td>ALT CLA Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapizco-Encinas, Blanca</td>
<td>KGCOE Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Zanibbi, Richard</td>
<td>GCCIS Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laury, Dino</td>
<td>NTID Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Zlochower, Yosef</td>
<td>COS Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawley, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Vice Chair/GCCIS Senator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpreters:** Nic Crouse-Dickerson and Jennifer Mura

**Student Assistant:** Guru Goutham Gangadharappa Ramesha

**Presenters:** Kate Leipold, Dennis Di Lorenzo and Bruce Hartpence