Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, November 2, 2023   12:15 – 1:50 PM   Slaughter Hall Rooms 2240/2230

Attendance: See Below

Agenda Item No. 1: Call to Order; A. Newman (12:15)
Meeting called to order.
Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; A. Newman (12:15)
Motion: S. Johnson **Seconded: M. Abushagur** **Approved by acclamation**
Agenda Item No. 3: Communication Officer's Report/Approval of Minutes; S. Aldersley (12:16)
S. Aldersley: There were a couple of edits to the draft 10/19 minutes which have corrected accordingly. Unfortunately, there is still a delay on the minutes from the 10/5 meeting. **Motion to approve the minutes: S. Aldersley** **Second: I. Puchades** **Approved by acclamation** October 19, 2023 Meeting Minutes
Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; A. Newman (12:17)
A. Newman: • The Executive Committee is continuing on its round of visiting each of the colleges in turn. So far we have had good conversations with faculty from CLA, SOIS, NTID and CAD, and I'd like to thank the respective Senate college cohorts for facilitating those meetings. The schedule for future meetings was published in the newsletter and can also be found in the drive. • The Center for Teaching & Learning has sent out a survey about classroom teaching technology. They have asked Senate to encourage faculty to respond. I will be sending you an e-mail to that effect that I hope you will share with your constituents. • Benefits enrollment is underway. People are wondering about the details that were not covered in last week's presentation. We have received an interesting request to review the benefits package for any hidden landmines and provide recommendations to our constituents, and I am asking senators to comply with that request. • The COACHE survey results are in and we hope that they will soon be shared with the community.
Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; E. Redman (12:20)

E. Redman: In our meeting later today, Staff Council will have a presentation from Dr. David on his vision for RIT and any current updates. Stacy DeRooy will give a presentation on changes to D.19 and then we will discuss various committee assignments and opportunities. We are finalizing our current round of special elections and finally, we are working on upcoming presentations on The Shed, Athletics and Public Safety.

Agenda Item No. 6: Student Government Update; J. Long (12:21)

J. Long: Like Faculty Senate, we are updating our own by-laws. We are about to pass the amended version of our election rules and even though March feels far away, we are getting ready for elections. Two weeks from now, we're looking forward to having our Provost come speak to us.

Agenda Item No. 7: Policy D19.0 (Student Gender-Based and Sexual Misconduct Policy) Revisions Vote; S. DeRooy (12:22) *Presentation linked below*

S. DeRooy: I'm here to ask for a vote on the revisions for D.19 Student Gender-Based and Sexual Misconduct Policy). Most of the changes we are proposing are definitions. We also made changes regarding 'advisor of choice' and opening impact and closing statements have been enhanced to offer availability to both of the parties during the hearing, access to the final investigation report and resolution agreement, another step to increase transparency in the process, and finally changes to the non-member procedural rights. After Student Government raised some concerns about our proposed removal of the hard timeline, we added a link in the policy to a flow chart. We extended the timing of the witness list. We incorporated a hold component on an accused person in a sexual misconduct case to prevent the person from leaving and transferring to another school before their case is heard. I'm going back to SG tomorrow and will hopefully receive their vote.

J. Lanzafame: You mentioned transferring. What if the accused graduates before the case is heard?

S. DeRooy: Yes, that could happen. We try to avoid it and we are candid with the complainant if that is the situation and they might opt not to move forward in that case.

I. Puchades: Since links sometimes break, I would like to see the flow chart in the main document.

S. DeRooy: That's a good suggestion – we can attach it as an addendum to the policy.

J. Long:: Since the timeline is based on averages and averages change, if you put the timeline directly into the policy, would you not have to keep coming back to the governance groups to get approval for the changes?

S. DeRooy: It's true that average times do change. That's a good point and we will have to think about it.

H. Ghazle: In D.19 Section #2 under 'Scope' there is a reference to faculty, but D.19 is for students. The relevant policy for faculty is C.27, so they seem to be intertwined.

