**Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting**

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

Thursday, March 7, 2024          12:15 – 1:50 PM          Zoom

Attendance: See Below

| |
|---|
| Agenda Item No. 1: Call to Order; A. Newman (12:16) |
| Meeting called to order. |
| Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; A. Newman (12:16) |
| **Motion: J. Lanzafame**<br>**Seconded: S. Johnson**<br><br>**Approved by acclamation.** |
| Agenda Item No. 3: Communication Officer's Report/Approval of Minutes; S. Aldersley (12:17) |
| S. Aldersley: If you were here at the last meeting, you may remember that the discussion following Ryan Rafaelle's presentation was somewhat chaotic and as a result, the wording of the final motion was not included in the transcript. When I revised the minutes to include it, I forgot to inform Tamaira so the draft minutes that Senators received were not complete.<br><br>A. Newman: We will approve the minutes at the next meeting. |
| Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; A. Newman (12:19) |
| A. Newman: I want to direct your attention to an agenda item that's coming up today, the COACHE survey results. We're going to be sharing those, but I want to make sure that everyone understands that time is going to be really short, and I'm sure that you're going to have a lot of questions that you would like to have answered, so if you haven't done so already, please sign up for the Town Hall event tomorrow. If we need to, we can make time for further discussion at a later date in the Senate. Second, we have confirmed that the elimination of the $500 incentive payments mentioned in the discussion of changes to the IP Policy is not going to be retroactive. This means that eligible faculty who did not ask for that $500 incentive payment should now do so, so that they can collect the payments due to them.<br>Third, I am pleased to report that the Center for Teaching and Learning, together with FMS, has created a classroom update master plan, and they are currently in the process of seeking approval for it through the administrative food chain. If this is approved, not only will all university managed |

classrooms get necessary equipment upgrades, carpets and painting, but they will also be placed on a regular maintenance schedule, so that they stay maintained over the long term,

Fourth, the Executive Committee has now visited every college, and we want to thank the College of Engineering for their wonderful turnout and for the great discussion that took place.

Finally, we're officially in election season for Senate. The Nominations Committee is soliciting nominations for the Executive Committee right now, but please make sure to stay long enough for new business today because we need to make a motion to extend the nominations deadline past spring break.

## Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; Emily Redman (12:22)

E. Redman: Hello everyone. I work in the Office of the Provost and am representative for Block One. I have a few updates. We are also gearing up for elections and elections for Blocks 2, 4, and 6 will be taking place shortly.

We are also preparing for the Presidential awards for Outstanding Staff event, which is on March 28th at 2:00 pm in Ingle, and we would love to see faculty there to support the amazing staff that have been recognized.

At our last meeting we had the first of two presentations on the new ERP project. You should have received a a communication in January about the selection of 'Workday'. Our second presentation will be taking place in May. Today at Staff Council we will be hearing about the proposed academic calendar changes, volunteer opportunities for Imagine, follow up from DDI about the campus climate survey and the student conduct advocate program. And lastly, I just want to point out that we've had continued concerns from constituents and other Staff Council representatives about the University's stance and messaging on the eclipse.

## Agenda Item No. 6: Student Government Update; A. Shuron (12:23)

A. Shuron: Hello everyone, hope the semester is going well. We also have our election season coming up. Candidates will be announced tomorrow, and elections will last about 3 weeks.

We have President Munson coming in for a general discussion on the University tomorrow during our Senate. Last, I wasn't able to attend, but we had multiple members attend the Board of Trustees dinner, and I heard there was a lot of good discussion. So, we're looking forward to seeing what comes of that.

## Agenda Item No. 7: Proposed Changes to Policies E04.0 and E04.1; L. Fernandes (12:24)
*Presentation linked below*

L. Fernandes: I am a representative on the Faculty Affairs Committee and I'm here to talk to you today about the review that we've done regarding policies E4.0 and E4.1. I'd like to thank our subcommittee members and the Faculty Affairs Committee for helping us make these updates.

The charge we were given was to review the two policies since they had not been reviewed in this years. So this was a regular review cycle for E4.0 Faculty Employment policy and E4.1 Extra Service Compensation and Summer Employment policy. I will review the changes we are proposing for each one, and then make a motion as we are looking for your approval on these changes today. Our goal was to improve the clarity where we thought there was some ambiguity, and we also used our review as an opportunity to address some of the regular types of questions that the Provost's Office receives around these policies.

We did bring the changes to the FAC for review and approval, and I'm happy to say that on 2/5, the Faculty Affairs Committee unanimously approved all of the proposed updates I'm about to share with you.

I'll start with E4.0. The most significant change is to Section 4B, appointment year faculty obligations.

