

Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, September 7, 2023

12:15 – 1:50 PM

Campus Center 2610/2650

Attendance: See Below

Agenda Item No. 1: Call to Order; A. Newman (12:16p)
Meeting called to order.
Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; A. Newman (12:17p)
Motion: A. Newman Seconded: H. Ghazle Approved by acclamation
Agenda Item No. 3: Communication Officer's Report/Approval of Minutes; S. Aldersley (12:17p)
<p>S. Aldersley: Senators should have received two sets of minutes, one from the May 5th meeting and one from the orientation meeting last week. I received no feedback and therefore move that both sets be approved.</p> <p>Seconded: A. McLaren Approved by acclamation</p> <p>May 4, 2023 Meeting Minutes</p> <p>August 31, 2023 Meeting Minutes</p>
Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; A. Newman (12:18p)
<p>A. Newman: I would like to acknowledge the passing of Ulrike Stroszeck of the Department of Modern Languages and Cultures. Uli was an active member of Senate for many, many years. Diane Forbes will speak in her memory.</p> <p>D. Forbes: Uli taught German at RIT for 18 years, having previously taught at several other universities including Duke, where she was department chair.. She always had a spring in her step and a smile on her face. You will never meet a nicer person. During all my years here I have never seen another teacher as enthusiastic and energetic in class and as dedicated to her students and her material. She was a wonderful teacher. She was very active in department activities including Brick City and Imagine RIT. She was really serious about the quality of our Study Abroad program.</p> <p>Her PhD was in French. She had studied Camus and, like many of us, she came to learn a lot about Sisyphus pushing the rock uphill over and over again. She kept her illness private. Life is short. Make the most of it because it passes by very quickly. Take care of each other and don't suffer alone. We could all use Uli's life as an example of how to live a generous, kind, happy, full life. I'd like to ask for a moment of silence for her.</p>

Agenda Item No. 5: Board of Trustees Presentation; J. Harris (12:22p) *Presentation linked below*

J. Harris: Thank you. I'm going to show a handful of charts that will allow us to interact with any questions or dialogue that you might have. I am an alum of the University having graduated from what's now the Imaging Science program. I've been a trustee for about 18 years and November will be my second of a three-year term as Chair. The Board's responsibilities arise from New York State nonprofit law. We think a lot about governance. We hire capable administrators to run the Corporation. When there is a presidential vacancy, the Board forms a search committee and empowers them to hire a search firm to help us with the selection. Their recommendation is then voted on by the Board of Trustees. The President is then responsible for hiring the provost. That's the governance model that we operate in.

RIT is a Research University, with national international prestige. In selecting Board members, we want to get a breadth of understanding and knowledge, so we look especially for university alumnae and a wide geographical distribution. We have 41 active Trustees and the 29 emeritus Trustees many of whom are active participants but they do not vote. We have a President's Roundtable that is separate from the Board of Trustees that gives advice and counsel to the President. For example, President Munson might say, 'Here's an issue that I'm wrestling with' and give an hour- long presentation to the Roundtable. The Roundtable might say, 'This is interesting. It's compelling but maybe you are missing this. Have you thought about this?' Then the presentation might be redone, and a 20-minute version would go to the trustees.

RIT is a corporation with about a billion dollar operation. It's not for the trustees to micromanage. But it can happen that there's a systemic problem that we're just getting wrong. I think back to my first trustee meeting. We were in executive session, and the President said 'I'm thinking through what protections we need to give students.

Sometimes they may put things on social media that may stick with them in the digital world forever. And which might harm their job prospects. They're here to learn, and we're here to nurture. Where's the line? I listened to an hour's worth of input. We had the Chief Diversity Officer of Eastman Kodak, the CAO from the General Motors company, the chairman of the board of Bausch & Lomb. We had accomplished people in the room and after an hour's conversation, the person sitting next to me said to the whole group, 'I think parents send their kids to College to grow up. We ought to give them enough room to test the limits while they're in college. It's a safer place to make mistakes.' And I was won over on how the decision was still the President's, but the richness of the conversation was real.