S. It sounds like we should tweak that and make it clear that faculty come under C.27, not D.19

Motion to approve: S. Johnson
Seconded: B. Dell

Motion approved 34:0:2

[Policy D19.0 Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 8: RSC and Scholarworks; N. Eddingsaas (12:33) *Presentation linked below*

N. Eddingsaas: We talked a little bit about the replacement for "Scholar Works" (SW) at our last meeting. After talking more with Laverne, We're now looking at a taskforce for the selection and implementation of new Faculty Activity System (FAS). For historical context, SW was a tool developed at RIT for faculty to upload their scholarly activity which would then be linked to your faculty website. It is a very onerous process, with many individual fields that all have to be filled manually by hand, so for example, a paper on something like Gravitational Waves might have hundreds of co-authors. It is very clunky and faculty have stopped using it. Back in 2018, there was a charge given to RSC to create a Task Force work in collaboration with the Provost's office to develop a more suitable alternative. Then Covid intervened. Last year, RSC looked at reviving it and this year, we met with Laverne on 10/12 and secured a commitment from the Provost's office to assist with a new faculty-driven task force. With regard to membership, we have talked about having two members from RSC, one from FAC and DEIC and other stakeholders. What we are hoping for is to go beyond simply replacing SW so as to include teaching schedules, service activities, annual evaluations, accreditation and tenure and promotion. We want to select something that will be much easier and more robust to use. Our first step is to look at our peer institutions and see what they are using. We are setting a fairly aggressive timeline such that we hope to have vendors on campus by the end of 2024.

E. Williams: *Inaudible*

N. Eddingsaas: *Inaudible*

I. Puchades: Is Marketing part of the conversation?

N. Eddingsaas: Everything is open. I'd say right now that RIT is trying to use SW for marketing, but it doesn't really work very well. . . *Inaudible*

M. Trauernicht. (26:00) One of the Library departments supports SW and I'm all for a larger system that will be a catch-all for everything that faculty need to input. That work has been going on since 2018 so it is definitely a long-term need. SW is an open-access platform. Not everything that faculty generate in their scholarship is appropriate because of licensing with publishers, etc. It was never meant to be a marketing tool, just an open repository. The other thing is that it is a proprietary platform, and the Library has been supporting it for a long time on our own dime. So if we can move things off the platform and I can do something else with it, hooray!
We do have all RIT Masters theses and dissertations in there also. And perhaps we will be able to ingest appropriate material from the new system to SW for open access. I'm not against this at all, but I just wanted to clarify what SW really is.

N. Eddingsaas: That's great to know, but I would say it's not how RIT actually uses it. If you do not put your scholarly work into SW, it will not show up in your faculty website. I completely agree with having SW do what it's supposed to do.

J. Capps: I find the idea of a faculty activity system kind of chilling. One of the questions I have is how much does this cost? Oftentimes things that are supposed to make our lives easier, in fact don't. Something like this seems like one more mechanism for taking up our time.

N. Eddingsaas: The goal for this is that it does not take more time, because it does it for you. You set it up so that it pulls information. *Inaudible.*

H. Ghazle: It may be beneficial to include Nick Paulus, because he's been doing this for a long time. I'm going to be selfish. I do have an open-access journal and I'm wondering how much work it will be to do the migration. I have spent weeks and months developing this and do I now have to spend all that time again on the migration?

N. Eddingsaas: Open access journals will stay with SW. (30:31)

B. Thomas: I'm glad RSC is moving this forward. I'd like to ask which vendors you plan on bringing to campus?

N. Eddingsaas: We haven't started to look at that yet.

B. Thomas: We had a committee at that time that worked on this and they were testing software . . *inaudible*
Why do we have to start from scratch?

N. Eddingsaas: Between 2018 and 2023, a lot of these programs have changed pretty drastically. But I don't think they are going to re-invent things. They're going to start with the information they already have.

R. Zanibbi: Is integration with Orchid something we would consider?

N. Eddingsaas: My goal is to have it integrated with all the different systems. One of the first steps will be to poll the faculty on what priorities they have and use that as a template.