The text on the screen was copied from the policy. The changes are noted in the bold underlined text. I believe all of these changes went out for review in advance to you.

This is the most significant of the changes to this policy. The others are minor wording changes. If there are questions about this, I'll take those now before I move on.

A. Newman: Just for clarity, we have a red line document, so people know what the difference is. 'The end of week following the spring semester, the week which follows commencement'. Is this an addition, or is this an adjustment?

L. Fernandes: Anything you see on this screen that's bolded and underlined has been changed in the policy. That particular change, the week following spring semester, the week which follows commencement, that was a clarification. That's already consistent with the published academic calendar. So this was one of the clarity updates we wanted to make. Was that your question?

A. Newman: Yeah, I wanted to see if this was added as fresh language, or if it was edited.

B. Thomas: Why don't we let her finish the presentation first?

L. Fernandes: Alright, just one other point on this slide, because Reading Day has generated a lot of questions in the past, we specifically wanted to add a statement about Reading Day. So you'll see that at the bottom of this slide.

We did want to make a cross reference between policy 4.0 and 4.1. So there's simply a sentence that says for additional information, you can reference this other policy with a link, and the only other changes we made were small wording changes.

So those are the changes to policy 4.0. And the Faculty Affairs Committee would like to request that the Faculty Senate approve them.

**Motion: FAC moves for Faculty Senate to approve the proposed policy changes for E04.0.**

A. Newman: Do you want to finish your presentation for 4.1? Or would you like to run the vote right now?

L. Fernandes: Can we do the vote now for this policy before I go on?

A. Newman: We have a motion on the floor. And now discussion.

M. Laver: I'll just speak for my college. We have traditionally held what we call spring celebration. But call it what you want, faculty appreciation, staff appreciation. You know, those sorts of events. We've held them traditionally on Reading Day because nobody has classes, and that makes sense. But according to a strict reading of this policy, one might argue you should not do that because faculty are required to be available to students. We're not required to to attend our spring celebration, of course. I'd just like to hear your thoughts on that. And whether that came up in committee and things of that nature.

L. Fernandes: We did talk about that and I think this was one of the areas where the Provost's Office has gotten questions in the past. We felt it was important to note that as it's stated, 'shall not be required to attend'. We can't control every single college and all of the actions they take on

Reading Day. But it's basically our recommendation that that day be available for faculty to be able to assist students if there are questions. I'd say, as long as your event doesn't require attendance, it wouldn't necessarily be in violation of what we have listed here.

S. Johnson: So I'm reading right here, and it says, 'end a week following the spring semester (the week which follows commencement).' Is it that that entire week is available for us to work? Or is it that Monday? Because normally, we're done at Commencement and don't have to do anything after that. This seems to say that there's an entire week after commencement that I should be available for work.

L. Fernandes: That's correct, and that is consistent with how the faculty appointment dates are currently published.

S. Johnson: Last year we had an issue where commencement was not in our contract. So that's a little different, then, isn't it?

L. Fernandes: I know that in the past few years there've been some issues with that particular week. But going forward, and if you need me to pull up the official website where those dates are published, I could do that

S. Johnson: I'm a little confused because I've never been required to be available the week after commencement and now it looks like I still have to potentially go to meetings and things of that nature after commencement is over for another seven days.

L. Fernandes: That is consistent with the published appointment dates for faculty. We just wanted to make it clear in this policy, but that is consistent with the published dates.

S. Johnson: Every letter I've ever gotten has always been like one or two days after commencement, and we're done.

L. Fernandes:  I can't speak to your specific letter, but I can tell you these dates are published in advance of the academic year. and what we have written here is consistent with those published expectations from the Provost's Office.

S. Johnson: Okay, so I would like to go back to my department before I vote on this to see what's going on here. Because this is a major change, according to what I've always been considering. If this is already current policy, I'd still want to look into it.

A. Newman: That's a good point. Anyone else?

S. Aldersley: Unless I missed it, nobody seconded the motion.

A. Newman: Motions from our standing committees don't need a second.

S. Aldersley: Sorry. I keep forgetting that.

A. Newman: So there is a motion on the floor. And now the question is, whether we would like to vote. Scott, do you move to table this?

S. Johnson: Isn't it our standard practice, that we usually get a presentation and then come back the next meeting and do the vote after we had a chance to talk to people.

A. Newman: It has been. But then, also, we've been trying to avoid having too many returning things to move things along.

S. Johnson: I would just like the opportunity to look at where this is actually written out. Because I wasn't aware that we are supposed to be available for that time, and I've gotten contract letters like last year, where we actually were off contract before commencement. So all of those contract letters apparently have been wrong, and I would like to see where that policy is.