When I was elected Chair-Elect, I got to shadow the outgoing chair for a year. In our bi-weekly meetings with the President, I was asked to be an observer, so I had a year under my belt of shadowing, and that was instrumental in a smooth transition. We've just downsized the number of committees from 17 to ten and a half. They're listed here. Some of us believed we had spread Board members' knowledge of RIT too thin. We had trustees who were experts on enrollment but didn't understand research. So by reducing the number of committees and increasing the commitment of time and purposely rotating trustees around committees, after 10 or 15 years, you've served on three or four committees. And you now understand the interactions amongst administrators and deans much better than you would have. The executive committee of the Board meets essentially once a month and since the chairs of each committee are members of the executive committee, the chair and the vice chairs can look to the committee chairs to work across topical elements. We are a University. The students are our product and it all comes back to are we giving them a set of experiences that make an RIT education worth it.

R. Ulin: I understand the emphasis on the board of trustees in terms of having members who have deep ties and commitment to RIT. But I wonder if any discussion has taken place about having a few positions on the board for people who come directly from the leadership of the Rochester community.

J. Harris: About six years ago, during an open discussion, it was pointed out that there is a Rochester Prep, K-9, but there is no Rochester Prep, 9-12, and one of the Trustees said he would like to give a gift to the community, to help with the success of Rochester Prep by leveraging our faculty. One of the trustees at that meeting was then Mayor of Rochester, Tom Richards. We engaged with the school board and the Union and a decision was taken to establish a lottery system for entrance into Rochester Prep and RIT is now getting maybe 18 students last year from Rochester Prep that are coming through the RT ecosystem. Three Rochester Prep students were named on a paper with Andre Hudson for finding the first bacterium in the world that was aggressive towards other bacteria. And that doesn't happen in very many high schools where you get to be on a peer reviewed paper. So we're establishing lives. And that happened because the University was working with the city. If we don't have a role in the Town and Gown part of your question, then we're not fulfilling our responsibilities.

The Vice-Chair of the Board, Susan Holliday, former President of Rochester Business Journal was a purposeful selection. At any one time, RIT Trustees are either on the UR Hospital Board or other institutions. I think we have a very loud voice in town.

Senator: Does the Board have any way to speak directly to faculty about issues?

J. Harris: Yes. Is it enough? Never. I've had the luxury while serving as a trustee to serve on the College of Science Advisory Board, and I was advisor to the Center for Imaging Science and that allowed me to come and spend three or four days a year talking to faculty and students about programs. And being an RIT graduate and systems thinker,

when presented with data by the Dean, I said, “that can't be true.” And the very next meeting, we would have a panel of seven students and what was interesting to me was at the end of meeting the Dean said, ‘I have time to handpick students, I simply put an email out asking who's available at 02:00 to come speak with my Advisory Board on how we're teaching calculus to freshmen and how we're integrating undergraduate research.’ So for eight or ten years, I’ve been asking questions and getting the answers directly from the students. And then as a trustee, I would take some of that meaningful learning and take it back into the trustees and say, ‘here's what I learned, on how we're teaching organic chemistry in ASL sign language and here's the data showing how some of the educational outcomes have changed.

Chris Licata is no stranger to the Board of Trustees, and under our old committee structure, the academic side talked specifically about educational outcomes and the responsibility of the Trustees to own that was real. And then talking to faculty as we've moved from a lecture-centered university to a research-focused university and recognizing the stresses around the faculty and how we’ve managed through the last 18 years around that, numerous conversations around that. So never enough. We had a nice conversation a year ago with Clyde telling us what we needed to think about and I thought that was the Faculty Senate speaking with a clear, concise voice. My favorite email of all time was when I was working on the Strategic Plan from the trustee perspective and Dr. Destler was working from the bottom up with administrators and people that know what they're really doing, and a group called the Faculty Salon published a very nice email that said that from their perspective the strategic plan is going the wrong way, ‘Here's how they should think about it’. And the email was forwarded to me. It had some valid points in it and the line I loved the best was, ‘What do trustees know about running a University?’ Great question. I said what I do know is we need to have lunch with these faculty. So we hosted a lunch over in the University Services Building, with six faculty and six trustees. And at the end of it, if you had taken a poll as to which side of the table got more out of it, it would have been a draw. It was fabulous. We've done that, probably two, maybe three times. In a slightly different format but a very rich exchange.