R. Zanibbi: Those systems tend to have access to databases already for all funding and all publications. Most, not all.

N. Eddingsaas: If the system is not pulling from existing databases, it's not worthwhile.

P. David: Academic Profile is a program that I'm familiar with. Generally it does a good job . . . *Inaudible.*
One challenge is for faculty, for example in the Arts and Humanities, who don't publish in mainstream journals, their work is more difficult to capture. A second challenge is for faculty whose careers span many years and their work is not in any database so it has to be manually uploaded. But it's a really nice thing to have, for example, I know that tenure and promotion reports are easy to generate. A third challenge is with service and teaching contributions which are not in any data-base and which may be more subjective. Some of the vendors allow customization. In the end, the idea is to get a holistic picture of each person's contributions.

N. Eddingsaas: *Inaudible* . . The Institute knows what we've taught. We should be able to populate what's internal into whatever new system we go with. It's important that with RIT looking at all these new systems, it is important they be compatible with each other.

R. Zanibbi: In the peer institutions that you are thinking of looking at, are there some schools that are art-heavy?

N. Eddingsaas: We don't have a set of comparable institutions yet.

R. Zanibbi: I think the Provost has identified a really important issue. Eastman might be a good place to look first, their scholarship being musical. But also, maybe some Liberal Arts colleges.

H. Ghazle: Back to the Task Force. I recommend adding one or two faculty from the SW group, not just for their input, but as permanent members of the task force. I think you could learn much from them and their experience.

A. Newman: Are you making a motion to approve this task force?

N. Eddingsaas: I leave that up to the Executive Committee. This was a charge to RSC.

H. Ghazle: Since this is a Task Force that will be representing the Senate, we have to approve it.

A. Newman: Do you move to create this task force with Hamad's amendment?

N. Eddingsaas: Yes.

Further discussion

S. Bamonto: As someone who has served on a task force that has looked at software only to have it turned down, what is the commitment for a budget going forward once the TF has done its work?

N. Eddingsaas: My understanding is that the Provost's office is committed to implementing this.

Suzanne B. Will they give you a working budget so that you know what financial constraints you're working under?

N. Eddingsaas: They are going to be supporting us along the way. We will tell them what we are looking for but the issue of a budget has not been broached.

M. Laver: I often think about these kinds of things from the point of view of opportunity costs. I'm not asking what it costs, but if we do this, what other things might it prevent from happening? I'm aware that budgets are tight and we've been looking for a course management system (CMS) for many years. I don't doubt that by allowing faculty to streamline their reporting this is a good investment. But I would say that a CMS is significantly more important. And we should be asking what other things might be more important than this. If we were in a vacuum, we would look at this and say "oh, sure," but we are not in a vacuum. So I think it should be incumbent on the task force to look at this from the point of view of opportunity cost.

P. David: The CMS has been approved. A committee has already been set up to discuss implementation. So there is no robbing Peter to pay Paul. The committee discussion will also be about governance, for example, who gets access.

H. Ghazle: A note on process. When the task force collects information it will have to come back to the Senate. And then the recommendation goes on to the Provost and then to the President to make the final decision.

S. Malachowsky: We've mentioned internal tracking and metrics and reviews, but is there an external component to this? I mean a benefit of having all this information in one place for ranking purposes, for example?

N. Eddingsaas: One thing that has been brought up is how this system might be used for accreditation.

E. Williams: So this new system is going to make reporting easier. Isn't it possible that it will actually be more trouble to use? So, maybe we should have some field-testing to see if it really does do what it's supposed to do.

N. Eddingsaas: Yes, the task force would run pilots and demonstrations on campus.

I. Puchades: This seems like a big deal and I'm wondering how a small task force will represent faculty in the different colleges. I assume RSC will provide frequent updates to Senate as discussions move forward so that we can push that out to the colleges and we won't have faculty being surprised when the vendors show up?

N. Eddingsaas: Yes, this is going to be for all faculty so we will want to collect a lot of input. I find that small task forces work more easily as long as they seek input.