L. Fernandes: I can send the link to the website if that would help.

S. Johnson: That would be very helpful. Because when I go to speak to the people I represent I'd like to show them that we're not changing any policy. This already exists, and we're just fixing the wording.

L. Fernandes: I'm in slideshare mode right now, Laverne, would it be possible for you to cut and paste the website in the chat. So people can actually go out and see those dates and that there's nothing in what we've proposed that's inconsistent with them.

A. Newman: I think that would be a really good thing. We also have a question from the audience. Lauren Hall is asking, 'could that language be clarified in the motion? I don't think that the language is clear that faculty obligations end at the end of the week after commencement.

H. Ghazle: We do have a motion from the FAC to move forward to approve this, but we have some senators asking for an extension so they can go back to their constituents and consult with them. Are you okay with withdrawing your motion for now and coming back at a different time to present it?

L. Fernandes: If that's how the senators would like to handle this. Whatever you would like to do, I'll do my best to support it.

H. Ghazle: I do recommend that. It looks like we have some senators who have some questions, and they have not consulted with their constituents. If we table it today, the Executive Committee can put it back on the schedule for a future meeting.

A. Newman: I think that's a good suggestion. And because these are employment policies, it's not something that can very easily be modified without making sure that everyone is okay with it.

J. Lanzafame (*in the chat*): Aren't the contracts what is binding? This language in policy doesn't change anything?

A. Newman: That's another question that we should probably make sure that there's an answer to, because if we are getting contracts that are contradictory to the policy, then maybe that's something that has to be addressed as well from an administrative as well as a policy point of view. So yes, if you're willing to withdraw the motion today, we will bring you back. And in the meantime let's make sure that our senators have all of the documents necessary to be able to share with their constituents and come back ready to vote next time round.

L. Fernandes: OK, then I'll move on to E4.1, the policy for faculty extra service compensation and summer employment. One clear change we needed to make was removal of any discussion of intersession, so that section was entirely removed and then we updated the language in sections A, B and E. to note that written agreement would be required between the faculty and their immediate supervisor. The previous language had stated faculty and their college department head/chair. So we changed the level of agreement in multiple sections, so that they consistently say 'between faculty and immediate supervisor'. The other thing we did in Section 2B was we provided a definition for overload teaching and that's shown on your screen there. In addition to those changes, we also did a cross reference to policy 4.0, and then very small wording changes were made to the document. So those were the only changes that were made. And again, the Faculty Affairs Committee would like to move that these changes be approved.

A. Newman: We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion.

H. Ghazle: Even though we don't have much discussion on this, and even though the linkage between 4.0 and 4.1 4 is not much, it may be beneficial for us to take it as one package the next time they come back.

A. Newman: Okay, we can absolutely consider that. But besides the reference to each other, is there any reason why there would be a need to review this?

L. Fernandes: I don't believe so. I don't believe the changes that we made have any implication for the questions that have been raised around 4.0 but again I'll go with whatever the group decides.

B. Thomas: I don't think the two are tied together so I think it would be appropriate at this time to vote on 4.1

A. Newman: Okay, I think that we should maybe continue with this vote, and then bring 4.0 back at a different time.

**Motion: FAC moves for Faculty Senate to approve the proposed policy changes for E04.1.**

Approved: 40-0-1

A. Newman: Thank you, Leonie, for your presentation and for the hard work of the subcommittee.


E 04.0 and E04.1 Presentation

E 04.0 Proposed Edits

E 04.1 Proposed Edits

Agenda Item No. 8: Updates from RABC; K. Maki and B. Hartpence (12:45) *Presentation linked below*

