

## Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, April 20, 2023

12:15 – 1:50 PM

GCI 1720/30

Attendance: See Below

Agenda Item No. 1: Call to Order; A. Newman (12:18)
Meeting called to order.
Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; A. Newman (12:18)
<b>Motion:</b> <b>Seconded:</b> I. Puchades
Agenda Item No. 3: Communication Officer's Report/Approval of Minutes; S. Aldersley (12:18)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Having received no suggestions for edits to the draft minutes of the 4/13 meeting, I move they be approved.</li><li>• Approved by acclamation.</li></ul> <p><a href="#">April 13, 2023 Meeting Minutes</a></p>
Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; A. Newman (12:19)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• We have three meetings left before the end of the year and we have many reports with motions to come, so I ask that senators please read the posted documentation ahead of time.</li><li>• At our next meeting, we will vote on the motion proposed by ASSA on their charge #2.</li><li>• The hold on our final scheduled meeting for May 11<sup>th</sup> has been released in favor of a Senate retreat on May 2<sup>nd</sup> (Reading Day) when we will review possible charter changes to B.2, which will then be brought for a vote at the full meeting on May 4<sup>th</sup>.</li><li>• Last year, Senate approved a new policy, E.36, requiring that all colleges hold at least one all-faculty governance meeting per semester and give a brief report on those meetings to the full Senate. We will now hear those reports.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ CET – report postponed til next meeting.</li><li>○ CAD – we are meeting later today.</li><li>○ GCCIS – we met two days ago.</li><li>○ KGCOE – we have a Standards Committee which interacts with the college once a semester. We share Senate proceedings and any concerns that come up. Also senators meeting with the leadership team to discuss any contentious issues.</li><li>○ NTID – we have discussed workload and communication issues. In addition to being evaluated on teaching, scholarship and service, NTID faculty are evaluated on communication for which we have recently introduced new ASL assessment methods. Our biggest concern right now is that we have 40 vacant faculty positions which is having a strong impact on workload. Finally, we have</li></ul></li></ul>

been discussing NTID's involvement with RIT-Certified.

- COS – we don't have a committee although we do have all the pieces in place.
- SOIS – the University Writing Program joined SOIS this year and the main issue our governance group has been working on is amalgamating the two groups of faculty.
- COLA – we have a monthly meeting. A lot of what we've been dealing with is trying to decide how to move forward with reorganization. We've had some leadership transitions. We've also started to discuss ABB and are working on formulating a policy on Professor of Practice
- GIS – We have a small number of faculty and we're very stretched. Each department has had a search going on and we've lost all three of our administrative assistants. We're meeting during exam week to decide what we want to attack next year.

#### Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; J. Zehr (12:28)

- We're in the middle of elections for blocks one, three and five for two year terms with the poll set to close on April 28. We're finalizing plans for the annual staff picnic on Tuesday, May 16, in the field house. This afternoon, we'll have a presentation from Stacey DeRooy on Title Nine and breakout sessions to finalize plans for the remainder of the academic year.

#### Agenda Item No. 6: Student Government Update; L. Dibble (12:29)

- SG had final reports last week. We're continuing to work on some bylaws which will be voted on and at our next meeting when we'll make appointments for open positions and cabinet positions. We're also working on stress relief events around finals.

#### Agenda Item No. 7: Environmental Sciences MS (and BS/MS) Program Change; G. Thurston (12:30) *Presentation linked below*

