

Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, April 27, 2023

12:15 – 1:50 PM

Zoom

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. Johnston
Seconded (NAME): E. D’Amanda

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

- Having received no suggestions for edits to the draft minutes of the 4/20 meeting, I move they be approved.
 - R. Ulin:: Seconded
- Approved by acclamation

[April 20, 2023 Meeting Minutes](#)

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

- A.Newman: I would like to remind senators of the retreat scheduled for May 2nd. If you have not yet RSVP’d please do so. We will be discussing a number of possible changes to B.2 at the retreat and are looking for to some robust conversation.
- I will not cede my time to Senate vice-chair to conduct the election for next year’s Executive Committee.
- L. Lawley: Because we only have one candidate for each position, I would like to do this by unanimous consent.
 - B. Thomas: Who are we approving?
 - A. Newman: I am running for chair, S. Malachowsky for vice-chair, H. Ghazle for operations officer, S. Aldersley for communications officer and K. Barone for treasurer.
- L. Lawley: Since none of the positions are contested, may I ask for unanimous consent?
- Passed by unanimous consent.

Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; J. Prescott (12:20)

- My only update is that our SC committees are finalizing their end-of-year reports and we are looking forward to the staff picnic on May 16th.

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

- SG has its final Senate meeting this Friday. We hope to pass some bylaw amendments regarding senator roles, and our Greek Senator has proposed changes to the Finance committee. We've spent a lot of time approving people for empty cabinet and committee chair positions

Agenda Item No. 7: Academic Support Student Affairs Committee Charge; K. Leipold (12:22)

Presentation linked below

- K. Leipold: On April 13th, we presented our committee's recommendation to amend the language regarding the deadline for faculty to notify students of suspected academic misconduct. After the motion was tabled, we followed up with John Mortimer and instead of 14 days and based on feedback from the Senate, we recommend 15 business days. We made some revisions to the policy about encouraging email only, verified appropriate office names, confirmed that this was appropriate with Student Conduct and the Ombuds. The existing policy says that notification can be in either writing or email, within three calendar weeks of the incident. And this is what we are proposing as our revised wording to policy. D08.V.B.
 - J. Venkataraman: I still have concerns about re-defining business day. The business day is defined in the Grievance policy in E.24.2 where it's defined as Monday through Friday during the academic year, fall and spring semester and does not include RIT holidays or the summer term. Re-defining it in another policy with something else causes confusion, and the grievance policy is very important, so I think it's not a good idea to re-define it here. You can even refer to it in this policy, as 'business day' is defined in E.24.2.
 - K. Leipold: I pulled this definition of business day directly out of Student Conduct's definition, so it's already being described in multiple ways in different locations. I understand your concern, but being that it's a more of a student facing policy, I would probably connect it back to Student Conduct's definition. I do have a concern about a faculty member noticing this right after spring semester finals, and then sitting on it for the entire summer term.
 - J. Venkataraman: I know if there are multiple definitions of business day, that is a problem. Maybe that should be cleaned up. But if you've checked that this conforms with student business days, I guess it's fine.
 - E. Lawley: I don't think it makes sense to have a single definition of business days for RIT as a whole. Faculty are on different contract lengths. The reason the grievance policy uses the dates that it does is that there's not an expectation that you are available to respond to and address concerns during a period of time that you're not on contract. We have a lot of things that talk about business days that are in the context of the academic year. But the idea that it has to be within 15 business days of the discovery of the incident does create a real risk that you discover it during Finals week, and nobody is notified until classes begin again in the fall. I think that's problematic. In fact, the reason for defining it in this policy is to clarify that in the context of this policy this is what a business day means, so I would not be in favor of changing that, because I think there are significant negative consequences. I do understand the importance of defining business days, because, like you, Jayanti, I have had to deal with that counting of days in the context of grievances, but that gets defined in that specific policy, and I think this one is pretty clear as it is.
 - F. Deese: I have a question about the word 'discovery'. Whether that word encompasses confirmation or simply suspicion, because the incidents that I have experience with are usually plagiarism, and usually there is kind of a whiff of plagiarism. Does the start clock start running when you first suspect something or when you know for sure that this is a violation.
 - K. Leipold: I think that some of that confirmation comes from talking to the student, so that would be after notifying the student so I guess when you first feel that this is something you need

to talk to a student about, that's discovery.