Hi, I'm Kara Maki, and I'm co-chairing the RABC together with Bruce Hartpence, who's also on the call. We want to start off by first acknowledging our colleagues who are serving on the committee with us. And we also want to bring your attention to everyone who's on the committee in case you have any questions or concerns that you wanted to talk about. After our presentation, you could perhaps interact with your college's RABC colleague representative or reach out to us via email. One of RABC's responsibilities, highlighted in bold on the slide, is to present an analysis of the budget and other financial matters to the Senate for your review and we wanted to start by sharing our efforts in that regard. Our committee has been talking a lot about how to interpret this charge: what does it mean to present an analysis of the budget? Well, here's a definition of 'analysis' according to Merriam-Webster. "A detailed examination of anything complex in order to understand its nature or to determine its essential features." Well, this sounded pretty daunting to the committee. But we are starting by thinking about the big picture, where are the big pots of money going within the Institute. So our field of view is large and our goal this year is to share with the faculty some perspectives on the essential features of the budget again, taking this big picture view. We've been working very closely with our colleagues, Jim Watters and Leanne Hill. They've been providing information and data to us and answering our questions. With that in mind, in December, together with Senate representatives, we participated in a meeting with the Budget Office, where we were given an update on what's happening in our current fiscal year. We also talked a little bit about the planning for the 2025 budget. And just to remind you that we are currently in FY24 which started in July of 2023. That meeting started with an overview of what happened in FY23. We looked at actual numbers versus projected numbers and what I took away from it is that the Budget Office in general does a pretty good job of predicting where the money's going to go, and then where the money actually goes. So in most of the big buckets, predicted was pretty close to actual. We then transitioned to talk a little bit about the current budget. And we put a link here, so you can look at the predictions for the current budget for yourself. They're available on RIT's website. We just wanted to share a few numbers to give you a snapshot. Maybe some of you already have an appreciation for this, but I did not. The first thing we're talking about is how much money is brought in to the university in the form of tuition and fees. A gross estimate is about 91% of total revenue. But then, once you think about the discount rate and the financial aid that's given to students the question becomes what is the net tuition. And it gets bumped down significantly to about 84% of the revenue that comes into the university. So we are very clearly a tuition driven university. The other thing that we've been thinking about, and we'll talk a little bit more about this later on, is how much of those monies are actually distributed to Academic Affairs. If you look on the website, you would want to add up the buckets that correspond to Instructional and Academic Services. And if you do that, you see about 60% of generated revenue goes to Academic Affairs where most of us sit. So the committee has been participating in these meetings and thinking about these numbers. We're also thinking about quantifying RIT's financial health in general rather than just thinking about a single year's snapshot. For example, Forbes Magazine creates a financial GPA score for private universities. In FY21 our GPA was 3.41. We were a B+. The way they compute this GPA is by looking at 2-year old data that's publicly available. So the grade that you're getting in 2021 is based on data from 2018 and 2019, so pre covid. If you look at the newest numbers, again using data that's 2 years old, we bumped up to an A with a GPA of 3.92. The Forbes article pointed out how universities had to be nimble during the Covid years, and how they actually became a little more fiscally responsible. So that's another thing that we are looking into. Our report at the end of the year

will include all this analysis. The other thing that the committee has been participating in is the 2025 budget cycle. Here you see a schematic of how the budget cycle at RIT works, and right here is where we just participated in February and March in the budget hearing meetings, where all the colleges and divisions requested additional funds, requests which had to be tied to the strategic plan, specifically People, Places or Partnerships. One take-away that I found surprising is how different the needs in each division are. With regard to the faculty voice in these deliberations, it sort of funnels up and comes through through the Deans right now. One thing that the committee has been talking about is, should there be a collective faculty voice, and if so, how could that work?

Now, moving on with our updates we have two continuing charges and two new charges. The first continuing charge relates to policy C3.0, and we have actually handed that off to the office of the Vice President for Research. And we understand they are moving this forward but we continually check in with them. The second continuing charge is to look for ways to increase transparency and to think about specific charges related to that. We decided that we would integrate transparency into our new charges. And so that's how we are moving forward. The first new charge is to review best practices for merit pay, and compensation. We're attacking this in different ways. First, we're looking at longitudinal data regarding faculty satisfaction with compensation. We have been given access to COACHE data from 2013, 2016 and 2019. We have not seen the 2023 data, but there will be a town hall on this so we expect to get it soon. One interesting thing to note from looking at the data since 2013 is that when faculty are asked to identify two and only two things that are the worst aspects of working at this institution one of the top four responses for many different faculty groups was compensation. So that's a trend we're looking into. We're planning to create a short Qualtrics survey, where we will ask the faculty what their current satisfaction is with compensation. We are also looking at the transparency of compensation practices, asking questions like do we meet our own benchmarks? We're working with HR on this to look at Compa ratios. And we're asking that the data be broken down by college and rank. Another question we're thinking about is how do we implement our policies and is this explained to faculty? Is there transparency? We have collected data from deans on how they distribute merit pay and also add-pay. And again we will be surveying faculty to see if they understand this process and whether it's clear to them. We've also been reviewing the HR website. If you haven't had a chance to look at it there's a lot of information on there, so I would encourage you to look at it. The other question we're looking at is are the benchmarks themselves fair? Here we're looking at IPEDS reports. We all have access to these and you can look at average faculty salaries, reported by rank, and you can compare faculty salaries to peer institutions. So we're looking at that data to try and get a sense of the fairness of our benchmarks. We're also thinking about ways in which we might look at how our benchmarks change over time. Often we only know what's happening year to year. Taking a longer view might be interesting.