- The program change involves a reduction in credits from 34 to 30 and the addition of a project option which will enable the faculty to handle more students, a lot of whom are coming up through the pipeline. It gives students more flexibility. The department presented this to Grad Council last month and we unanimously approved it. That's what I'm bringing to the Faculty Senate.
  - R. Zanibbi: Can you say more about the research experience?
  - C. McAlley: The only option right now is six credits of thesis plus three credits of research. The new option would be a 3-credit project as a culminating experience with six additional credits of electives. Most of our students do a huge amount of field work associated with the thesis.
  - R. Ulin: I was wondering if this program has any relationship to the Environmental Studies program in the College of Liberal Arts?
  - C. McAlley: Yes, there have been lots of interactions over the years. I think there are shared courses at the undergraduate level, but this is a graduate course. Is Environmental Studies a degree now? My understanding was it was not.
  - C. Lutzer: Motion to approve this change.
  - R. Zanibbi: Second.
  - B. Thomas: Could you elaborate on your second point, 'to enable more faculty with diverse research interests to support projects, and enable individual faculty members to support more students, with use of projects.' Would that include faculty from outside the program?
  - C. McAlley: We already have faculty outside the program who are thesis advisors. But we have a

lot of faculty who are primarily on teaching portfolios, and who therefore don't have the time to commit to a supervising a thesis. But they are willing to advise students on projects. That's a big reason for this change.

- Vote on the motion: 34 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions. Motion passes.

[Environmental Sciences MS \(and BS/MS\) Program Change](#)

**Agenda Item No. 8: Graduate Council End of Year Report; G. Thurston (12:39) *Presentation linked below***

- Our main responsibility is to review graduate programs and this year four programs have come to us. Two of the proposals I presented to Senate last month: a master's in Engineering Management, and a BS/MS in Industrial Engineering. We have also reviewed a proposal from CAD to accept baccalaureate-equivalent graduates from India's Pearl Academy. They looked at the pathways leading to the Academy's degrees and judged them to provide suitable preparation for a Master of Fine Arts in CAD. It's a three year pilot with CAD reviewing it every year to see how the students are doing and whether or not they are adequately prepared. We voted unanimously to endorse it. The fourth one, which we'll look at next Monday, is Smart Cities Construction Management. I anticipate that we'll still want to bring that to Senate because its proposers are very eager to have it approved by NYS before July 15 so that they can start to offer it.
- All our other charges are still under discussion. With regard to Activity Based Budgeting, and course duplication, we were a little confused until Dr. Granberg advised us that we should establish a policy where the onus is on the proposers of programs to prove to us that newly proposed courses don't represent duplication. So ICC and GC will need to work together on this.
  - S. Aldersley: With regard to what you said about ABB and getting together with ICC, do you have a timeline by when the provost asked you to come to some conclusions about what additional policies you might want to implement?
  - G. Thurston: Not really, it's been kicked down the road til next year, given that there's going to be a new provost. We looked for a white paper that actually lays out exactly what's going to be done in ABB, but we weren't able to find one. In any case, it's going to be really tricky. For example, right now I'm teaching a course in soft matter physics, and there's a course called soft matter physics in Chemical Engineering. And there's a student who's taking both of them. He tells me that they are completely different courses. We're going to have to be careful to be very clear in our student learning outcomes exactly what we're expecting.
  - .B. Thomas: So the charges three and four. I see you got the same charges last year. If you have charges that the committee did not get to, do you think their renewal is appropriate?
  - G. Thurston: I don't have an opinion, because what we did was divide into subcommittees and the subcommittee on this didn't really get going. Because we had other programs to review we got to this late in the day.
  - A. Newman: The fact that this charge has come back twice means that somebody does feel it's important. If we don't want it to continue, we can drop it. Or we could consider updating it, but that would be a question for the Senate when it approves charges next year.
  - S. Aldersley: I can see how those two charges would need to be addressed by the faculty in relation to the development of RIT-Certified. So I would support keeping them on the docket for next year.
  - J. Venkataraman: I'd like to say something about ABB. Although Dr. Granberg said we can put the burden on the proposers, there's the other issue of already existing programs, and I don't know whose responsibility it is to check whether there's duplication or not, but it's going to be very difficult to do that. We can develop methods for reviewing new programs but for existing programs there's no guidance at all.