- F. Deese: In my experience faculty are loathe to talk directly to a student until they're pretty sure it's plagiarism. So if there's the clock running there's going to be more of an incentive to possibly jump the gun?
- S. Malachowsky: I think this is probably a rational way of approaching it, because it's really hard to know what the burden of proof is. We're not in a court of law, and I know it's a little bit vague, but I think it's a strong enough word that's better than suspicion, but not absolute proof, I think discovery probably is an appropriate word for this.
- A. Newman: Kate, is this a motion?
- K. Leipold: Yes, we'd like to move to update the wording for policy D08.V.B.
- A. Newman: Thank you. Do we have any further discussion?
- S. Malachowsky: I have a question about the capitalization of the 'Graduate School.' Is that a proper noun or the one that's referenced earlier in that sentence?
- K. Leipold: 'Graduate School' is the name of the department of the college that it goes to.
- S. Malachowsky: Okay. The Center for Student Conduct and Conflict Resolution is an actual college or university- level place. I would offer a friendly amendment to not capitalize it and say to the student's graduate program.
- E. Lawley: If you're making a motion to add 'RIT' before graduate school, then I second that motion.
- K. Leipold: The committee accepts the recommended change.
- A. Newman: Okay. Coming back to the motion itself, are there any objections to voting by unanimous consent. Seeing no objections, the motion is passed. Thank you very much.

[Academic Support Student Affairs Committee Charge Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 8: Global Education Committee End of Year Report; J. Cecchini (12:35) *Presentation linked below*

- Julie Cecchini: We had five charges this year. One was a carry-over charge, #s 2 and 5. It's to encourage and facilitate participation and input of global campus faculty at all levels of the governance system. This charge was presented to the Dean's Council with the Executive Committee last year and they were asked to make several changes which we feel we've done. We've also incorporated carry-over charge #s 1 and 4 into this. The intent of this charge is that each college base its own set of expectations on these guidelines. That would then be shared with the international locations which deliver those specific programs. So, as you know, not every college has a program at every campus. Global programs must meet the same standards established on the main campus. This is a requirement of Middle States and the New York Department of Education. To achieve this requires coordination on a variety of levels. And we have developed a 5-point strategic plan to do this: strategic planning; teaching and learning; research and scholarship; personnel; and technology.
- Strategic planning. This portion is based on RIT's current strategic plan, Greatness through Difference. There are three main points: a) main campus students get the opportunity to study, work and pursue experiential learning abroad; b) faculty and students engage in research with global partners; and c) increasing the number of international students enrolling at RIT main campus.
- Teaching and learning. The central operation of each academic unit consists of managing curriculum and students. Faculty are the key players in this. For curriculum, colleges need to articulate short, medium and long term plans and strategies for global education. Regarding students, managing students through curriculum is primarily handled at the local level. Some coordination is necessary when students participate in semester abroad programs. Regarding research and scholarship, global locations serve a different population of students. And this does allow for some deviation from Rochester-based curriculum.
- Research and scholarship. Our recommendations are based on two surveys that were taken of

administrators and faculty at the global campuses: create global campus sabbaticals which would promote faculty exchanges; establish global faculty Provost enhancement and development grants, also global Provost learning initiation grants, which is the PLIG; address how faculty release time could be reviewed and allocated globally; share potential funding opportunities among the campuses; establish a central location where all research activity can be listed, which would encourage awareness and collaboration among the locations; create pathways for students to conduct research internationally; promote mentoring across all locations; and share what support is available with respect to writing and submitting of grant proposals.