The last charge is to look at how our benchmark universities have historically allocated budgets to Academic Affairs and how their allocations compare to RIT's. The subgroup working on this task have identified peer institutions, and downloaded publicly available reports on their websites. One challenge the sub-group is currently facing is how to compare these reports which are created by different accounting firms and don't always use the same terminology. This means it can be hard to understand which pot of money at another institution is actually being allocated to Academic Affairs.

A. Newman: Thank you for an excellent presentation. Do we have any questions? I see there is a question in the Chat from Josh Faber wondering whether we can get an extra credit assignment to raise our grade.

P. David: Thank you so much Kara. I am wondering who is doing all this heavy lifting on your committee.

K. Macki: Here is the list of members. We decided to divide and conquer. A few of our colleagues have taken the lead as chairs of the subgroups that are working on these different charges.

A. Newman: I see from a comment Bruce has mentioned that they are working with the Faculty

Affairs Committee on Merit and Compensation.

N. Buch: Just an observation as your benchmarking different Academic Affairs units across institutions, you may also want to make sure what the purview of each of these Academic Affairs units is because it does vary from university to university.

A. Newman: That's good to know. Thank you.

P. David: One observation here for everyone. This is terrific work. On the benchmarks, Academic Affairs decides what to do with it. I want to make this clear. HR does not determine what salary we are supposed to give to faculty. That's purely an academic decision. They provide benchmarks based on guidance that we have given. They are serving us. They don't tell us what comparable universities should be. They don't tell us what percentile we should peg our benchmark. None of that. They just provide us with information. For faculty salaries, and I'm only talking about faculty salaries, it's purely a decision that's made within academic affairs. HR does not interfere with that at all. I just want to make sure that that part is clear.

A. Newman: Thank you. And we have some volunteered support from Emily on meeting with RABC to discuss the Academic Affairs budget. And another question, Ivan is asking where would the travel budget fall in the breakdown, and why has it not yet returned to its pre pandemic levels. Is that something Dr. David, you would be able to answer?

P. David: Yes, we will address that in the presentation on the COACHE data.

RABC Presentation

---

Agenda Item No. 9: Substantive and Other Program Changes to Various NTID Associate Degree Programs; M. Lynn and H. Nickisher (1:04)  *Presentation linked below*

H. Nickisher: Good afternoon. I am here to present on two recently ICC approved pieces of curriculum. The first has to do with substantive changes to several programs. As you can now see, I've just been joined by Matthew Lynn, NTID's associate dean of curriculum affairs. I've asked him to join me because he so deftly laid out everything for ICC.

M. Lynn: Thanks, Heidi. Because I have limited time, I've written a script because I wanted to make sure I get through everything. So good afternoon, everyone. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss with you the curriculum changes that are being proposed for a number of NTID's associate degree programs. As part of this effort I worked with Chris Licata and Brenda Thornton to prepare all of the paperwork necessary for reporting to NYSED. And it was this documentation that was submitted recently to ICC for review. I'm especially grateful to Brenda for all of her assistance through this process. I literally could not have done it without her.
Because of the limited time I have with you this afternoon, it's not possible for me to explain every individual change that is being made to all seven programs that are currently under consideration, but I can certainly give a reasonable enough overview to help you understand the need to communicate these various changes to NYSED. By way of background, NYSED defines an Associate in Occupational Studies, abbreviated AOS, as a degree that has a minimum of 60 credits and is career focused. AOS programs are not required to include any general education coursework at all.
Modifying at least one third of the minimum number of credits for the degree results in a substantive change requiring review by the College Curriculum Committee, ICC, Faculty Senate, the Provost, and NYSED, so for an associate degree, such as the AOS, changing at least 20 credits triggers this review.

NTID's AOS programs have been designed as five-semester career focused programs with program specific literacy and technical skills incorporated throughout the major coursework. Students learn how to prepare major-specific documents, such as memos, reports, forms, technical summaries, emails and resumes. They work on their interview skills and they often create a program-specific portfolio. Each of NTID's AOS programs requires a co-op between the fourth and fifth semesters. Although not required, NTID has also included its own general education framework into its AOS programs to ensure that students have the necessary foundational English and math skills, as well as more general communication and liberal arts perspective skills to help them to understand the world around them.

Because of the career focused nature of our AOS programs, these students are not required to complete Writing Seminar or the RIT Liberal Arts Perspectives. For comparison, students in NTID's analogous AS and AAS programs must complete Writing Seminar, the artistic, ethical, global, and social perspectives and two General Education electives, one of which must be a math course.