- A. Newman: That's an excellent concern. I completely agree.
- H. Ghazle: We don't know whether ABB will be implemented, but it may be a good idea to be proactive and develop a charge related to this point.
- A. Newman: There is also a potential option for creating an ad hoc committee to look at this over the next two or three years. But regardless of whether ABB is implemented, maybe we should be looking at the issue of course duplication anyway.
- R. Zanibbi: As an historical point, we looked at duplication of programs under the previous president and provost early in their tenure. I remember there was a lot of talk about finding programs that can be merged, removed, or discontinued, but there was really nothing done. So if that's going to be pursued, I think somebody has to go back and find out what the limitations were because there was substantial money and time invested in it by administration and faculty.
- A. Newman: Do you have any idea where the documentation would be?
- R. Zanibbi: Jeremy or the former president had white papers or documents talking about plans for preliminary investigation.
- A. Newman: I'll follow up on it.
- G. Thurston: My perspective is that any academic field that corresponds to a name is a very large thing, and any course can only deal with a very small part of the field and different disciplines will have different approaches. There's another example I'm aware of. I teach a graduate course in Statistical Mechanics, and there's a course with the same name taught in Chemical Engineering. Again, they are completely different courses.

[Graduate Council End of Year Report Presentation](#)

**Agenda Item No. 9: General Education sub-Committee End of Year Report; S. Thompson (12:51)**  
*Presentation linked below*

- I'm reporting on behalf of the General Education Committee. Our ongoing charges are what they always have been. We had no new charges this year.
- I have some basic statistics here including the number of courses we reviewed, the number of paths, the number of courses that are still pending, and then a few courses that were deemed to be not quite the thing for liberal arts and sciences. We also reviewed 11 immersions. Only a couple of them were new, most were immersions that were being edited and they just needed to be reviewed to make sure they still conformed with GE expectations and also to ensure that none of the edits would make it difficult for a student to complete an immersion.
- Our second charge was an audit review of GE student learning outcomes and courses. That is something that the Office of Educational Effectiveness Assessment (EEA) maintains, and they evaluated the Global and Social perspectives in fall of 2022. People should have access to the results of those. They were very positive and showed students are doing quite well in relation to those perspectives.
- Our next charge was to review the results from the general education course audit, and make recommendations if appropriate. I think there may be some confusion here because sometimes the words audit and review or assess are being used interchangeably. There was a course audit of GE courses that took place in 2019. The results have been available for some time, although we're waiting for a curriculum management system to be able to post them more prominently. That was an audit that was intended to make sure that courses that had been put through as GE were in fact following the assessment standards. Its goal was to ensure that courses that were approved very early in the process back in 2013 when the course outline form was different are still in compliance with current GE expectations. And we did find courses where things were not aligned.
- A little bit of business from carryover charges. One of them was about exploring the addition of diversity

as a perspective and another was about clarifying expectations of perspectives. The element of diversity got tabled at the end of last year because we ended up hiring an external consultant and are now waiting on the results of that. In relation to clarifying expectations,, we had a couple of recommendations. We need to make sure that our policy is clear in its use of terms. ‘General Education’ is actually an RIT-specific term which is largely synonymous with liberal arts and sciences content. It describes a framework that students are required to participate in before they graduate. In our own policy, it’s not always clear when the term is being used in the RIT specific way and when it’s being used generally to refer to liberal arts and sciences content. NYSED, which is what we’re following, uses ‘liberal arts and sciences’ as their term for the university level and ‘general education’ for K-12. Which means that if someone was trying to look on NYSED for liberal arts and sciences standards at the university, they wouldn’t find that information. So our suggestion is that we make some clarifications in policy. They’re in the proposal, with the changes in red.