- Personnel. The responsibility for delivering programs, no matter the location primarily belongs to faculty, full time, adjunct and visiting faculty. The hiring process, including search committees and various approvals, should be considered with global personnel in mind. Faculty from global locations should be formally linked to those in the home department and faculty who teach in a program should be afforded the opportunity to help guide it. Diverse perspectives on curricular activities should be encouraged. Hiring of staff is predominantly the responsibility of the RIT and the global location. We recommend exact procedures be established and shared among faculty and administrators at all locations.
- Technology. This would incorporate sharing facilities, equipment, software, data, etc. This is potentially very complicated, but it doesn't need to be in the initial phase. Sharing things like databases across the global locations would benefit us in cost savings. It also would increase the availability of resources.
- Charges #2 and 3 have been merged together as well. They concern the appropriate scope with rationales in which to collect and report faculty engagement. There are three questions. Why: why collect information on global activities? What: what information will help us to best enhance our international presence. And how: how will this relevant data be collected?
- Why? globally engaged faculty help drive institutional distinction. They ensure cultural vitality. They advance our goals as a diverse and dynamic scholarly community. The importance of this is reflected in Dimension Four of the institute's current strategic plan governing partnerships. What? Proposed categories for international activities that would be reported would be scholarly dissemination with international collaborators: funding with international collaborators; international visits for scholarly activities, including teaching or curriculum development; international professional services with leadership; international visitor hosting; community; and voluntary engagement. How? This is probably the most complicated part of this. Currently, the Global Office collects information in a piecemeal fashion which is ineffective. The method they've been using is surveys, but the response rate is low, and they feel that significant global engagement activities have been missed. The QS score, the world university ranking, is a way to see how engaged RIT faculty are. Outside the United States the QS score is highly regarded. For the China campus, the jobs students from our campus can get is based on the Institute's score. RIT is making a concerted effort to improve our score. Peer review of each school's scholarly activities has a heavy impact on this. RIT's current rankings are quite low. More comprehensive vehicles for collecting data are available. Currently, the Saunders College of Business has an electronic reporting platform which automatically populates faculty members' scholarship reports and perhaps could be modified to gather global engagement data. It's worth considering a task force to look at different commercial options available and make recommendations on one that would work best for RIT.

○ B. Thomas: Some of us have talked about the possibility of collaborating with people in some of our global campuses. I do a lot of work with infectious diseases so collaborating with people outside of the US would be very interesting to me. Regarding gathering collaborative work with international partners, we had this discussion at RIT several years ago about how to gather faculty publications. The system we have right now is not working. Three or four years ago, Joel Kasner led a committee, and my understanding was that they were at the point of selecting a particular software that would be used all over the campus. That system is not working yet. I don't know if the provost would like to comment.

○ E. Granberg: I think you are referring to an effort that was led by Carmy Garzione when she was associate provost for academic affairs to look at options for an enterprise system to replace the faculty scholarship report that used to be done by the library. I believe they had recommended one or two packages when the pandemic hit. This is in Laverne's office and she is really interested in being able to acquire the software and implement it. The two big issues now are budget for the license and getting in line with other enterprise conversions that are currently

going on. It's definitely something that would be really useful. These systems are typically a part of a broader faculty activity system. It can make annual evaluations faster and easier. We do have an internal scholarship reporting system. but it is really clunky, so we've really pulled away from using it.

- A. Newman: I'm tempted to ask if there are any plans for updating this, but I'm assuming you're leaving that for your successor.

[Global Education Committee End of Year Report Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 9: Academic Affairs Committee End of Year Report; L. Buckley (12:52) *Presentation linked below*