This slide summarizes the reasons for the current review of each of our AOS programs and for one of our AAS programs. At least 20 credits of coursework is being changed since the last NYSED registration for four AOS programs. Those are the four on the left that have the letter Y, and are shaded in orange.

These are the AOS in Applied Computer Technology, the AOS in Applied Business Technology, the AOS in Precision Manufacturing Technology and the AOS in Laboratory Science Technology. The most recent NYSED registration for each of these programs occurred right before RIT's conversion to semesters a decade ago. The AOS and the AAS in Design and Imaging Technology have been reported to NYSED more recently, but right now we're informing them of the addition of a Digital Media Concentration which makes this an FYI to ICC.

Lastly, the AOS in Architectural and Civil Drafting Technology is registered with NYSED's Office of the Professions, which means that we have to inform them of any program changes, regardless of how many credits are impacted.

So now for the details on how we've reached 20 modified credits. To prepare for RIT's conversion to semesters, NTID designed its AAS programs to include a 24-credit subset of the General Education framework included in RIT's baccalaureate programs. Similarly, a 24-credit but NTID-specific Gen. Ed. framework was created for our AOS programs. This is what you see on the left side of this table starting in Academic year 13/14, the first year of semesters. In subsequent years this AOS Gen. Ed. framework has been modified in various ways. Starting in fall of 2014, two of the AOS Perspectives and the unspecified elective were removed. For the remaining two perspectives, students had a free choice for one or both of them, depending on their major. Then, in fall of 2017, Freshman Seminar was reduced from one credit to 0 credits. For fall of 2024, we are proposing the replacement of the Career English I, and Career English II requirements to allow students to apply almost any unused English, math or liberal arts coursework toward the AOS degree. The sum total of these changes to the AOS Gen. Ed. framework alone is 16 modified credits, which is just four credits shy of the 20 credit threshold necessary for reporting to NYSED.

I do want to specifically address the proposal to remove Career English, because I don't want it to seem as if English isn't important for our students. A bit of context is important here. Career English is a terminal, 2-semester non major-specific sequence that is taken by only a small number of our AOS students and is not required at all for students in the analogous AAS programs. Because most of our students have the goal of switching from an AOS program into an AAS program, instead of taking Career English, many of them already opt to take NTID English coursework that leads to Writing Seminar. These English courses are more advanced than Career English, and are already being accepted in place of Career English toward the AOS degree, if a student is ultimately unable to complete all AAS Gen. Ed. requirements. Further, Career English repeats the workplace literacy skills that are already covered in courses in students' majors, and it prevents them from applying credit they have earned in other English math and Liberal Arts courses toward the AOS degree. As part of this modification, we are also adding a requirement that all students must either place out of the developmental NTID English coursework that currently leads to Career English, or they must take 1, 2, or 3 NTID English courses to achieve the same proficiency. In the latter case, students will be able to apply these English courses toward the new AOS electives allowance that are replacing the Career English I and II requirement. So these AOS Gen. Ed changes constitute the vast majority of modifications that have been made to NTID's AOS programs since the last time they were registered with NYSED. Each of our programs has also modified anywhere between one and four major specific course requirements, and this is what gets us across the 20-credit threshold for reporting. I don't have time today to review each of these program-specific changes with you. But they have been described in detail in the information that has been provided to ICC, and that will be communicated to NYSED.

H. Nickisher: As you can see, we did unanimously vote to approve this. Again, thank you to Matt for the way it was laid out for the members of ICC which made it pretty simple for us. So again, unanimous approval there and that if you can go to the next slide, we would just like to make the motion **to approve these changes to these NTID associate degree programs.**

**Motion approved: 33-0-1**

[NTID Associate Degree Programs Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 10: Analytic and Expressive Communication Certificate (AEC); H. Nickisher (1:15)
*Presentation linked below*

H. Nickisher: I'm joined by COLA Associate Dean Lauren Hall who was very instrumental in shepherding the proposal for a Certificate in Analytic and Expressive Communication through ICC. First, a little bit of background. When these certificates were first introduced, our previous provost was very excited about them, especially this one, as I understand it. And the goal here is to bolster students' general education, experience, and create a robust pathway into Philosophy and Communication. Thus the proposed interdisciplinary certificate is focused on developing students' analytic and critical thinking as well as communication skills. And this is the rationale for emphasizing these skills. The curriculum requirements are pretty straightforward: there are two required courses and 3 electives, and the list of approved electives has about 20 possibilities, many of them coming from Philosophy, with a number from the Communications Department. ICC voted unanimously to approve the certificate and would like to make a motion that you approve it as well.

B. Thomas: I need a little bit of clarification here. Reading the documentation it seems this is tailored specifically towards students in STEM-related programs. Is that correct?