H. Ghazle: Could you elaborate on the Board’s vision for the future? What are you thinking regarding how we are going to grow over the next two to five years.

J. Harris: From the Board perspective, your question would be better for 15 or 20 years. Because we're not supposed to fix things that are too near in. For example, I recently heard the same squeak in the same wheel from three faculty and their dean over the course of seven months.. But when I asked the administration about it, I was told it was not really a problem. Then I heard another little squeak. And in my conversation with Dr. David yesterday, he said it was on his radar within the first six weeks on the job, and he recognized that it was sort of a problem and needed to be fixed. But as a trustee, I don't want to be the mechanic on tactical issues that need to be fixed.

But your question is about vision. Our vision is clearly stated in the Strategic Plan. Dr. Munsen and I talked today about the process for drafting the next strategic plan and how important Dr. David's voice is going to be in that.

We're all creatures with a lot of muscle memory - here's how we've always done it, ever since we were the Mechanics Institute. 15 years ago, I learned from the faculty that we should not be threatened as a residential university by online education because parents don't want their kids in the basement. They want them here learning from us, and they want it at a school where the probability of them moving back into the basement is low. So we said here's what we're going to do to define ourselves with distinctive programs that address today's problems of the world. And we're going to deliver them to get creative, thinker, innovator, game-changing behaviors out of our students. I just finished a meeting where we're looking at the market place and our peer schools, some of which are really struggling to onboard a freshman class. We’re fighting every day to get the right freshman class and the tuition revenue that we need to empower this enterprise with the differentiated programs that you provide.

But we are hobbled by our six-year graduation rate which is killing us in the marketplace. We are penalized in the national ranking - we're above 100 because of our six year graduation rate. We now know because of good work why some of that is. And we know how to fix it. It's going to take six years. We had a freshman to sophomore class that didn't persist. Two points below the previous average persistence, which kills our graduation rate. We don't get those students back. Our academic advising has been remarkable. The Board had lunch with the academic advisors in June. We are focused on assuring that if we bring you into our ecosystem, we will get you out in four or five years with a reasonable amount of debt and a good paying job and a future. We know what we need to do, why we need to do it, what the market demands are on us. And now we have to get the market to treat us the way we want to be treated. And if we ask what rabbit do we have to pull out of the hat in order not to worry about these stress cracks, the rabbit we have is the faculty at RIT that differentiates us. That we have gone from a \$30 million research program to a \$94 million research program over six years speaks volumes. So part of that says, if you look in the mirror, not bad, but if you look in the looking glass, we have some work to do.

So, welcome to a world where education meets business.

A. Newman: Thank you Jeff. Now, going back to the Executive Committee report, the first thing I was going to say was welcome to our new Provost, with Dr. Prabu David. Coming up next week, we have the President’s State of the University address and I will be speaking at that event. Next week, again at this time and in this place, we have a luncheon to which all Standing Committee members are invited. Please remember to RSVP and encourage your Standing Committee members to do so as well since I am trying to make sure that our Senate interacts with our Senate Committee members as much as possible.

S. Malachowsky: Please note the row of empty seats here in front. In the hope of having Senate engage more with the standing committees, the ExComm is asking that one member of each committee attend Senate meetings in one of these seats. It's up to the committee to select which member it should be - it can be a senator who is already here - but we think that if the committees are formally recognized by virtue of their presence at meetings, that will enhance the interaction between Senate and its committees.

[Board of Trustees Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 6: Staff Council Update; B. Strowe (12:54p)

B. Strobe: Good afternoon, everyone. Staff Council will have our first meeting of the semester right after this meeting, when Jeff Harris will visit us too. And later this month we will host President Munson at our following meeting later this month. As we approach some of the issues and challenges before us, Staff Council is very excited to have the opportunity for more engagement with upper administration.

Agenda Item No. 7: Student Government Update; J. Long (12:55p)

J. Long: Hello, everybody. My name is Jake Long, the SG Senator for the College Engineering Technology. By way of a quick update, SG will have a two-day retreat this weekend. Our internal committees have been working on 15 separate issues this past two weeks.

Agenda Item No. 8: Senate At-Large Position nominations/elections; H. Ghazle (12:56p)

H. Ghazle: We got a good response from the Orientation meeting last week with volunteers to fill at-large positions on the standing committees. There are still slots available, so if you are interested, please nominate yourself or someone else.