- We’d also like to clarify what perspectives do and what we expect from them. It’s in the general education framework documents, but it’s never actually been articulated in policy, which can make it difficult for faculty who are trying to propose courses as perspectives, because they don’t necessarily have a clear understanding of what a course need to do in order to qualify. The two things that are notable are that perspective courses need to be courses in liberal arts and sciences and they need to be courses that are broadly open to the RIT student population. So they shouldn’t have significant prerequisites, and they need to be at least three credits.
- Literally two days ago, we launched a new website which clarifies aspects of process because I know it can be very maze-like to try to submit course proposals for approval. It has faculty resources that hopefully more clearly describes how to route courses through the approval process and what faculty should expect to see in return once they’ve submitted something.
- Suggestions for new charges. We badly need a curriculum management system as soon as possible and we’re suggesting a charge to contribute to the implementation of such a system for GC approvals and records. I am sure that anyone who has ever worked on curriculum has found how difficult it can be to shepherd a proposal through to approval. For example, how often different people have different laptop versions of a document and how signatures and dates get lost. And who knows who actually has the original version or the one that has the signatures on it, and how much time is actually spent routing versions to each other, and correcting each other when we forget to include the attachment and all of the other pitfalls that come with not having a centralized system. The GEC has had a vested interest in RIT getting a curriculum management system for years and we would really like to see it happen as a priority.
- A second suggestion for a charge is to update the course outline form and include more detailed instructions for filling it out. Currently, the form serves several different audiences at once: the faculty member designing the course; the academic unit, as a record; the registrar’s office as information they enter into SIS; the academic advisor, as to what a class can be expected to do. And it’s never really clear who is looking at what.
  - S. Malachowsky: Did you consider other terms for general education, like ‘RIT General Education’ or something like that?
  - S. Thompson: I would like to see that. It’s a bigger change. It would require someone to rethink how general education is categorized and promoted. But I don’t think that it’s a change that the General Education Committee could itself determine. If we got a curriculum management system that may help us to get more faculty buy-in. The committee has been talking for really the last couple of years about how general education as a framework could be changed. It’s been about a decade since it was implemented. It seems like it’s definitely time for a review and a reconsideration. It also seems like we may be missing some opportunities at RIT to use general education in a way that helps to promote some of our strengths, rather than treating it like here are some checkboxes, hoops that you need to jump through so you can get a degree. Instead of making it something that students are obligated to do, to make it something that people want to do, because it enhances their learning process here. Perhaps to think about it in business terms as a rebrand because the term General Education is so generic, so boring, and people have different ideas of what it should accomplish.
  - J. Venkataraman: Related to the committee membership list you presented, it showed a dean’s

representative. Since we moved to a Faculty Senate, are deans supposed to be on these committees or not?

- A. Newman: That's one of the changes that we're going to be bringing up. When we started looking through B2 it was not clear why some deans are attending and some not. We also discovered that the provost's delegate still has a vote of some of our committees, which doesn't align with the spirit of the faculty senate charter. Maybe somebody has more historical knowledge, but it seems like we might have made broad changes and not gotten down into the details. In any case we do need to look at charter changes, because there are inconsistencies in what the charter is saying in one place versus another.
- H. Ghazle: Your point is well taken. You're right, and we need to address it.
- S. Thompson: In relation to that, just as a note of information the dean's representative on the GEC doesn't have a vote. They're present, but they don't vote on curriculum.
- H. Ghazle: I hear you regarding the need for a management system. I remember this came up before
- S. Thompson: I think I did the same presentation last year.
- H. Ghazle: Do you have a system in mind that you could propose?
- S. Thompson: I don't remember the brand names, but I know that about a year ago, they trialed two different versions and then tabled it for budgetary reasons. It's an ongoing source of friction. By not having this kind of system in place we're being very, very wasteful with faculty and staff time and resources.
- H. Ghazle: You may want to bring it back and maybe the Senate can advocate on your behalf. I know many places are using MyCourses but that isn't a course management system.
- S. Thompson: No, it is not.

