

Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, February 15, 2024

12:15 – 1:50 PM

Slaughter Hall 2240/2230

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 to approve the agenda: S. Johnson Seconded: J. Lanzafame Approved by acclamation
Agenda Item No. 3: Communication Officer's Report/Approval of Minutes; S. Aldersley (12:17)
<p>Good afternoon everybody. Having received no suggestions to amend the draft minutes of the 2/1 meeting, I move they be approved. Before we vote, I'd like to welcome Molly, who is assisting with taking the minutes.</p> <p>Seconded: S. Bamonto</p> <p>Approved by acclamation</p> <p>February 1, 2024 Meeting Minutes</p>
Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; A. Newman (12:18)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">I want to remind everyone to respond to the invitation for the luncheon with President Munson on 2/22. This is the second year in a row we are doing this and we are hoping for a larger turnout this year. I believe it's a very valuable experience, and senators get to talk to President Munson in an informal manner. There is no agenda. It's just a conversation. Last year, we had a small turn-out which was a surprise because it was right after the One-Payroll issue. In any case, he covered a lot of topics, and answered a lot of questions. An event like this helps us to connect with him and helps make RIT a better institution. So please make sure you RSVP as soon as possible.Some of you may be questioning how you came to be added as either a member or an alternate on the Dismissal for Cause Committee for either TT or NTT faculty. I apologize for this, but this is due to the current language in E.23 & E.23.1. It turns out the Provost and the chair of Faculty Senate are supposed to select committee members by lot, and everyone whose name is not drawn ends up being an alternate. I believe the policy is overly prescriptive and I think amending it should be a charge for next year. But for the moment, don't panic. Nobody is being dismissed. It's simply that we're trying to make sure we are following our policies because we wrote them.The budget hearings have begun. We've seen presentations so far from SCB and COS. Each college has the opportunity to brag about their great accomplishments, and pitch their vision for the near future. I can't really tell you anything much beyond that, because, realistically, no decisions have yet been made. The co-chairs of RABC

have also been invited. I feel they are getting very valuable information and I'm looking forward to them coming to present to us soon.

- We are almost done with our college events. We got the wrong date for the College of Engineering, so we have rescheduled with them. Hopefully, next year, when we do this a second time round, we'll get more faculty involved.

- We are looking forward to hearing from each college's senators at the end of the year about their college faculty meetings, so if your college hasn't yet had such a faculty-led meeting, this would be a good time to start organizing one.

- The ExComm sent out a straw poll to senators regarding the proposed changes to B.2. If you have not yet responded, please look for the link and respond. You have the option of either approving or suggesting edits to each of the proposals. So if you're concerned about any of the language, this is a really good opportunity for you to join in on the word-smithing to frame the version that will go out to the full university. B.2 is an incredibly important document and it's not something we're taking lightly. We do think it's important to have as many great minds as possible look at it and help us fix things. So please jump in and help your Executive Committee by responding as quickly as possible.

Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; G. Harrington (12:23)

We don't have much to update. For the rest of the academic year, all of our meetings will be on zoom with agendas sent out ahead. We are going to have presentations from Public Safety and the HR Tiger Cloud ERP project

-

Agenda Item No. 6: Student Government Update; A. Shuron (12:24)

SG attended an interesting Student Governance conference at UR, along with representatives from Fisher and Alfred and we are preparing for elections starting next week

Agenda Item No. 7: Policy C03.0; R. Raffaele (12:25)

I'm going to talk about two things: first, an informational note about a change to the existing IP policy and second, a recommendation coming from the Research and Scholarship Committee.

- A routine audit by the IP management office discovered a provision in the fine print according to which RIT would pay \$500 to any individual with provisional patent with an additional \$500 when the patent is no longer provisional. I see a surprised look on your face, which was also my reaction. We have never been making these payments, and most people didn't know this provision existed, but after this was brought to the attention of the former provost and President, I was directed to remove the provision. I think the primary reason wasn't so much the logistical challenge but more a philosophical reason for why we would have that in the first place. I can't speculate how it originally got in there, or what the motivation was, but President Munson said this no longer makes sense with the size of our university so this clause has now been removed and I was asked to go round to the governance groups and inform them of the change.

- The second thing concerns the dispensation of any license revenue that gets returned to the inventor. The proposed change is that faculty with licensing revenue can either have it put into a discretionary account to fund their research (new) or as personal compensation (existing). This is a little bit different as I've been told by our friends in the Comptroller's Office in Legal Affairs, because this is additional compensation per policy and not an award but fundamentally, it's the same thing. The Scholarship Committee supported this change, so I'm here today to make the motion. In a nutshell, we license some patents. Our policy says that 50% of any licensing revenue after the patent costs are recovered goes directly back to the inventor. I'm still surprised at how many faculty don't realize it. but it's a great benefit. Most universities don't do this. What this says is that the faculty member chooses to instead of putting in their pocket, they can take in the form of discretionary funds to use for research. That's the

motion.

S. Malachowsky: I have a question about the first case, the \$500 for a patent. Is this a personal patent? Or is this a patent that's licensed with the university?