There is a lot of information in the Google Drive available to you, including Robert's Rules.

B. Thomas: It would be nice to have representation from each college on the Grievance Committee. Engineering is not represented

H. Ghazle: The Grievance Policy does not specify where its members should come from, only that they be associate or full professors. That would require a change in policy.

A. Newman: We could look at that - though it's not entirely within our control. But for the moment, there are vacancies on the committee so someone from Engineering could volunteer.

Agenda Item No. 9: Charges Preview; A. Newman (1:03p)

A. Newman: I'd like now to give a small update on the charge selection process. We have surprisingly fewer charges than last year. Most of the charges in front of you have come from the committees themselves in their end-of-year reports. I would like to have the charges for most of our committees approved by the end of the next meeting on the 21st so that the committees can start work on them.

So far we have only five committees out of 13 who have elected their chairs. I'll begin with the charges for the Committee on Academic Support and Student Affairs (ASSA), they have a standing charge to monitor and review the aspects of the University that support education and teaching. They also are responsible for policy recommendations related to the academic aspects of student life. They have one carryover charge, which is in regard to the Disability Services Office and the resources that are available to them. This was a very big topic of discussion last spring. Besides that, there are two new charges that have come in from our outside stakeholders: one is to explore ways to streamline the process of declaring a minor, and the other is to change the grade requirement to receive credit for a transfer course from C or better to C- or better.

Does anyone have any comments?

By the way, Senators have access to this folder in the Google Drive, marked 'Faculty Senate – ALL.' For new senators, you should know that these are charges which you should be discussing with your constituents. Of course, just because something is charged doesn't mean it will necessarily result in specific recommendations from the relevant committee. It just means we are asking a committee to look into it.

Motion: To approve the charges for the Committee on Academic Support and Student Affairs

Seconded: B. Thomas

Vote: Approved 39:0:0

Senator ?: Does everyone on campus have access to the Google Drive?

A. Newman: Yes, everyone has access, and in any case, you are welcome to share with your constituents.

Next, the charges for the Committee on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI). They have one standing charge which is to review and where needed, make policy recommendations concerning diversity, equity and inclusion, as these might be relevant to Academic Affairs. At the end of last year the Committee itself suggested two charges for this year: first, to consider strategies for infusing DEI into the curriculum, and second, to review the new COACHE results with respect to DEI and identify areas for improvement.

P. David: There was some discussion I believe about having the option to report DEI activities in one's annual self-appraisal. What is the status of that?

A. Newman: It was put forward as a recommendation but no decision was made. If you would like, we could make that a charge for the DEIC as well.

J. Faber: I believe the current status is that it can be done on a college by college basis. The College of Science does have that.

B. Dell: I thought we did approve that last year. That every faculty member has the opportunity to report their DEI-related activities.

A. Newman: Was it a recommendation or was it a motion?

H. Ghazle: It was a recommendation, but it was not added to any policy.

A. Newman: This is an interesting conversation. When something comes forth as a recommendation, the Senate can endorse it, but to affect policy, it must come forward as a motion.

P. David: I would like to explore that if possible.

A. Newman: We can add that as a charge, but in the meantime, I would like to put the DEIC charges aside for the moment because otherwise it is too easy to lose track of what we are voting on.

Moving forward, we have the General Education Committee. In our request for charges this year, the GEC did not get any new charges, so we recommend that they simply work with their standing charge, as this is described in B.2

Motion: To approve the charges for the General Education Committee.

Seconded: S. Bamonto

Vote: Approved 38:0:1

A. Newman: I will skip over the Global Education Committee because they have a lot of charges. Let's go to some of the less contentious charges. First, the Honors Curriculum Committee. Once again, there was no new charge proposed for this committee, so I recommend they focus on their standing charge.

Motion: To approve the charges for the Honors Curriculum Committee.

Seconded: E. Weedon

Vote: Approved 38:0:1

A. Newman: Next, the Long Range Planning and Environment Committee. A similar situation, no new charges, simply their standing charge.