[General Education sub-Committee End of Year Report Presentation](#)

**Agenda Item No. 10: Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee End of Year Report; S. Rothenberg (1:19) *Presentation linked below***

- I'll begin by going through the charges and then I'll get to some motions. The first charge was to look at how to work with a curriculum consultant to integrate DEI into our curriculum. We brought in Nora and Jennifer, who talked about a program they did that was quite successful. It was a bottom-up approach in terms of what they did, top-down to the extent it was pushed by their administration. What came out in our discussion afterwards was this was something that needed a high level of support and a high level of resources including a dedicated full-time person, at minimum, one full time person. So we are presenting a motion that the Senate recommend that RIT provide resources to support a full time employee dedicated to integrating DEI into the curriculum (Motion #1). The person would work with leaders across the institute, making sure they provide resources to the colleges and with student government to bring in DEI issues that students think are important too. Nora is the consultant we hired and she's going to be providing us with a framework on how to move forward with this type of initiative. At the same time, we recommend that each college provide resources to support someone with one or two course releases to lead the initiative to improve both curriculum and pedagogy. We are continuing to use the consultant this summer to start gathering information and figure out where we are in each college because the colleges are at very different places. Third, to consider instituting an RIT flag system for DEI-related activities in our curriculum.
- Charge #2 focused on retention of diverse faculty. We decided to focus on onboarding since a lot of research shows that onboarding is a very important opportunity to aid in retention and our recommendation is that the Senate think about establishing an ad hoc committee to review and approve onboarding processes for faculty. Right now, our onboarding is very typical of many institutions: you come in, get an initial training, and maybe one or two later. What we really need to do is get a committee together to really

think about what a more robust onboarding system would look like, one that maybe continues even into the second year.

- Charge #3 concerned whether RIT should cover all costs for getting a green card for international faculty. We did some benchmarking of our peer institutions, which you'll be able to see in our report. Basically, we recommend that the university bear the total expense of sponsoring applicants of EB 1, which is one path you can go in, and that they cover the cost of I 40 for applicants of EB 2 and EB 3. The idea is so that we can attract the best people we can. Also, we attract a diverse faculty in this way,
- Charge #4 was a carryover from last year, and asked us to figure out how faculty should report DEI activities in their annual reports. We asked all the colleges what they are doing and there are really only two colleges that do anything specific. NTID faculty have 5% of their evaluation based on communication and diversity and the College of Science has a separate box at the end of their self-evaluation, where people can opt to report if they did things specific to DEI. It's not considered part of the annual evaluation but it might relate to promotion and tenure, and it might be used in determining merit increments. No other college had anything specific, but faculty could report under teaching, scholarship or service. We talked to the FAC about this and there we heard about the effort to streamline the annual evaluation, so they thought there would be a lot of push-back against adding another category. There was also some concern about having something in policy that would indicate how DEI activity might be used in evaluation, promotion and tenure. So we decided to move that Senate recommend that each college "have a mechanism outside of the annual evaluation to report and reward DEI activity." (Motion #2) One of the benefits of that is that a lot of accrediting agencies are now asking schools to list all these things, so having a formal reporting mechanism would be a great opportunity for colleges to collect this type of information. The colleges would have to provide examples of DEI-related activities. In our report last year, we had a list of different types of activities that people might consider reporting on. It would also be important that the colleges provide opportunities for faculty, such as trainings, speakers, money for developing case studies, etc. as well as mechanisms for cross-department sharing and dissemination of best practices. And, as always, nothing gets done without resources. It's great to have all these initiatives, but if there's no resources, then probably not much will happen.
  - M. Liu: Thank you for the recommendation that RIT assist international faculty to get a green card. I have been through this process and it took a lot of time and a significant amount of money. The junior international faculty in our college have a lot of pressure to publish. I think this will help the them and also encourage high quality international faculty to join us.
  - S. Malachowsky: I have a question relating to the first motion in slide number three. Asking for another FTE is a big ask. Did you explore how a new person might interact with other folks on campus to do the sorts of things you're talking about here?
  - S. Rothenberg: We talked a lot with Keith and with Taj. There's simply not enough resources to implement this type of initiative with the people we have.
  - T. Sparkman: Should this become a full-time position, you will want someone who has a history of engagement. The purpose of the position is to engage faculty and students as it relates to curriculum design to create an environment with full diversity.
  - S. Rothenberg: I want to stress that this doesn't have to be an external person. It could be someone like Torrence, because one of the things that Nora stressed is the value of long-term relationships. It's just about providing the time and resources.
  - S. Malachowsky: You might want to consider strategic placements as part of that position, like for example on the honors curriculum committee. I guess somebody would have to look at the larger structure.
  - S. Rothenberg: What we were hoping to do this summer is figure out all the stuff that is going on across the Institute. And where could we utilize what's already happening?
  - J. Chiavaroli: Along the same lines, we have departmental curriculum committees and college-wide curriculum committees. Can you give us a sense for the demand out there? How many departments did you canvass that have this need that they can't handle themselves?
  - S. Rothenberg: We did not canvass departments but from informal discussions this is meant to be an initiative that would take people from where they are. For example, I'm a part of two different