H. Nickisher: Yes.

B. Thomas: And so what we're saying here in essence is that current students in those programs cannot communicate properly.

H. Nickisher: Well, I don't know that it's they can't communicate, and maybe, Lauren, you can chime in here. I think the College of Liberal Arts was hearing from potential employers that they really wanted their students to have these certain kinds of skills. And I guess these skills were seen as maybe not as well developed in some of these students because they didn't have as many opportunities to take those kinds of classes.

L. Hall: I'll just very quickly echo what Heidi said. The proposers of this curriculum, who are also co-PIs on the grant from the Tiegle Foundation which supported this work, did substantive surveying and focus group work with STEM students, as well as area employers, about the kinds of skills that employers would like to see. And they also did focus groups with STEM students in particular about what kinds of certifications they would find most helpful when on the job market. And one of the things that clearly came out of those surveys and focus groups was the need for some sort of certification or sort of additional signal to employers that students had taken additional coursework that was really skill focused in both analytic and expressive communication. It was that STEM student and employer feedback that directed the course of the curriculum.

I. Puchades: So these certificates are for students, but also for non-students. Right? We could have people outside RIT signing up for this certificate and paying money to get this certificate. Is that how that would work?

H. Nickisher: Lauren, correct me if I'm wrong but this is just for RIT students.

L. Hall: Yes. This is separate from RIT-Certified. This is a NYSED undergraduate certificate. It's a credit bearing certificate, and therefore different from the kinds of certifications that RIT-Certified provides which are generally zero credit, although that depends.

I. Puchades: Okay? So this would be different than a minor would be, for example?

L. Hall: The way that NYSED is thinking about this is that minors are a cluster of disciplinary courses. So you might have a minor in Renaissance Literature, for example. Certificates are intended to be much more skills-based, and are intended to provide students with tangible skills for the workforce, which is why we would not be bringing to the ICC a certificate in Russian Literature or Philosophy. It's really a skill- based career-focused cluster of courses.

B. Thomas: So one of the challenges with carrying out surveys on campus is that you want to see what the population of students you want to survey is, and how many people will fill out your survey. I read from the documentation that ten students were surveyed. Does Lauren have any information on how many students were surveyed? Looking at the statistics vis a vis the number of students within that STEM discipline. My concern with this would be that if we're surveying just a handful of students and on the basis of that, designing a certificate program, I wouldn't know how effective that will be. There are General Education courses or writing intensive courses at the upper level which significantly push students' ability to communicate, to review published papers and to write summaries of those papers. I know of such courses in my own college, and I think probably in the College of Science and in GCCIS. But that's not all that makes up a STEM discipline. So I just want to make sure that we're all on the same page here.

L. Hall: I don't think there was any intention to say that the STEM disciplines don't do some of this. I will say that in terms of the sample sizes, I don't know what they are off-hand. But I will say that the one of the co-PIs on the grant, and one of the major folks who is involved in the creation of this curriculum is Kelly Martin, who at the time that this began, was the director of the School of Communication, and her scholarship focuses almost entirely on workforce development and workforce skills and how the field of Communication thinks about the kinds of skills that are needed in the workforce. And so she came to this from as a specialist, as a scholar, with that lens in mind, and I know that they did a wide range of focus groups. There were a number of ways that they accessed student opinions.

A. Newman: Okay, so there is a vote on the floor to approve the Certificate in Analytic and Expressive Communication.

**Motion: To approve the Certificate in Analytic and Expressive Communication**

**Motion approved: 31-1-3**

AEC Presentation

---

Agenda Item No. 11:COACHE Survey Results; A. Newman, S. Sarchet and L. McQuiller Williams (1:25) *Presentation linked below*

L. McQuiller: On behalf of Provost David, the COACHE task force co-chairs, Atia Newman and Sarah Sarchet and myself, I want to thank everyone for joining us for the presentation on the 2023 COACHE faculty job satisfaction survey results.

I want to begin by acknowledging the tremendous dedication and commitment of the COACHE task force members, who worked tirelessly to increase faculty participation and were charged with reviewing and contextualizing the system wide results.

So now let's turn to the survey response rates. A total of 449 faculty members responded to the survey, representing 47% of faculty, and this response rate was slightly lower than the 50% who responded back in 2019. Now, differences in rates of response between demographic groups are also reflected on the slide and the table summarizes the response rates by tenure status, rank, gender, and race.