B. Thomas: I recall a discussion last spring about merging committees. Where did that discussion go?

A. Newman: I would like to bring that issue up once we have approved all the charges. There is a section of the Charter that allows the Senate to vote to rearrange our committees and reallocate people. The brunt of this year's charges is landing as usual on the FAC and ACC. We cannot change the ICC or the Graduate Council, but certain committees will always have a lot of work to do. What I would like to suggest, once Senate has taken full stock of this year's charges and the work that we are giving to each of the committees, is that we consider reallocation of people to where they are most needed.

Ideally, it would be wonderful if anyone has suggestions for how that reallocation should potentially take place. I have my ideas, but I don't want to push them onto the group.

I. Puchades: Did nobody bring forward any concerns or questions for this committee?

A. Newman: Exactly. So the way it goes is that the Executive Committee receives all the recommended charges and tries to parse them out into areas of responsibility. And up until now we haven't received any charge that says, for example, how is the University's strategic planning going.

I. Puchades: So does that mean that this committee will need to decide what they want to work on?

A. Newman: Beyond their standing charge, not really. Which is why we might want to reallocate their membership to where they will have more impact.

S. Aldersley: I think that's a somewhat contentious issue. I don't believe personally that the committee should decide itself what charges it wants to pursue. I think the charges should come from the Senate.

Motion: To approve the charges for the Long Range, Planning and Environment Committee.

Seconded: S. Johnson

Vote: Approved 38:0:1

A. Newman: So we've now wrapped up quite a good set of committees. Now we can look at some of the other charges. I don't think there'll be a need to vote on them. We can just look at them for now because they're a little bit more involved. Let's go to the University Writing Committee next.

They have their standing charge as outlined as B.10. Besides that, they have two continuing charges: to explore adding a requirement to the University's writing policy to recertify courses as Writing Intensive at some frequency between 5 and 10 years, and secondly, to Explore the University Writing Policy's writing requirements and expectations for total time, topics, effort, fraction of grade, and credit hours prior to graduation as appropriate. Besides those, they recommend two further charges: to collaborate with the University Writing Program to develop workshops and training for faculty based on the needs identified last year, and secondly, to collaborate with the UWP, DEIC, and other committees and departments as appropriate to develop and host workshops/tutorials/trainings for faculty about the negative impact that implicit and explicit linguistic bias has on students from diverse language backgrounds, and recommend how to address these issues in classrooms, assignment design, and syllabi.

Now we can move forward to the ICC. The ICC standing charge is to review policies which impact the undergraduate curriculum.

They have two carryover charges: first, to investigate approaches to reduce course duplication. This charge relates directly to the question of whether the University will move to an ABB budget model. Even though we don't have a decision on this yet it is something that would be helpful for us to be prepared for; second, they want to consult with appropriate committees, including Graduate Council and RABC, to investigate the need for an effective curriculum management system. In addition, they have proposed two new charges: first, to address a recently discovered inconsistency in the minor revision policy, and second, to investigate how many of the new programs that have been approved in the last five years have actually been implemented.

M. Laver: I'm generally not in favor of charges that introduce what we might call the fallacy of assuming the question behind the charge. The question assumes duplication of courses. So unless there's already been a report that shows in fact that there is course duplication, I would ask that the charge be to investigate whether there actually is

duplication, and if there is to only then propose solutions or policy changes.

A. Newman: What would you propose as a change?

M. Laver: I don't want to word-smith on the floor. But that's just my overall concern.

A. Newman: I think that's a very valid point.

B. Thomas: There was an extensive conversation last year about how we define course duplication. I don't know what the conclusion was.

J. Faber: For the second new charge for ICC, it currently only poses a yes/no question for each new program. Asking for a little bit more information might make for a much more interesting report. It shouldn't be too burdensome, but it would be good for all of us to hear a little bit more about how new programs are performing, for example, from the point of view of enrollment.

A. Newman: Would you like to propose an addition or change to the wording of the charge.

J. Faber: After the meeting.

A. Newman: For our new senators, or for those of you who may not be aware of this, you are allowed to word-smith a motion or to edit it to make it more suitable and more robust as a charge to a committee. So if you would like to propose alternate wording, you can do that. Then you would need a second, after which we would vote to approve just the wording change, not the charge itself. And then assuming approval of the wording change, we would then vote on the charge itself.