R. Raffaele: The way patents work is that whoever invented the invention, their name goes on the patent but as per our contract with the University, the University owns all intellectual property so they are the owner but you're still the inventor. That's why per policy, if we get licensing revenue, it is shared. So yeah, these would be the patents that are owned by the University.

S. Malachowsky: Patents have value beyond licensing, so patent portfolios have value, and I would suggest that the \$500 payment might have been in lieu of payments, because some patents are merely part of a portfolio essentially to prevent action, encourage action. If the university themselves use the patent in some way, there may not be any actual transfer of funds, so if somebody working with the university creates a patent and it's never licensed by anybody, they receive nothing, Correct?

R. Raffaele: If I understand you correctly a faculty member discloses some IP to the university and then the University decides that it wants to pursue patent protection on that intellectual property and it does so. Then, if that patent is indeed granted, but then the University never licensed it, the faculty member doesn't get any additional compensation. That is correct.

S. Malachowsky: So wouldn't it follow . . .

H. Ghazle: Point of order. I have people who want to speak.

I. Puchades: We've discussed this at length in the College of Engineering. It's our feeling that RIT should go back and compensate the inventors for that money according to the existing policy. And also we don't think it should be struck out of the policy itself.

R. Raffaele: I'm fine with that, but I was directed to remove it. The President and the Provost made the executive decision to do so, I think, for good reasons. For compliance reasons. They don't feel that it was particularly practical, and philosophically they oppose it. What the President said is "why should we be providing additional compensation for submitting a patent? Why should we not be doing it for a peer reviewed publication? I should be giving a faculty member an extra 500 bucks every time they get a peer-reviewed publication? Why am I doing it for patents and not publications?" That was his philosophical argument. The Provost also supported it. We couldn't find any other universities that had such a practice. I know a lot of corporations have gone down that road and regretted it, but Sam, one thing to your philosophical point, there's a whole process by which the University decides what intellectual property to try to protect, and if we do not believe there is a strong chance that it will eventually be licensed, we would not pursue patent protection. In that case, policy provides for that intellectual property to be returned to the inventors themselves, and then they can decide.

M. Anslem: You asked for a vote earlier, but I'm not clear exactly on what that is for. Is it the \$500?

R. Raffaele: No, the \$500 is gone.

M. Anslem: So the vote is . . . ? I don't understand what the original terminology in the policy was and what the new language is. It would be nice to see that on the screen.

R. Raffaele: Let me read it to you.

M. Anslem: But what was it before?

R. Raffaele: This does not exist in the policy currently. The way the policy works right now is if there is intellectual property and it gets licensed and money comes back to the university, once patent costs are covered, it gets split 50/50 between the university and the inventor. And so you would get a nice check. This change was suggested and deliberated in the Research and Scholarship Committee – to allow a change in the way faculty members could receive that money. Right now it goes into your pocket. With this change you could choose, instead of putting it in your pocket, it could go into your discretionary account to be used for your research work.

M. Anslem: What is the exact wording?

A. Newman: I'm going to step in here. One of the things in the structure of how we work is we always request a red line document.

R. Rafaelle: Yes, I don't have one because we have not been provided the exact language. Because of the nature of this compensation, the Controller in the Office of Legal Affairs has not given me the language.

A. Newman: How can we vote on something when we don't know what it is?

R. Rafaelle: I can read it to you. It's what I've explained to you. I'll read it to you again.

A. Newman: Then we can't approve it.

R. Rafaelle: I think you can approve it with the understanding that Legal Affairs will make sure that it's administered legally.

A. Newman: We should invite you back when you have the language.

R. Rafaelle: You should invite Bobby back because he has the language.

A. Newman: That would make a lot of sense. We should invite Bobby as well, I agree.

R. Rafaelle: Can I read the motion for Martin one more time?

A. Newman: Sure.

R. Rafaelle: Alright, here you go. Any faculty who receives licensing revenue per RIT Policy can choose to take it in the form of discretionary funds to support their research as an alternative to receiving it as personal compensation. It's pretty straightforward.

G. Tsouri: Okay, moving forward, it's obviously the right of the university to change the policy with regard to IP. That's something moving forward. But as Ivan said it was raised in a meeting in our college and people are looking for an answer about implementing the existing policy that's been in place since 2009. And just so you know, we are aware of people who did receive this payment if they insisted on it. If something was in the policy for the past so many years, it should have been implemented and if it wasn't, it should be retroactively paid. I did try to contact the IP office again on behalf of my constituents, and I know that others have personally tried as well. But there was no straight answer. We're fed these rumors that maybe they're trying to retract, change it and cancel it and I don't think that's even legal, so it would be nice to have an answer about how you intend to rectify this mistake that's been going on for over 15 years.

R. Rafaelle: I agree with you. If the IP was issued while the policy was in force, those faculty members are owed that money. That's what I believe. But once it's changed, it's been changed. So going forward no deal. I would encourage those faculty members to pursue their payments. I believe I'm due payments. I've never received any and I have seven patents. That's 14 times x \$500. I could use that.

N. Eddingsaas: We can just go ahead to the second part after seeing what the actual language is. I'm perfectly fine with that. But there's one thing you said that I was confused about. You talked about saying this was discussed in the Research and Scholarship Committee. I don't remember that, unless it's been more than two years ago.