schools. One school doesn't have anything going on, the other has a lot going on. They would take very different approaches. In the former, it might be just getting people thinking about DEI. In other schools, it might be instituting new courses or developing cases. But we didn't do that yet. You need a central person to coordinate and push it. We're arguing that this is really important and it needs to be a high level initiative.

- Q. Song: I feel that an internal appointment might be a better choice because the university is very diverse, with different colleges and different departments and this person would need to have broad knowledge about our curriculum. But I'm concerned about how much power this person would have and what their responsibilities would be. If the person is only in charge of DEI, there's a risk they will feel they need to push DEI across the board regardless of fit. It's the faculty who know the curriculum the best and whether DEI is a fit or not. If I'm in this position, I would feel I must do something, must push.
- S. Rothenberg: What counts as DEI can be very, very different. The thing we liked about Nora's model was that it was really different. She got to know each department. For example, in chemical engineering they thought about how certain populations are more affected by air pollution. It's not about trying to force everyone to do the same thing. We might have to think more about what the model is, but it's certainly not to push certain ideas. It's to enable people to do things.
- Q. Song: I agree. But if it's a full time position I feel there's certainly some risk there. There might be too much power to just push through regardless if that becomes a burden to the faculty. Your example is perfect. But what if the person doesn't think this way? For example, in the school districts, they are pushing things through in a different direction from what parents expected. And now at the college level. I just feel with a full time position the dynamics will be different.
- B. Thomas: This is a very nice presentation, much clearer than last year when I voted against this kind of person. But to reiterate, we're not going to incorporate DEI into all our courses, for example, if you're teaching basic immunology. And I like the idea of the university paying for international processing. But the question is will this apply to lecturers as well as tenure-track faculty? Another question: if the faculty member leaves RIT, do they have to pay the money back? Is the money taxable?
- S. Rothenberg: I don't think so but when we looked at peer institutions, 'long-term faculty' was the term used and there were some definitions.
- A. Newman: Point of order. I'm sorry, we're going over time. What I would like to recommend for now is that we table these motions and re-visit them at the start of the next year. I apologize, the motions are on the table.
- J. Venkataraman: Are we voting on the motion that Senate recommend that all colleges have a mechanism to report and reward DEI activities? (Motion #2) This is not going to go into E.6 or anything like that, is it?
- S. Rothenberg: No, it's just a mechanism, so at the end of the year, you have a list which highlights what people are doing, and have some awards. It's a very watered-down version of putting it in the annual report. But I wasn't sure if we were going to vote this time.
- H. Ghazle: Maybe what we can do is we can make a motion to table them, but not indefinitely.
- S. Rothenberg: That's fine.
- H. Ghazle: So I move to table them.
- C. Lutzer: Seconded.
- J. Venkataraman: The second motion is something they've been working on for a couple of years. We can go ahead with that.
- A. Newman: Will you amend your motion to table one but not the other?
- H. Ghazle: I amend my motion to allow the second motion to move forward.
- S. Rothenberg: Can I ask one question in response to Torrence? Would it be possible to fit the other one in sometime soon?
- A. Newman: The earliest we might be able to do it, and that's a really big if, is on May 4<sup>th</sup>, but that would require everyone be really quick and not talk. In any case, what we will do now is we will first vote to table the first motion and then we will vote on the second one. All in favor of tabling



the first motion (to hire a full-time person) please raise your flags.