R. Zanibbi: Maybe something to include in the final materials might be mock-ups of how faculty will submit and how much time it will take. I know you need to bring the vendors in but you can go to their websites ahead of time so faculty can see what's likely to happen. Then it'll be a much faster conversation and faculty will feel more able to trust the system before it reaches the actual implementation stage. Mock-ups will be very important.

Motion to approve the task force

Motion approved 35:1:1

[RSC and Scholarworks Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 9: Charter of Academic Governance Discussion; A. Newman (1:05) *Presentation linked below*

A. Newman: Continuing with our discussion of changes to the Charter of Academic Governance which we began on October 5th when we talked about some inconsistencies and particularly how our standing committees are structured and how we, as a Senate, might make our lives easier and more efficient.
Everything starts with B.2, our Academic Charter which outlines the faculty's responsibilities and areas where we can weigh in on particular topics related to how the University runs. There are two articles that I want to draw the Senate's attention to: Article 3.1, which outlines our responsibilities as defined in E. 6. These include identifying issues of academic concern, such as the establishment or dissolution of all degree programs, faculty hiring, retention, promotion, tenure, development, dismissal, curriculum, admission standards, scholastic standards, examination and testing programs, awarding of honors, approval of candidates for earned degrees, establishment or dissolution of colleges, departments, or independent centers, or institutes. All of these are part of the charter that was approved and signed by our current President when we switched from an Academic Senate to a Faculty Senate. Article 3.2 states that we are expected to advise and make recommendations to the Deans, Vice-Presidents, Provost and President as appropriate and as specified in university policy. We are expected to make presentations to University Council on such matters. We are supposed to weigh in on many topics, like, for example, most recently, the academic calendar. We are supposed to talk about priorities, set fundraising priorities, the formulation of priorities for and review of the annual operating budget. All of these matters exist within our scope.
So how does that affect our standing committees? And what should we be thinking about when we're looking at our

Standing Committee?

I want to add that we're not going to be making any motions today. This discussion is intended to give Senators an insight into what the Executive Committee has been thinking about and we are looking forward to hearing back from you and your constituents. This is a two-way street where we are looking to Senators to talk to their constituents and bring their feedback back to us.

It's not always obvious what our committees do, even to the committee chairs. FAC is probably the most well-known because it has to do with promotion and tenure, hiring, dismissal, appointment, administrative and academic officers, faculty personnel policies, etc. AAC manages curriculum, although not in a way to overstep ICC or Grad Council, but rather to ensure the maintenance of admission and scholastic standards, examination and testing programs. Graduate Council and ICC are responsible for the establishment or dissolution of graduate degree programs and undergraduate degree programs. They are also responsible for reviewing and monitoring programs on an ongoing basis, which may have been overlooked in recent years, but there's language there which gives them more power than maybe they have been using.

The RABC is supposed to liaise with Dr. Watters' office to set fundraising priorities and to formulate priorities which they are to review with the Senate, so that the Senate can make recommendations to the University, to the President and the Provost. However, this has not happened in my memory though I would really appreciate it if anybody remembers a time when it did.

Long Range Planning and Environment is responsible for the development and expansion of the campus.

The Academic Support and Student Affairs Committee is to monitor and review the aspects of the university that support education and teaching, they are also there to support academic affairs.

DEIC is a more recent committee, designed to make policy recommendations concerning diversity, equity and inclusion.

The Global Education Committee is to facilitate and encourage international activities by RIT faculty and students. It also acts as a university-level liaison between the Rochester campus and our global locations. The General Education Committee (GEC), University Writing Committee (UWC) and Honors Curriculum Committee (HCC) are actually subcommittees of ICC and since they do not merit their own individual articles their responsibilities are not so clear. Finally, we have the Nominations Committee which is so poorly defined that at the end of last academic year, we suggested discontinuing it in favor of establishing a nominations officer position to be elected each year from the Senate, making sure to remove any conflict of interest on the part of existing members of the Executive Committee. Since this seems to be a very obvious change, at some point we will be bringing it to Senate for a vote. As we consider revising our committee structure, it's the Executive Committee's feeling that the scope of the AAC and ASSA is quite similar, so that it might be a good idea to make the ASSA a subcommittee of the AAC or to actually absorb it into the AAC.