- This report covers seven different charges, some of which will carry over to next year. The first I'll talk about today was a charge to consider extending the grading deadline. Having worked with the registrar's office the committee recommends that when the semester ends on a Friday, the deadline should be extended to Sunday night. Can we vote on this now?
 - A. Newman: We can. Is there any discussion?
 - S. Malachowsky: Can you clarify?
 - L. Buckley: The motion applies to when final grades are due on a Friday night.
 - S. Malachowsky: There is some stickiness because of graduation. You could have people walking that didn't pass a class.
 - L. Buckley: That's true of the current system. Joe Loffredo's concern is that if we say Sunday night, people will wait until Monday. It's a slippery slope argument. This is not a small ask of the registrar's office, but Joe gave the impression he can live with it.
 - A. Newman: Is there any objection to approving this recommendation by unanimous consent? Seeing none, the recommendation is approved.
- L. Buckley: Another of our charges was to do an assessment of AI generators and how they can be used in cheating. We didn't address this yet and recommend it carry over to next year.
- The next charge I'm going to discuss is one the committee has had for multiple years. It pertains to reviewing and revising the current policy regarding academic integrity violations (D08.0). We looked at three different sources: 1) the current D.08 policy; 2) a proposed revision that was developed and circulated by the committee in AY20/21, only to stall when COVID hit; and, 3) the comments that that committee collected at the time from various campus stakeholders like Student Conduct and Student Affairs. Using those sources, we developed a new version, and we would now like to ask Senate for permission to circulate it among campus stakeholders. It really needs to be vetted because it's such an important policy. There's already been a revision to it earlier in this meeting! I'd like to give an executive level summary of the main differences that we've included in this new version. I have given Tamaira the draft that you can look at and suggest revisions to. I do expect that this is going to go into next year. What we did was we broke the policy in 6 main parts: Introduction; Definitions; Academic Integrity Expectations; Academic Integrity Initial Procedures; Academic Integrity Hearing Procedures; Academic Integrity Appeal Process. The first two parts are broadly similar to the existing policy. Regarding expectations, the current policy has three general areas of violation which we are proposing to expand to seven. Particularly important here is the inclusion of details about web-specific violations, because those have really ballooned. We've also reworked the possible sanction section to include statements on professional programs because they have specific needs associated with student conduct and particular academic integrity. We also emphasize in the new version that sanctions may need to be based on program-specific concerns. In other words, sanction

severity might differ program to program. The next section concerns procedures, beginning with the initial procedures that take place in the process prior to a hearing, if the instructor and the student have not been able to reach a resolution. Prior to a hearing there are some really important steps, and one of those is what we just heard earlier in this meeting concerning the timeline to notify a student of a violation. There's a related issue concerning whether or not we make an exemption for PhD students. Another procedural aspect in the current policy that has received a lot of complaints is the requirement for multiple meetings to decide whether a hearing is justified. This is especially onerous and stressful, so our current draft reduces the number of meetings to one after the initial notification of the student by the faculty member. In preparing the new draft we looked at the D.08 policies at many universities, and many of them force their colleges themselves to independently maintain the records of student integrity violations even for students outside their college. The problem with that is, when there's no central repository for those violations, it becomes virtually impossible to know when a student is a repeat offender. Right now at RIT, the Student Conduct Office serves that role and we think that should be maintained. Moving on now to the hearing procedures, we are recommending that each college establish an ad hoc committee, first because the academic integrity cases are non-predictable.

- A. Newman: I hate to interrupt, but you're a little over your time.
- L. Buckley: Let me suggest that everybody read through the Powerpoint. Please use track changes to note any suggestions you may have and send them directly to our committee.
- L. Buckley: The next charge we had was an online learning policies. We need to move this to next year because we didn't make any progress. The same is true for the next one, concerning contact and credit hours. The last thing I want to report is that Student Government came to us this year with some changes to policy D03, the registration policy. The first is that in SIS right now it can be difficult for a student to discover what the specific course requirements are for a course, particularly with regard to textbooks, and this is partly because some faculty don't adopt textbooks until close to the start of the semester. SG would like to see faculty be required to put information about what they're requiring in a course into SIS. SG's second recommendation is to change the add drop procedure by extending the drop period for 2 more weeks. Our recommendation is to move these to a charge for our committee or some other standing committee next year.

[Academic Affairs Committee End of Year Report Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 10: Inter-college Curriculum Committee End of Year Report; H. Nickisher (1:02)
Presentation linked below