R. Rafaelle: It might have been before your time. It was originally brought to our attention by our friends in Imaging Science, Carl Salvaggio.

S. Aldersley: Just to clarify, I think maybe you're talking about the RABC because this issue came to the RABC last year, brought by Carl. I don't know whether it also went to the RSC, but it did come to RABC.

S. Malachowsky: I'm back to that \$500. So that policy has been changed. Our job is to advocate for faculty. So we're saying that's not a policy change that we have any control over. It's just been changed.

H. Ghazle: Point of order.

J. Capps: The policy is still on line. Does Senate have some role in how policy gets changed? Or is this a decision that has been made without our input at all?

R. Raffaele: I was directed to remove that line from the policy. Obviously, it's still there. I was directed to inform the governance groups, and I went to University Council in October, and we informed them of the change and then I was directed to come here and inform the Senate of the change. My understanding is that when the President directs me to remove something from the policy, he has that authority.

H. Ghazle. I appreciate that, but just as a point of order, because there are a lot of questions and concerns about this, I recommend bringing the original policy and then once we get the information from Legal Affairs about the new language, bring it back and say, 'Okay, here's the red lines, this is what we're changing.'

R. Raffaele: There are no red lines.

H. Ghazle: Even if it's an addition. I respect that the President has come to you and said, 'change the policy,' but this is a policy that has to get a vote in Senate to move forward. It's beyond informing. So I think at this point, as long as you're coming to us with a motion, a motion requires a vote. There's a difference between informing and a motion.

R. Raffaele: I'm doing two things. I'm informing, one thing, and I'm bringing a motion forward that originated with the faculty. If you want to kill the motion, kill it!

A. Newman: I think this is a matter of process more than anything else. This is not a policy that is owned by Senate. We don't have any voting rights. However, it is our responsibility to be very careful about what we endorse. So it would be irresponsible of the Senate to vote on it right now, because we haven't seen any language. Whatever the document is, if you want the Senate to endorse it, it makes sense to give us the document. So my recommendation, is that it would be great if we could either bring back Bobby Colon, or if you'd like to come back, we'll work with you on scheduling, but we can make sure that it comes back, and that our Senators have some of their questions answered. Because obviously, you can tell, this is something that we care deeply about.

R. Raffaele: I just don't want to conflate the two things. I do want to do justice to the RABC because this motion comes from the faculty on the RABC, and I support it. I was hoping to get the Senate to say 'yes, we support that as well.' But you know this is not my motion and if you choose not to do that. . .

A. Newman: That's perfectly fair. As much as we agree with you on the spirit of it, we've also learned, in some cases the hard way, just how scary it is to discuss something sight unseen. I'm actually just working through similar issues with E.6 with the Provost, concerning sentences which were added in without actually being discussed. So it's really important for us to stay really formal on this, even though we appreciate what you're bringing to us.

R. Raffaele: I will go back to Bobby and say that the Senate hasn't said one way or another whether they support this, but they're willing to consider the language that you bring forward.

A. Newman: I appreciate it.

I. Puchades: I'd like to make a motion for the Senate to show opposition to changing the \$500 payment in Policy C3.0 moving forward. Whether it's in the form of a committee or a letter expressing disagreement with the executive action taken by the President.

J. Capps: Seconded

E. Williams: I'm sorry, I'm still unclear about our jurisdiction. Is this a policy that we have anything to say about? Where is the policy listed?

A. Newman: This is C3.0. It's always at the bottom of every policy which office owns it. The C policies are not within our control but we can advise on it.

S. Aldersley: I don't know whether Senate has jurisdiction over this or not, but the point in the motion is that the President has apparently unilaterally changed something that was in an existing policy and the motion is that he can't do that. What he does going forward, maybe is his privilege, as Ryne pointed out.

A. Newman: And if the motion in itself is merely about raising the question, then it seems like a reasonable one.

G. Tsouri: I can see the legal issues here. . . . *inaudible* . . . So I think they should iron this out completely before we vote on anything. We should have the legal issues put away. . . *inaudible*

S. Johnson: I think people are confusing two different things. Right now we're talking about the \$500 and not putting the money towards your research or in your pocket. So there are two different things and they keep getting overlapped.

A. Newman: The motion itself is specifically about the \$500 that was removed. But it's currently in policy right now, as I think John looked it up. It's currently in there. It's supposed to be struck out. And that's what the motion is about - expressing disapproval.

J. Lanzafame: We just refused to vote because of not having language and I don't know what the language is for the current motion. Are we simply expressing displeasure or are we asking them to *inaudible*?

A. Newman: Tamaira, can you put up some language on the board to clarify the motion, so we can see what it is we're disapproving of?

J. Lanzafame: It may be a process issue more than anything.

A. Newman: I think we can start with 'The Faculty Senate moves to . . .

I. Puchades; I think there are two options: create a committee to investigate the issue. I'm not really sure how to approach it.

H. Ghazle: Procedure-wise, we have a motion on the floor that was seconded. So something has to be done. I know we have a motion on the floor, you can keep it on or you can withdraw it. It may be beneficial for us to wait for Ryne to come back.