R. Zanibbi: Is there any additional information available about a decision on ABB?

A. Newman: The decision was supposed to have been made in the summer. Perhaps Dr. David would like to comment on it?

P. David: I've asked a group of deans and others dealing with the budget to look at ABB and give me recommendations for implementation.

R. Zanibbi: Is there a rough timeline?

P. David: The recommendations will come to me by the end of October, and then we'll have a discussion before we go into it.

A. Newman: That was very helpful. It looks like we have a couple of charges for ICC that need to be word-smithed. Like I said, these documents are available to you to add suggestions or comments, that is with the exception of the charges we have already approved.

We now come to Graduate Council charges. The Graduate Council is responsible for promoting the development and maintenance of high quality educational programs at the graduate level and see that policies and procedures that pertain to graduate programs are carried out effectively. They have four carryover charges. First, to support ICC and develop policies needed for effective curriculum management in the context of ABB. Second, to work with Deja Campbell, Assistant Registrar for Degree Audit and Course Planning to provide a structure for programs to use on tables regarding the term and usage of "electives" that is clear for reviewers, students, and can be implemented in Degree Audit. Third, to Review Policy D1.0 Curriculum for Advanced Certificates, to determine whether it should be comparable to the policy on undergraduate certificates, and fourth, to propose guidance for the development of Advanced Certificates. As for new charges, as with ICC at the undergraduate level, to review the extent to which new programs which have been approved over the past five years have actually been implemented. And to Josh's point earlier we should probably ask for more information. So I'm going to ask Josh to go in and make suggested word changes on both of those so that we can go ahead and vote on them when we come back.

J. Lanzafame: With regard to the charges to investigate a curriculum management system, it was my understanding that our prior provost had a proposal on her desk, but had not come to a decision.

N. Buch: It's a very timely question. Chris Licata, Joe Loffredo and I spent yesterday talking about the curriculum management system. So that conversation has restarted and very soon we'll have something in front of Provost David to comment on, so please stay tuned.

A. Newman: I sincerely hope that there is some room to include the ICC and the Graduate Council in the conversation.

N. Buch: Absolutely.

P. David: So there's a group that's working on it as a top priority. I spoke with the chair of ICC. It's just a matter of the 21-day enrollment. So in a couple of weeks, we'll know where we stand in terms of budget and this should be among the first set of items.

A. Newman: That is really very good news.

We have one final committee to look at, the Global Education Committee. The standing charge of this committee is to serve as the university level liaison between the Rochester campus and global RIT locations and to advise Senate on governance issues as they affect RIT global locations. After the Global Summit earlier this year, the committee members went back and collected information from the other campuses and as a result, in addition to their standing charge, they are proposing six new charges: first to consider rewording the standing charge to incorporate faculty and student engagement across campuses; second, to establish a standard to incorporate Global Campuses in the leadership of the committee, possibly with co-chairs, one from Rochester and one from one of the global campuses; third, to investigate ways in which the Committee may provide guidance for issues at Global Campuses between faculty and administration; fourth, spotlight International Engagement by means of a biennial event early in the fall focusing on faculty scholarship and future collaboration; fifth, make the planning for the Global Governance Summit a standing charge, and finally, sixth, make recommendations for regular updates on course outlines and syllabi, ensuring reasonable and appropriate objectives are being met. The role of this committee especially in facilitating and encouraging international activities involving research and study abroad is very important. There is some mixture with some of these charges between charge and rationale so, again, if anyone would like to make suggestions on rewording these charges, please do so.

J. Chiavaroli: One of the charges last year was to develop a document and I've been wondering if there's been any follow-up on that? We took it to Dean's Council last summer and would like to bring the revised document back to Senate.

A. Newman: Please do. That brings us back to the DEIC charge to gather information about the type of DEI-related activities that faculty might include in annual reports of their activities. So this is the third and final charge for the DEIC. We will put these charges aside for now.

Is there any new business?

Agenda Item 10: New Business; A. Newman (1:46p)

B. Thomas: I need to bring up the issue of parking in J Lot. There was a problem last year and now we've been moved further away from where we used to park. I paid extra to reserve a space for parking. Now J Lot is full up. What I'm bringing up is we need to have a system where faculty who cannot find space should be able to park and not get tickets. That's number one. Number two. We used to have multi-lot parking which the parking folks have canceled. I don't know what we can do to get the parking office to respond.