- ICC had its last meeting yesterday. There have been a couple of changes to the document that was circulated to senators. First, our response to Charge #1 which will need to carry over to next year. I said earlier that we would like to come to Senate next week to present our suggested modifications to Policy D.1 on curriculum development. However, when committee members vetted our suggestions with their respective college committees, they received a lot of pushback on some of the proposed changes, so we are not ready to bring them to Senate. One of the things that was really consistent in the feedback, however, was a repeated emphasis on the need for a curriculum management system. We do hope to bring a version of the document to Senate at the beginning of next year. We also discussed Charge #1 in connection with #2, and how we might come up with any kind of policies that might be effective for ABB, should it happen. Anything that might be done for #1 depends on whether #2 goes through. For Charge #3, we worked with the DEIC. I believe they have decided to postpone bringing the motion to Senate to recommend creation of a university-wide position. But with regard to their second recommendation to charge each college to appoint a faculty member, just this morning, my dean sent something out about appointing one faculty member and one staff member to work on DEI initiatives in CAD next year, so it seems some of these efforts are coming from the bottom up rather than top down. So unless either one of us receives any additional related charges, I think that work is done for now. Charge #4 is one of the primary

functions of the ICC and we looked at 5 Minor proposals and 2 academic degree programs. Lastly #5, again one of the primary functions of the ICC. This was something that was identified at the end of last year. However, it got low priority this year because of our focus on Charges #1 & #2. It will be first up in the new year.

[Inter-college Curriculum Committee End of Year Report Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 11: Research and Scholarship Committee End of Year Report; B. Lohse (1:08)
Presentation linked below

- Our standing charges are to formulate, monitor and review policies pertaining to research operations and facilities, compliance and infrastructure. It could take five years to do just one of those things. Also, we are the Senate liaison with the Vice President of Research as well as other administrators. We really focused this year on the IRB policy 5.0. We had Heather Foti revise the policy, we went over it and decided that although it's not perfect, and there are several concerns with it, we feel that the committee needs to move this forward to get additional input from other interested people.
- There are three other issues that we feel need to be carried forward to next year: 1) the scholar work system is obsolete and we need to identify a replacement; 2) development of a research portal that will integrate some of the research office functions with the IRB to help researchers be more aware of deadlines. We have started work on this, but faculty researchers have not been made aware of what's available; consideration of open scholarship, so that RIT can move forward with research.
- We had several continuing charges from previous years. One was to look at dependent care and reimbursement for dependent care. We decided this is an HR issue, and not aligned with our committee's function. Another was the idea of creating a task force, outside of our committee, where we would have some centralized statistical support. We strongly recommend that this be something that RIT needs to look at. Another charge is related to a faculty scholarship information system. This has been considered for quite a while and our recommendation is that the Provost's Office initiate some market research with a balanced group of faculty and administrators, and develop an action plan. If we want to be serious about research, we need to be looking at this. Charge #4 was about professional faculty leave and the sabbatical prioritization system, especially looking at how colleges might be able to fund incremental sabbaticals. We did not get a chance to discuss this particular charge. Institute Scholarship Allocation was another charge we did not get to. It concerns the current merit scholarship and tuition remission policy and practices for research-based MS programs. Another charge concerned ensuring that female faculty have the same opportunities as male faculty to teach advanced undergraduate and graduate classes. We had some communication with Advance on this issue and we will continue to work with them. Regarding a charge to look at the Intellectual Property Policy, we decided this was outside our scope. Charge #8 concerns human subjects. We reviewed the current policy, preliminary revisions that were proposed last year, and changes that were proposed this year and we would like to move the revised policy forward for consideration and this will be part of our final report.
- We also have some current charges. This is a charge regarding how to evaluate people when they're on leave? For this, we determined that the scholarship accomplished during any leave should be counted in the following academic year for Faculty's Merit Review. Charge 11 was to make recommendations on how to strengthen the library holdings. We reviewed the ad hoc Holdings Committee report and we agree with their conclusions that the limited holdings of the RIT library could actually impede realization of our strategic goal to grow research programs. The report had five recommendations: increase the annual materials budget; secure off-campus archival storage; provide more professional staffing; establish an institute library advisory committee; conduct an external review of the library every five to ten years. We also recommend exploring external funding opportunities for a new library building.
- We are proposing two new charges. Eric Williams of GIS has proposed that we consider an IOU deferral system for first-year Ph.D student stipends. For example, where a faculty member has a research grant that would cover the first year of study but not the second, it would make sense to defer the first year of the Ph.D support to the second year. Lastly, a charge related to the growing practice of federal agencies and philanthropic entities to look at academic research and scholarship in terms of the Open Science construct.