Inaudible

R. Zanibbi: Are we trying to clarify the motivation behind the change? Do we need a committee to get information? We can act more quickly without creating a sub-committee.

A. Newman: I would suggest that rather than create a committee it would be something that we can just ask about.

Inaudible

I. Puchades: I don't want to discuss this for too long, but I think it's an administrative decision that we don't agree with. And if we had information on that, what is that information going to be? It's going to be more of what we just got.

R. Zanibbi: Possibly, but I think if we do it formally, maybe not. And then, if it is, this body can decide.

I. Puchades: So the motion will be to require the administration to come back to Senate and provide information on how the policy was modified.

R. Zanibbi: I would be more concrete and ask for the motivation behind the change in the policy.

I. Puchades: Yes, and we don't want to change it.

J. Capps: I think there's a policy on decommissioning of a policy, I think it's B.05 and it says that there has to be a rationale for decommissioning policies, and stakeholders have to be informed. . . . *inaudible*

S. Aldersley: I may have misunderstood your original motion, but I thought that what you were getting at was not so much about the decommissioning of this policy, but about the fact that the Administration retroactively is saying that faculty that didn't ask for the money, no longer have standing to ask for it. I would like for the Senate to go on record as saying that not only did Ryne tell us we should pursue this but that we are going to pursue it with some reasonable chance of success, because I got the impression, reading between the lines of what Ryne was talking about, that that reasonable chance of success may not exist.

A. Newman: Everything is getting a little out of hand.

M. Laver: I'm not going to support that motion. I think it's a fine motion but I think we're talking a little bit out of ignorance here. We're not exactly sure what happened and I trust our Executive Committee to go back to the President and ask what happened. And is this a governance policy that can be decommissioned? It's probably a valid point that John makes. I'm happy to entertain it. But I don't know for sure. So I think before we start making all kinds of motions and being confrontational about it, let's just find out what happened. And then when we need to be confrontational, we can be.

A. Newman: That's a good idea. Alright. There's a motion of the floor. We can make this a more formal process or we can leave it up to the Executive Committee. Are we ready for a vote?

R. Zannibbi: I would say rather than 'question', say 'ask about', so that we're not posing this as a challenge.

A. Newman: OK, so we'll make it less painful, and ask about the process by which this decision was made.

S. Aldersley: What is the motion, please?

The motion is to ask about the process by which an executive decision was made regarding the removal of an existing faculty benefit (\$500 payment for provisional patent, \$500 for final patent), including the potential intersection with policy B05-4e. (This motion was a friendly amendment to the original motion proposed by I. Puchades. It was made by R. Zannibbi and accepted by I. Puchades.)

Motion passed 32-3-2

Agenda Item No. 8: United Way Presentation; E. Johnson and N. Prahler (12:59) *Presentation linked below*

N. Prahler: Hello, everyone! My name is Nicole Prahler. Some of you may recognize me because I used to be a student and was in some of your classes back in the day. I'm also a student again, finishing my Master's degree, so I might be in some of your classes again in Saunders College of Business. I am one of the coordinators for the United Way campaign here on campus. It is the only philanthropic effort where we ask all faculty and staff to participate. If you're willing and able to. And it's a great way for you to give easily to an agency or fund that you're passionate about. It can be an overall community fund or a particular agency. I lost a family member to cancer. So you can donate to organizations like 1330 Cancer or Breast Cancer Coalition of Rochester. So those are just a couple of examples for you. I'm joined by Ellen Johnson who is our volunteer campaign chair, and is from NTID. She will give most of the rest of the presentation. But I'm here for questions if anybody has any.

E. Johnson: A little background about myself. I've been at RIT for 12 years and in my current role for about six years. It is an honor to be chair for this year's United Way campaign. I'm going to talk about the mission and goals of the United Way Community Fund. Remember this tagline: 'Power of one, collective impact of many.' Impact areas include youth success, education, financial security, economic mobility, healthy community and community resiliency based on sustainable efforts in the environment and the community. This can be seen as community gardens being built, access to water, heat and buying more sustainable materials for homes and vehicles. This also can be seen in how we respond to the crises in the community such as the flooding in Canandaigua last summer and how we were able to mobilize with our partners. Lastly, this new impact area allows us to be more nimble and flexible to support more nonprofits in the region and serve folks in the community better.

This year's campaign goal is to raise \$285,000 with 900 donors. Currently, our campaign has achieved \$26,148. (Showed video)

So remember: Power of one, collective impact of many.

Soon you'll see three more videos coming out featuring Dr. Munson and his wife, Nancy Munson, Dr. Gerry Buckley and his wife, Judy Buckley and also Provost Dr. David.

We have some United Way agencies directly supporting Tigers. Here are just a few examples: The Center for Youth, supporting our most at-risk students; CHS, created as a merger with Chili, Henrietta and Scottsville Volunteer Ambulance Services. Global Integrated Healthcare supports RIT students, transporting them to hospital.

Financial aid is available for those students who are unable to afford the care that is given to them. The Legal Aid Society assists students dealing with immigration, citizenship cases, as well as other legal matters. Trillium Health offers health and mental health care for many of our students. They specialize in LGBTQIA+ care. The Willow Center, supports our students in domestic violence situations.