With regard to the three subcommittees of the ICC, the language makes clear that the Senate is not required to form any of them except when explicitly asked to do so by the chair of ICC. But that has not been happening. We just automatically put out the call and the three subcommittees are populated, regardless of whether they are needed, and in the process we tie up approximately 36 faculty. At the very least, we should follow B2 and only create the committees if asked, or perhaps instead, we should consider simply absorbing them into the ICC as a whole.

S. Aldersley: It is interesting to read through B2 word by word to see to what extent we as a Senate are following our own charter. Words matter, but only if people pay attention to them. In the section that lists these three subcommittees, it specifies the membership, but it doesn't say what they are supposed to do. I don't know where the language came from. Maybe it was just copied from the Academic Senate. But what Atia has outlined is just one of several places where I think it behooves us to take a closer look at the language.

A. Newman: I agree. I think currently we follow policy when it really works for us, and then the rest of the time we rely on sort of collective ignorance and habit. I think it's really important to take a closer look at our responsibilities. As a policy-writing body, if we can't get our Charter in order then we can hardly serve our constituents. People don't have to comment right now but I would love to hear from senators what you think. It can be scary to think of changing committees or dropping them but I think we should really stop and consider what areas we want to address so that we can regain our place on campus. I feel we've been stepping away from a lot of our responsibilities and letting other offices take over, with the result that we end up being confused when people don't ask us for our opinion. I'd like to get back to participating in the running of the university.

Next, the RABC and the Long Range Planning and Environment Committee (LRPEC). The RABC is responsible for all matters pertaining to university budget and finances. Those of you who were here last year heard Bruce Hartpence's report about how they didn't get any information about the university budget and finances. We would like to change that. The LRPEC is supposed to be involved in strategic planning initiatives of the University, but it was not very much involved at all in the development or approval of the University Master Plan. The Executive Committee considers that the two committees might be more effective if they were combined.

If we make some of these changes, it will free up senators from serving on committees that may not be very active and allow for expansion and contraction on a regular basis, depending on the needs of the Senate and of the University itself at any given time.

S. Aldersley: Faculty Senate being three or four years old now, I think it is timely to review our charter in some

detail. Clearly we do not meet many of our responsibilities as a Senate. Oftentimes, my impression has been that we are the recipients of information, but we have very little say in creating that information, or at least advising on the creation of that information. So I think it's time to look very closely at B2 and see if we can't up our game a little with regard to governance.

S. Malachowsky: Sometimes, when a specific issue comes up, it would be useful if we were able to form an ad hoc committee or task force to deal with it, but we cannot find bodies because of the need to staff all of our standing committees on an ongoing basis,

A. Newman: In the past couple of months I've gotten a couple of requests to staff task forces, and I've had to decline because I honestly don't know how many times I can come back to this body and ask you to find these people. There are limits and I think we're at that point where if we had a system today that was tracking how much service our faculty are doing, it would probably explode. We really have to take this seriously.

H. Ghazle: Surely we have the authority to go ahead and revise or modify the charter but in order to make such changes we have to have a two-thirds majority from the faculty at large. Which suggests that it will be useful if we have input from the faculty before we propose specific changes.

S. Aldersley: Senate has made piecemeal changes in the past and asked the faculty at large, usually over the summer, to approve them, but not two thirds of the whole faculty, rather two thirds of those voting. At that point it's "do you approve or don't you approve?" So the involvement of the faculty beyond this body has to happen before the vote, through Senators going to their constituents and bringing their opinions back to Senate.