- H. Ghazle: 34 in favor, 1 opposed and 2 abstentions.
- A. Newman: We will now vote on the second motion.
- H. Ghazle: 32 in favor, 2 opposed and 3 abstentions.
- S. Rothenberg: Thank you. I will try to get the report on what this person will be doing before this comes up again.

[Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee End of Year Report Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 11: Long Range Planning and Environment Committee End of Year Report; M. Indelicato (1:40) *Presentation linked below*

- This is the committee's summary based on the charges that we had. Ventilation, masking, COVID, disruptions of that nature. The executive committee suggested we look at these in relation to campus policies. To do that we divided the committee up into four different subgroups. As far as financial exigency is concerned, we thought it would be good to have a definition of what that actually means and we recommend instituting a committee to work with the President to determine if there are different alternatives to terminating faculty appointments, for example, that faculty be offered relocation within the institute. As to who might serve on the committee, we thought a mixture of both tenured and non-tenure track to give us broader input. There are two different policies here, E.22 and E.20. And they're not consistent with regard to the amount of time that a tenured faculty member has to make a decision. Not only do we think they should be the same, but also that ten days is not enough time to make a decision that is pretty impactful on the individual faculty member and their family, so we recommend that be extended out to one month.
- As far as business continuity is concerned, we recommend that there be a template making clear what the process is for invoking and overseeing the business. A general question is who actually is involved in the process because the documents aren't exactly explicit.
- With regard to emergency action, we would like to see it made seamless and accessible to all members of the community, for example, defining who the first point of contact is for certain emergencies. Usually it'll be Campus Safety, but it might not be. Last year, we talked about the fact that our deaf and hard of hearing community don't have equivalent access to information. Since policies were being developed every week, it wasn't easy for those folks to get the information that they needed. So we think a dashboard with several tabs would be a really good idea, not just for COVID, but for any emergency that might affect people both on and off campus.
- With regard to an armed intruder on campus, we feel that Campus Safety should be a more visible campus safety presence here on the grounds. RIT does have the ability to deploy armed personnel with long guns. Campus Safety is available to hold training courses for anybody who's interested in the department.
- With regard to ventilation, we favor making more doorstops available, rather than having to use a chair. The committee didn't have time to get to the emergency health management charge so we're tabling that to next year. As regards instructional continuity, I think we have learned a lot over the past few years. It's a good idea to have a department policy for when things happen. I think we have certain policies in place already at the Institute level. An emergency response team would be a team that would be available to give recommendations based on national trends. Chris is available to help us in this area.
- Here are the references that we used and the documents that we've looked into. Otherwise we don't have any motions for Senate to vote on.
  - A. Newman: Thank you. We're over time and I'd like to ask that if senators have questions or

comments they reach out to you individually.

[Long Range Planning and Environment Committee End of Year Report Presentation](#)

Agenda Item 12: New Business; A. Newman (n/a)

There was no new business

Agenda Item No. 13: Adjournment; A. Newman (1:52)

## Attendance April 20, 2023

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

Laury, Dino	NTID Senator	x	Zlochower, Yosef	COS Senator	x
Lawley, Elizabeth	Vice Chair/GCCIS Senator				

**Interpreters: Eric Severson and Jennifer Mura**

**Student Assistant: Guru Goutham Gangadharappa Ramesha**

**Presenters: George Thurston, Sarah Thompson, Sandra Rothenberg and Mark Indelicato**