RIT students give of their time and talent to so many United Way entities. In the 2022/23 academic year, they provided 18,865 service hours equal to an economic impact of \$581,042. Additionally, students reported giving \$123,124 in donations to *inaudible*. Student United Way donations for the last 5 years totalled almost \$49,000, an average of \$10,000 a year.

This slide shows programs benefiting from student efforts: Hochstein Memorial music school; Genesee County village museum; Junior Achievement, Breast Cancer Coalition of Rochester, 1330 Cancer. *Inadible*. Other opportunities: Big Brothers, Big Sisters of Greater Rochester, Lollipop Farm Humane Society.

So how can you get involved? Volunteers are the foundation of any successful campaign. The United Way campaign at RIT is almost entirely volunteer driven. We count on our talented staff looking for opportunities to give back to their communities in ways that are comfortable and achievable for them.

The easiest way to become involved is to attend some of our events. The Kick-Off begins with the PB & J Jam and we will have several other events happening throughout the month of March. Volunteer positions are available under the steering committee which is made up of representatives from across campus. Members will meet monthly to receive updates on the campaign. Members meet within the subcommittees they have chosen for campaign execution. Key Captains: these volunteers are the rubber that hits the road, individuals who support the campaign by messaging to the employees in their area.

Here's a big one: E pledge donations. We try to make participation as easy as possible. You can use your RIT credentials to donate an amount you are comfortable with which will be automatically deducted from your pay check. Employees can select how many pay periods they would like to donate, whether it be \$1 or \$100. Every donation makes a positive impact.

Here's the most important part. Even if you don't give, please complete the pledge form and submit it. If everyone in your department submits the form, that counts as 100% participation for your department. That's the most we ask of you.

Here's a few events that we have scheduled: PBJ Jam on March 1st, 11:00-2:00. President Munson should be there, I believe at 11:00. Events not only raise funds, but also generate interest in the campaign. We have a goal to make 2,000 sandwiches for local programs that tackle food insecurity. The event is a benefit for the Center for Youth, the YWCA, and the Boys and Girls Clubs of Rochester, and we are possibly adding additional agencies. Contact Nicole if you're able to support this effort. The Chairity Auction runs from March 19th-March 29th. In this annual event, each artist selects a local United Way charity to receive the auction proceeds. On February 29th we have our spring pie sale running til March 14th. The goal is to exceed 250 delicious pies to support the School of the Holy Childhood. Next we have the annual day of caring on May 23rd. The day of caring is the largest community-wide volunteer event across our region, serving Genesee, Livingston, Monroe, Ontario, Wayne, and Wyoming counties. Volunteers connect with co-workers, friends and family to spend the day helping hundreds of local nonprofits. Information about how to serve and sign up for projects will be available soon. It's one morning. Some places provide breakfast, some provide lunch so hopefully you will sign up.

To learn more about the United Way campaign, please visit these websites. We appreciate the time and attention you have given us. Please remember our tagline this year: Power of one, collective impact of many.

J. Faber: When does the ability to donate open up for faculty?

N. Prahler: It will be the whole month of March. I don't close it off until the end of April. We usually get a couple of people saying 'please open it up'. So we'll open March 1st. We will send an invite or email to the campus community through RIT message channels if you're opted into Community Engagement. You are also likely to receive an email from the key-captain assigned to your area.

A. McLaren: I know last year I had some students that wanted to be part of the charity event. I'm in the School of Arts, and we were too late for it. When do we find out the timeline? Do we just go to that site and it will tell us?

N. Prahler: Chair pickup happens in November. You have to be opted into community engagement. That's the email list we're restricted to. I do have some chairs in storage. If somebody's got a lot of motivation. You can email me. We do have some stock if they're interested. They just have to be back by February 27th, which is very close. We put the ask out around November. But if they want to do it over the summer, I'll store it for the whole year until we have the auction again. I'll take donations however they come in. So if the time they're available happens to be over the summer, and they want to take a chair and design it into something really cool, I'm happy to work with them. And one thing about the charity action I'm not sure that we mentioned. The chairs are on display in the Campus Center by what used to be the fountain. We got our first one the other day. It's an amazing Dr. Seuss-themed one. So

if you're looking for some interesting furniture for your offices, come check them out. They're really cool.

[United Way Campaign Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 9: RIT Advocate Program; T. Gordner (1:19) *Presentation linked below*

Thomas Gordner: Thank you for the opportunity today to talk with you all. I serve as the assistant director in the Center for Student Conduct and Conflict Resolution. Today I'm here to talk a little bit about the student conduct advocate program. The advocate really is a role to support students through the student conduct process. So if there is a behavior that happens, whether it's in the dorm, residence hall or even potentially in the classroom, that exceeds the level where we need to get involved and leads to a conduct hearing, we would send you an email asking if you want to participate and if you wanted to support the student through that process, you would receive the redacted copy and then it's the student's responsibility to reach out to you. We really want the students to take ownership in order for them to understand how to continue to move forward as an adult within our community and within the rest of their world.