Senator ?: I feel like I can make comments on almost every slide, but I'll stick to the one concerning ASSA and AAC, because it speaks to a broader issue here. I know you're mostly concerned with committee structure. I mean the big difference between AAC and ASSA is the representation on ASSA which does not exist on AAC. When we went from Academic Senate to Faculty Senate, I remember two big arguments: one, that faculty did not have a representative body of their own and two, it was felt that Academic Senate mirrored University Council. But University Council really isn't a deliberative body, so, if we are the Faculty Senate and University Council is not deliberative, how do you get all stakeholders involved in a deliberative process? As it is now, Student Government can bring things forward on their own to the Provost's office, but wouldn't it be more efficient if we all got on the same bandwagon?

A. Newman: One of the things that we talked about when we last brought this charter up was to remove voting rights from deans and provost delegates in the committees themselves. One of the topics that was left that we did not bring back this time was whether or not we wanted to maintain student opinions because it is really important to get student feedback. I do think they should be involved, particularly in the early stages of the policy-writing process, because that's where good things can happen. If we were to have them vote us down over and over again in University Council, it would make the relationship adversarial. But that would be a second stage conversation.

M. Laver: My first time on Senate was ten years ago and we were talking about these issues. So, for example, global education committee – should it be ad hoc, should it be part of Senate? My real comment is what are we trying to do? What are our first principles? If we want to streamline faculty work by streamlining our committees, then that's fine, we could do that. But if we want people to avail themselves of the Senate, I don't know that we're going to get there through the Charter of Academic Governance. If we're trying to advertise that the Senate exists, that we're here as a resource for faculty, tinkering with the charter is on the fringes. What are the real issues? Why are people not engaging with the Senate? I don't think it has anything to do with the Charter, because, as you say, most Senators are not familiar with it. So I think we need to ask, 'what are we trying to do?' And then let actions flow from the answer.

A. Newman: I agree with you. In terms of what we're trying to do, one of the reasons why the Executive Committee is doing more events this year than I think other executive committees have ever done is to try and reignite faculty interest in shared governance. The idea of amending the charter and redesigning the standing committees is primarily from a faculty-centric interest to reduce the load of service. because since the pandemic, I think the average faculty person sees that we're doing more work, we have more students who need more help. We have more research that we have to do, we have more of everything that we have to be involved in, and service is not weighted as much. Everything that we write in policy nowadays is about more weight towards research and more weight towards teaching and service is basically the bastard child. But unfortunately, the work of the Senate is something that we all really want to make happen, because that's where all of the decisions are made. This is where the policy gets written that decides, for example, whether or not you're supposed to work over break, whether you get a promotion, or whether you're allowed to have a sabbatical, anything, in fact. This is the body that we want people to be involved in, and we can't do that if we don't have the bandwidth.

R. Zanibbi: Is it possible that some of these committees seek information from faculty who are not actual committee

members, because it seems to me that's where most of the work comes in. I think I can see faculty getting service credit for providing information about what they know about and that's their only involvement with Senate that year. Then it would be the responsibility of the committee members to discuss the information and vote. That would allow more faculty to get involved with Senate in a more flexible way without having to be actual committee members. The other thing is that if you are going to roll out changes like this, you might want to have kind of a tree or a triage plan, so that you might say, 'we're going to put this out first because it's the most important, please say 'yes' or 'no,' then we do this one . . .', and I would draft all of the proposed changes so that then you could show the colleges the tree from the beginning.

A. Newman: I agree. We are doing this in stages for pretty much that reason. When this goes to the full faculty for a vote, hopefully very few people will be surprised at the suggested changes. That's part of the reason why we're doing the college visits and why we are trying to motivate our college cohorts to interact with their constituents. Again, that's one of the reasons for the Newsletter. Once the vote actually comes out, the way I would like to structure it is, if you don't vote for X change, then do you vote for this other one? That way, we might not get all the changes approved, but it might take us towards the goal. I like your suggestion to manage the workload of the committees. If you wouldn't mind writing something up and sending it to us, we can put it into a repository which senators can then share with their constituents.

M. Anselm: In a document like this, it might be nice on one of the first slides to list a few specific objectives. There've been two or three good suggestions that I've just heard, but I'm having difficulty conveying this to my constituents. One of the objectives, for example, might be to rewrite Article 3.1 and 3.2. I think it's important to see the whole picture even if we're not actively pursuing some of those things. Am I misunderstanding?