S. Malachowsky: It may not be an issue for Senate. But I'm on the Advisory Committee, so please send me an e-mail.

A. Newman: We do have one open position for the Parking Advisory Committee.

Agenda Item No. 12: Adjournment; A. Newman (1:48p)

--

Attendance 9/7/2023

Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended	Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended
Abushagur, Mustafa	KGCOE Senator	x	Lanzafame, Joseph	COS Senator	x
Adrion, Amy	ALT CAD Senator	x	Lapizco-Encinas, Blanca	KGCOE Senator	x
Aldersley, Stephen	Communications Officer/ SOIS Senator	x	Laver, Michael	CLA Senator	x
Anselm, Martin	CET Senator	x	Lee, James	ALT CET Senator	
Bamonto, Suzanne	CLA Senator	x	Liu, Manlu	SCB Senator	
Barone, Keri	Treasurer/CLA Senator	x	Malachowsky, Samuel	Treasurer/ GCCIS Senator	x
Boedo, Stephen	ALT KGCOE Senator		McCalley, Carmody	COS Senator	
Brown, Tamaira	Senate Coordinator	x	McLaren, Amy	CAD Senator	x
Butler, Janine	ALT NTID Senator	x	Newman, Atia	Chair/CAD Senator	x
Capps, John	CLA Senator	Excused	Newman, Dina	COS Senator	x
Chiavaroli, Julius	ALT GIS Senator	x	Olabisi, Joy	SCB Senator	
Chung, Sorim	ALT SCB Senator		Olles, Deana	COS Senator	x
Crawford, Denton	CAD Senator		Olson, Rob	ALT GCCIS Senator	
Cromer, Michael	ALT COS Senator		Osgood, Robert	ALT CHST Senator	
Cui, Feng	ALT COS Senator		Puchades, Ivan	KGCOE Senator	x
David, Prabu	Provost	x	Ray, Amit	CLA Senator	x
Davis, Stacey	ALT NTID Senator		Ross, Annemarie	NTID Senator	x
Deese, Franklin	CAD Senator	x	Shaaban, Muhammad	ALT KGCOE Senator	
Dell, Betsy	CET Senator	x	Sheffield, Jr. Clarence	ALT SOIS Senator	
DiRisio, Keli	CAD Senator		Song, Qian	SCB Senator	x
Dye, Matt	ALT NTID Senator		Staff Council Rep	Brendon Strowe	x
Eddingsaas, Nathan	COS Senator	x	Student Government Rep	Jake Long	x

Faber, Joshua	COS Senator	x	Thomas, Bolaji	CHST Senator	x
Fillip, Carol	ALT CAD Senator		Tobin, Karen	NTID Senator	x
Ghazle, Hamad	Operations Officer/CHST Senator	x	Tsouri, Gill	KGCOE Senator	
Ghoneim, Hany	KGCOE Senator		Ulin, Robert	CLA Senator	x
Hardin, Jessica	ALT CLA Senator	x	Van Aardt, Jan	ALT COS Senator	
Hazelwood, David	NTID Senator	x	Warp, Melissa	ALT CAD Senator	
Hsieh, Jerrie	ALT SCB Senator		Weeden, Elissa	GCCIS Senator	x
Jadamba, Basca	COS Senator	x	White, Phil	ALT GCCIS Senator	
Johnson, Dan	CET Senator	x	Williams, Eric	GIS Senator	
Johnson, Scott	GCCIS Senator	x	Worrell, Tracy	ALT CLA Senator	
Kincheloe, Pamela	NTID Senator	x	Zanibbi, Richard	GCCIS Senator	x
Kiser, Larry	GCCIS Senator	x	Zlochower, Yosef	COS Senator	x
Krutz, Daniel	ALT GCCIS Senator				
Kuhl, Michael	KGCOE Senator	x			

Standing Committee(s) Represented: LRPEC (J. Lanza fame) and RSC (N. Eddingsaas)

Interpreters: Nic Crouse-Dickerson and Jennifer Mura

Student Assistant: Lee Cornell

Presenters: Jeff Harris, RIT Board of Trustees Chair