So here's a very quick overview of the conduct process. Typically what happens is we get some sort of referral, typically, from a Resident Advisor or Public Safety. Someone is flying down Lowenthal, guess what, I'm going to get it. If they are really violating an RIT policy, we get that report. I see every single Public Safety report that comes through. I decide whether it needs to be just a conversation, or a hearing? How do we move it forward? If it's a hearing, the student has the right to request resources, one of which is an advocate. Initially, a student conduct officer reviews the report and decides the type of response: what do we need to do? Do we need to speak with the student? Has Public Safety already had an educational moment with the student, and do we need to do anything? We will assign the case to a hearing officer, who will either be someone in our office, or it may be one of our Resident Life partners, one of the residence coordinators. They will typically handle lower level cases, anything that would lead up to probation. Anything that may exceed that, we'll stick with ours.

Now, the hearing. Students have what's called the Student Bill of Rights. Within the charge letter that students receive, there's a hyperlink that students can see. The Bill of Rights is their bill of rights for the entirety of the RIT community, not just the conduct process. One of those pieces is that they don't have to consent to a room search by Public Safety unless there is specific evidence that shows that there may be a danger that Public Safety must respond to. And then this last piece is really where a conduct advocate comes into play. The outcome could be anything. It could be something like 'you are not responsible for this alleged violation'. And that's it. There's no other action taken. If they are responsible, it could be anything from a warning, all the way to expulsion, severance from the university. Those last two, suspension and expulsion, we never aim for those. We also don't aim to remove someone from housing unless there's a true community impact. That's never our goal. We really aim to be restorative and working together in partnership with you, the RIT advocate, we want students to understand and recognize that, 'yeah, maybe I did make a few mistakes here. I get that. How can I do better? How can I be the person in this community that I want to be.' It's about what they want to do, how they want to engage.

I'm not going to talk about the range of outcomes since they are listed on the web page. But anytime that we issue an outcome aside from no action taken, we also assign an educational portion. Sometimes it's a decision-making seminar. Maybe they had a candle in their room. Okay, Fire Safety. There are certain educational components that we will always assign when we are going through the conduct process because the goal is education. The goal is to gain that knowledge that the student may not have had before. There's a lot of times, and I don't know about you, but I don't always read terms and conditions. There's a lot there. It's about walking through those and understanding, 'Okay, well, these items are not allowed in the dorms. And so that's when we do a condition like, 'I want you to write me a paper on prohibited items in the dorms or apartments and tell me why you think that those are prohibited.' That's just an example of a condition.

Our Res. Life team do not do audio recordings. Theirs is a very informal process and they approach it in that way. They can only assign statuses up to the level of probation. Probation means that student is not in good standing with the university, which means they may not be able to take up a leadership role in governance or potentially even study abroad. Nine times out of ten, interactions with the Residence Life team simply involve the Residence coordinator and the student. Sometimes you as an advocate, may show up. If the student is part of NTID or the deaf

community, interpreters are part of this. We intentionally limit the number of people that have their eyes on these things, because a lot of times students might be embarrassed.

We keep it private but not confidential. First time violations are very low risk. Smoking cannabis in the residence hall. Yes, it's a danger. Understand? You're going to talk with maybe Alex Jones. First time violation, let's have a conversation. Let's understand why you should not do that. And you as the advocate can probably support that and in addition, kind of prepare the student for that.

The Student Conduct team does record the proceedings. All of our hearings are audio-recorded. If we assign the status of probation, or above, it is appealable to Nicole Boulais and the AVP team to review it and it may come out differently. It's never really an increase or decrease, it's more a question of like was this proportional with the traditional outcomes associated with a case like this? I can assign anything. I can't be like, okay, you need to go swim 500 yards. That wouldn't be ethical, but I could. I would invite campus partners and liaisons, like Athletics, NTID, an academic department perhaps. It depends on the circumstances. We work very closely with Residence Life, and oftentimes they will be represented and talk about the impact.

Now, after giving you that whole spiel, what does an Advocate do? The function of an advocate is to support the student through the conduct process. A lot of times when a student gets the charge letter that says you have a hearing schedule for this date at this time and in this place and here's a zoom link and here's the hearing officer, they freak out, and it's understandable because they are scared, especially if it's the first time that they have ever gotten in trouble. And they're going to say 'I didn't know,' and they're going to fill out the form and they're going to say, 'I want witnesses, I want an advocate, I want the redacted report. I want blah blah blah!' Then, I get on the phone with the student and say, 'it's okay. It's a meeting. You're meeting with this person. I know them. It's okay. Let's get you an advocate'. And the student may reply, 'I want an advocate, it doesn't matter who they are. I want support'.

Then our office will send out an email to the folks that are on our list. Students can see the list. They cannot edit it.

They cannot manipulate it, but they can see the list. And so, they might know Michael right, they might, say 'Oh, Michael is on the list I know him. I trust him. I have a relationship with him', and that student might ask Michael, 'can you serve as my advocate?' But a lot of times they might not tell Michael. Then we get information and we approach Michael, and ask, 'can you serve as the advocate?' If Michael says 'no', that's it, this is a volunteer role.

We appreciate your active participation but we recognize that everybody has busy lives and busy times. We all get that. But if Michael says, 'Yes', how can we support him? It's the student's responsibility to connect with him. In addition, Michael gets all the information including the redacted report and the charge the student was sent.