A. Newman: We're not proposing to rewrite Articles 3.1 and 3.2.

M. Anselm: So those are the guidelines for the two or three different objectives that we have? OK, so if you can put a slide in there with some high-level objectives based on the discussion we've just had, it'll be easier for me and my constituents to understand.

S. Aldersley: To respond to Mike, Atia has already mentioned the college visits by the Executive Committee, I know you attended the first one, then we went to NTID and we had 25-30 faculty attending, and on Monday we went to CAD. So this reaching out to the faculty beyond the immediate group of senators, I think, is already proving its worth. For example, with CAD faculty we talked about the fact that COLA and NTID both have internal governance groups and it was suggested that CAD might organize a similar formal bod within their college. So I think that spreading the word out about faculty governance into the individual colleges goes some way towards what you were talking about.

Inaudible

A. McLaren: I couldn't make it to the meeting on Monday because I had class. But whoever you're meeting with, are you getting back to the rest of the school to talk about what happened?

A. Newman: This is again one of the reasons why we're putting so much energy into reminding our Senators that their responsibility is to communicate with their constituents, because the five people on the Executive Committee can't reach 1,100 faculty, get the message across and be able to answer all their questions. However, 50 people might be able to do that. My goal and hope is that we can get everyone on board enough so that we can make our lives better by having less work, but also have the work we do be more impactful.

J. Capps: What is your timeframe for voting on these changes?

A. Newman: The Executive Committee would like to bring some concrete suggestions to the Senate by the end of this semester and then in January and February, start formally trying to put this out to the greater population. That means we have this semester to discuss with you, get input from you, and get input from your constituents before we craft our proposals and bring them to Senate for a vote. Then, assuming you are in favor, your job would be to go and convince everyone to agree with you.

Charter Presentation

Agenda Item 10: New Business; A. Newman (1:49)

None	
Agenda Item No. 11: Adjournment; A. Newman (1:49)	

Attendance 11/2/2023

Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended	Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended
Abushagur, Mustafa	KGCOE Senator	x	Lanzafame, Joseph/LRPEC Rep	COS Senator	x
Adrion, Amy	ALT CAD Senator		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	x
Barone, Keri	Treasurer/CLA Senator	x	Malachowsky, Samuel	Vice Chair/ GCCIS Senator	x
Boedo, Stephen	ALT KGCOE Senator		McCalley, Carmody	COS Senator	
Brown, Tamaira	Senate Coordinator	x	McLaren, Amy	CAD Senator	x
Butler, Janine	NTID Senator	x	Newman, Atia	Chair/CAD Senator	x
Capps, John	CLA Senator	x	Newman, Dina	COS Senator	
Chiavaroli, Julius	ALT GIS Senator		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	x	O'Neil, Jennifer	ALT CET Senator	
Cui, Feng	ALT COS Senator		Osgood, Robert	ALT CHST Senator	
David, Prabu	Provost	x	Puchades, Ivan	KGCOE Senator	x
Davis, Stacey	ALT NTID Senator	x	Ray, Amit	CLA Senator	x
Deese, Frank	CAD Senator		Ross, Annemarie	NTID Senator	x
Dell, Betsy	CET Senator	x	Shaaban, Muhammad	ALT KGCOE Senator	
DiRisio, Keli	CAD Senator		Sheffield, Jr. Clarence	ALT SOIS Senator	
Dye, Matt	ALT NTID Senator		Song, Qian	SCB Senator	
Eddingsaas, Nathan/RSC Rep	COS Senator	x	Staff Council Rep	Emily Redman	x
Faber, Joshua	COS Senator	x	Student Government Rep	Jake Long	x
Fillip, Carol	ALT CAD Senator		Thomas, Bolaji	CHST Senator	x

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

Interpreters: Nic Crouse-Dickerson and Jennifer Mura

Student Assistant: Lee Cornell

Presenters: Stacy DeRooy, Nathan Eddingsaas