This has a large potential impact on our university policies, practices, operations and facilities.

- B. Thomas: This committee has previously discussed the fact that Heather Foti has no committee to assist her. We recommended that a committee be established to work with her. Were you able to make any progress on that?
- B. Lohse: It is something that we discussed, especially because of some of the new degrees and programs where we'll be having more human subjects research. So, yes, it's something that we want to move forward on. We felt the first thing was to deal with the IRB policy since that is out of date.

[Research and Scholarship Committee End of Year Report Presentation](#)

Agenda Item 12: New Business; A. Newman (1:21)

- S. Johnson): I wanted to point out that the item that we just passed about extending grading deadlines will not go into effect this semester. So please don't think that you are going to have an extra two days this semester to grade after finals!
- B.Dell: I just wanted to go on the record about having the Senate meeting on Reading Day. Advance RIT has been working with Laverne's office about strengthening the guidelines for having meetings on Reading Day. That said, I personally prefer it on Reading Day rather than on the eleventh, and I can understand that others may feel that way too. But in general, I think we should try to follow the guidelines that Laverne's office has put out to avoid scheduling meetings on Reading Day.
 - A. Newman: I'm glad that you brought that up. This is something the Executive Committee discussed in great detail. The first thing I'd like to point out is that Faculty Senate is a governance group, not an administrative group, and in saying that administrative work should not be carried out at particular times of the year, the policy does make that distinction explicit. The other thing is that we didn't think we would have a lot of participation on the 11th since it's so close to the end of the contract year, and everyone will be grading and not really interested in discussing the future of governance at RIT. We also took into account the fact that we are giving our final report on the 4th and since we plan to bring motions for the Senate to vote on, we thought it would be good to have a conversation about those beforehand. Let me also say, with all due respect to the Provost and Laverne and others who attend Senate meetings, that this meeting is restricted to faculty only. I know there has been a concern in the past that some senators may not feel comfortable stating opinions when there are others in the room.
 - J. Venkataraman: Reading Day is supposed to be when faculty are available to students to answer questions and hold office hours.
 - A. Newman: We are planning for the meeting to be held from noon to 2:30, not a big chunk of the day, so hopefully it won't be very disruptive.
 - M.L. Reed: I didn't know about a meeting on Reading Day. Was it just announced today? And we do run sessions in math for students in the afternoon. So I agree it's a difficult time.
 - A. Newman: We announced it last week or a couple of weeks ago and we've been sending reminders.

Agenda Item No. 13: Adjournment; A. Newman (1:44)

Attendance April 27, 2023

Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended	Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended
Abushagur, Mustafa	KGCOE Senator		Lee, James	ALT CET Senator	
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	x	Ma, Yunn-Shan	ALT CLA Senator	
Babbitt, Gregory	COS Senator	x	Malachowsky, Samuel	Treasurer/ GCCIS Senator	x
Bamonto, Suzanne	CLA Senator	Excused	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		Perez Sanchez, Alejandro	CAD Senator	
Crawford, Denton	CAD Senator		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	x
Dell, Betsy	CET Senator	x	Ross, Annemarie	ALT NTID Senator	
Dibble, Leah	Student Government Rep		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	
Gehret, Austin	NTID Senator	x	Thomas, Bolaji	CHST Senator	x
Ghazle, Hamad	Operations Officer/CHST Senator	Excused	Tobin, Karen	NTID Senator	x
Granberg, Ellen	Provost	x	Tsukernik, Olga	ALT COS Senator	
Hazelwood, David	NTID Senator	x	Ulin, Robert	CLA Senator	x
Heyman, Emily (sub Joanna Prescott)	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	
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	x
Kray, Christine	CLA Senator	x	Worrell, Tracy	ALT CLA Senator	x
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	x			

Interpreters: Nic Crouse-Dickerson and Jennifer Mura

Student Assistant: Guru Goutham Gangadharappa Ramesha

Presenters: Kate Leipold, Julie Cecchini, Larry Buckley and Barbara Lohse