Typically, a case is three hours maximum. It could be the initial meeting with the student and then the hearing. I always plan for an hour. Sometimes they go for thirty minutes, and then maybe a follow-up with the student after the conduct hearing. So typically, it's a pre-brief, the hearing and then a de-brief, if the students wants. A lot of times, the student just goes on their way and that's it. And Michael, thanks for letting me pick on you. I appreciate it.

RIT's advocate program is unique. The simple fact that you, as an advocate, can actively participate in the hearing. Other programs across Rochester and other programs that I have been involved in have a procedural advisor, a peer advisor who cannot participate in hearing. They are a silent support in the hearing and they can't ask questions.

Obviously, you can ask us questions and we want to be asked questions as the hearing officer. We deliver the outcome. You might say, 'you said December, 2024, but what's the date?' A student might not think to ask that. But you, as a seasoned professional, understand that we need to know the date. Or, 'what does this decision-making seminar look like? How does this typically happen?' A student might not ask. But you know to ask that question. Once again, this could be the first time the student has ever been in trouble, so they might be severely triggered. So it's really about supporting and helping the student through the process so they can feel comfortable and confident, engaging in a conversation with us as the hearing officer. Once again, a student might want that, a student might not. The student might say, 'I really want to talk about what probation is going to mean, If there's a question like that, please refer it to me. I am more than happy to help, and also I want to make sure that you are educated on what that means as well. A student may say, 'I've been really thinking a lot about being away from family', you can connect them to the Counseling Center. If you're not sure that you can get them in, contact us. I can make that direct connection if you can't.

S. Aldersley: I think you mentioned there is an appeals process. Does the advocate get to participate in that?

T. Gordner: It's up to you. Most people would continue to support the student through the whole process but you don't have to. If you can't do it any more, then we would help find another person that might be able to do it. The appeal process a bit different from a typical hearing. It's not a re-hearing. It's simply talking about the grounds that the student has for their appeal. I can't speak directly to the appeal.

D. Herman: I'm Director of the College Restoration Program. I also serve as the Appeals Board chairperson. I just wanted to make sure that you have a name and a face.

H. Ghazle: What is your involvement with RIT policy violations? Because when you talk about D.18, there's a long list of violations. If I have a student involved in plagiarism or cheating, or something like that, which falls under D.8, the Academic Integrity policy, what would be your involvement in that?

T. Gordner: To my understanding, that is dealt with under D.8 and we are just told what the decision is. We input it

in Maxian, which is our Conduct software and that's it. We don't have any involvement specifically unless there has been escalation in behavior or a continuation of specific behavior. If it's a one-off academic integrity issue like cheating, you follow the D.8 policy, and that's it. It might be something that we would get involved in if there's other things going on, for example, if the student was drinking alcohol in a lab. A lot of times we're talking about a violation of other RIT policies, C.13, for example, emotional support animals that weren't properly registered. That might be something we might get involved with, or even electric scooters. There's a specific policy about conveyances. It's interesting.

M. Laver: I just want to say that I've been doing this for a few years, though not in the last year when I was on leave, and it's a pretty rewarding process. I think we overestimate the amount of contact students have with people who are not students. They sit in classes with their professors, but do they really have contact with their professors? Maybe, maybe not. So. They can go one or two years of their RIT career without really coming into contact with non students. And sometimes what they're looking for is a non anxious presence. They just want somebody to calm them down a little bit. Give them a little perspective, and I know that we are not always great at perspective, but give them a little perspective on life and everything. So it's actually a very rewarding process. After the process, you become anonymous to the student. You don't continue to have a relationship. But it is an interesting process. It can be emotionally draining but most of the time it's really just about bringing some perspective to a student who may be freaking out.

F. Deese: Is there any kind of advocate confidentiality? Is any conversation you have with the student open to evidence, subpoena?

T. Gordner: An RIT advocate is not a confidential resource. For example, an NTID academic counselor cannot serve in an advocate role because they are a confidential resource. Our counseling professionals cannot be advocates because they are confidential resources. I can't say for certain whether that would be open to a subpoena. What I would say is that if there is a severe enough case, I would probably have a direct conversation with you to say that I need an advocate who knows what's going on, who has experience at this level to help the student navigate some of these challenges. An advocate is a private resource, not a confidential resource, and as part of that during the hearing you can prompt the student and remind them that 'we talked about this during our meeting. Do you want to bring it up now? You know, you were manipulated into doing XYZ.' If you were a confidential resource, you're not able to disclose the full conversation.

J. Lanzafame: Isn't it a little problematic if the student is talking about something that borders on a Title IX issue, because then you would have to report that conversation.

T. Gordner: It doesn't have to be reported to me. I have that happen all the time. I used to be a residence coordinator, a residence director. I was constantly engaging with students who would say things like, 'Oh! And this happened to me last semester at this time and this date.' I would reply: 'Hold on. I appreciate that you are confiding this. But I want you to know that this is my role, and this is what I must do. I'm here to support you. But this is what I am obligated to do.' Not because you want to, but because you're obligated. Once again, it doesn't have to come to me. I might get it because of Public Safety, whatever the involvement is, but if a student trusts you enough to divulge that information, you can still have that tough conversation, and a lot of times they still want you to report. They don't have to do anything if they don't want to. All the action is up to that student. Stacy DeRooy can proceed if she really needs to through C.27, Title IX. But if the complainant doesn't want to move forward, then it's really ended. But I appreciate that comment. I would say that if you are able to establish trust with that student, I think that's the best relationship.

[Advocate Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 10: Faculty Grievance Committee E24.0; A. Newman (1:45) *Presentation linked below*

A. Newman: We have one remaining item on the agenda, which is the Faculty Grievance Committee. We discovered recently that the Senate has to vote to elect the chair. The committee cannot choose their own chair. I'm not entirely sure why, but it's part of the policy.

I have three slides. The first slide has the names of the existing committee members, Michael Amy, Carol Marchetti, Stephen Aldersley and Vincent Serravallo, and the next slide shows what they said when asked if they would be willing to run as chair, which basically leaves us with one person to vote for.

S. Aldersley: I nominate Michael Amy as chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee.

F. Deese: Seconded.

A. Newman: We now have a motion on the table. Any discussion?

F. Deese: I think he is a very competent, knowledgeable professor and would do a good job. And you can tell him I said so!

Motion passed 36-0-0

[Faculty Grievance Committee Presentation](#)

Agenda Item 11: TBD; A. Newman (n/a)

N/A

Agenda Item 12: New Business; A. Newman (1:48)

H. Ghazle: Some of my constituents were inquiring this morning about what the decision about the eclipse is going to be. I know we did surveys in our colleges. Now people are waiting to hear from the administration what the decision is going to be. My recommendation is that we may need to reach out to get a statement.

S. Johnson: The decision has been made already. The Provost sent it out.

Agenda Item No. 13: Adjournment; A. Newman (1:49)

Attendance 2/15/2024

Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended	Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended
Abushagur, Mustafa	KGCOE Senator		Kuhl, Michael	KGCOE Senator	X
Adrion, Amy	ALT CAD Senator	X	Lanzafame, Joseph/LRPEC and ASSAC Rep	COS Senator	X
Aldersley, Stephen	Communications Officer/ SOIS Senator	X	Lapizco-Encinas, Blanca	KGCOE Senator	X

Anselm, Martin	CET Senator	X	Laver, Michael	CLA Senator	X
Bamonto, Suzanne	CLA Senator	X	Lee, James	ALT CET Senator	
Barone, Keri	Treasurer/CLA Senator	Excused	Liu, Manlu	SCB Senator	
Boedo, Stephen	ALT KGCOE Senator		Malachowsky, Samuel	Vice Chair/ GCCIS Senator	X
Brady, Kathleen	ALT NTID Senator	X	McCalley, Carmody	ALT COS Senator	
Brown, Tamaira	Senate Coordinator	X	McLaren, Amy	CAD Senator	X
Butler, Janine	NTID Senator	Excused	Newman, Atia	Chair/CAD Senator	X
Capps, John	CLA Senator	X	Newman, Dina	COS Senator	X
Chiavaroli, Julius	ALT GIS Senator		Olles, Deana	COS Senator	X
Chung, Sorim	ALT SCB Senator	X	Olson, Rob	ALT GCCIS Senator	X
Crawford, Denton	CAD Senator		O'Neil, Jennifer	ALT CET Senator	
Cromer, Michael	ALT COS Senator		Osgood, Robert	ALT CHST Senator	
Cui, Feng	ALT COS Senator		Puchades, Ivan	KGCOE Senator	X
David, Prabu	Provost	Excused	Ray, Amit/ICC Rep	CLA Senator	X
Davis, Stacey	ALT NTID Senator	X	Ross, Annemarie	NTID Senator	X
Deese, Frank/UWC Rep	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
Eddingsaas, Nathan/RSC Rep	COS Senator	X	Staff Council Rep	Gabrielle Harrington	X
Faber, Joshua	COS Senator	X	Student Government Rep	Alex Shuron	X
Fillip, Carol	ALT CAD Senator		Thomas, Bolaji	CHST Senator	
Ghazle, Hamad	Operations Officer/CHST Senator	X	Tobin, Karen	NTID Senator	
Ghoneim, Hany	ALT KGCOE Senator		Tsouri, Gill	KGCOE Senator	X
Hardin, Jessica	ALT CLA Senator		Ulin, Robert	CLA Senator	X
Hazelwood, David	NTID Senator	X	Van Aardt, Jan	ALT COS Senator	

Hsieh, Jerrie	ALT SCB Senator	X	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	X	Worrell, Tracy	ALT CLA Senator	
Kiser, Larry	GCCIS Senator		Zanibbi, Richard	GCCIS Senator	X
Krutz, Daniel	ALT GCCIS Senator		Zlochower, Yosef	COS Senator	X

Standing Committee(s) Represented: ASSAC, ICC, LRPEC, RSC and UWC

Interpreters: Nic Crouse-Dickerson and Jennifer Mura

Presenters: Ryne Raffaele, Ellen Johnson, Nicole Prahler and Thomas Gordner

Student Assistant: Molly Kohli