Now, also, with regard to demographic groups throughout the presentation, you will hear results regarding faculty of color and under-represented minorities. So brief definitions are in order, and you can see those definitions on the slide. Faculty of color, as defined by COACHE, are those individuals not characterized as white non-hispanic, and under-represented minorities are individuals who identify as neither white, non-Hispanic nor Asian-American. Also presented in the table are the response rates for the peer institutions and the cohort. The five peer institutions were chosen by RIT and reflect the five institutions that you can see on the screen. The numbers in parentheses represent the year the institution administered their survey. For example, Clemson administered their COACHE survey in 2022.

The cohort consists of 86 institutions that participated in the COACHE survey from 2020 through 2023. RIT's response rate of 47% is the same as our peer institutions, and both are 5% higher than for the cohort. Now the peer institutions and cohort information is going to be very important because, as we will learn in just a few minutes, COACHE compared our benchmark scores with peer institutions and the cohort to determine areas of strength and areas of concern.

Now let's get to the nitty gritty. This slide is an overview on how to interpret the results we're going to see in a few minutes and what we are most concerned about is the placement of this diamond marker.

A score in the red section of the column indicates that RIT ranked in the bottom 30% of all institutions, a mark in the blue section indicates our faculty ranked in the top 30%, and a mark in the gray area indicates a middle of the road result. The open circles reflect where the five peer selected institutions landed on particular benchmarks, and the solid line reflects our previous scores from 2019.

Earlier I mentioned the importance of the peer institutions and the cohort for identifying areas of strength and areas of concern. An area of strength is identified as any benchmark where our score is in the top two among our selected peer institutions and in the top 30% of all institutions. So we have a two-part test.

An area of concern, on the other hand, is a benchmark where our campus falls in the bottom two among the selected peer institutions, and in the bottom 30% compared to the entire survey cohort.

To step us through the areas of strength and areas of concern, I will turn it over to Atia.

A. Newman: Thank you, Laverne. Moving on to the next page, here are the 25 benchmarks that faculty were surveyed about, and just in a very quick glance, you're going to be able to look for the dark black diamond shape, and where it falls in roughly, pretty much every single one of the the benchmarks. Obviously, this is something that you're going to want to be able to see more closely, so the documentation for this survey is going to be available on the Provost's website. I think our results are not going to be very surprising for most of us.

The thing that you're going to look for is the dark line that indicates where we are relative to 2019. You're going to find there are a number of places where we have dropped down further in our own perception of where we stand as a university in benchmarks. These are all areas obviously of concern. One of the things that the COACHE survey does in a very sort of concise way, is they summarize our areas of strength and our areas of concern in clear, defined categories. In 2019, we did have some areas of strength. In 2023, we now have no areas of strength. And the same number of areas of concern that we had in 2019. I believe some things have been moved off this list, but we do have a lot of areas of concern

Something we did in order to make this feel a little less traumatizing overall was to make the effort of talking about areas where we actually did better from where we were in 2019.

So the language that's in blue is where you can see we've made some improvement since 2019. And areas in red is where our satisfaction is among the lowest of peer and cohort schools. Overall, our areas of moderate satisfaction are areas where we're sort of middle of the road.

Moving forward, there are a couple of different ways where the data has been encoded for you. The first round of information is going to be presented in these sort of pie-shaped wedges where you're going to be able to see, not only the the actual benchmark categories, but also among them, a whole series of columns, one which actually keeps track of the mean of where we lie in the overall Peer/Cohort groups,

which is a score between one and five, so the higher the mean, the better our overall rating. Then you can see a breakdown according to category, such as tenured, pre tenured, full, associate, men, women, etc. You're going to be able to see how we rank according to our peer group and our cohort group. If you see blue at the top of the pie, that means that we rank first or second among our peers and in the top 30% of the cohort. If you see a lot of red, that means we are either fifth or sixth place in our peer group, and in the bottom 30% of our cohort group. And if you see middles, that's all in the middle 40% of both our peer group and our cohort group. The other interesting way of representing our benchmarking data is where we see by rank and gender we're going to be able to see breakdowns by benchmark, topic by topic, which groups in comparison to each other are more or less satisfied. For groups that are less satisfied, their numbers will come up. Minor differences are represented as text only, moderate differences show up in yellow and larger differences in levels of satisfaction between groups show up in orange.

That's a lot of information, but this is helpful just to keep track of what's going on.

The next slide shows the first set of benchmarks that we have received and you're going to notice that we have a lot of red.

I don't think any of this is surprising. Some of the unsurprising areas are that we are high up in our personnel and family policies on the peer group side but in the cohort areas we have some areas of blue. Otherwise you're going to notice our nature of work, our collaboration, our tenure policies and leadership, which is right at the bottom. I will also indicate here the importance of the mean. The numbers in the first column, because that is a very good indicator of where we fall in the overall level of satisfaction.

Next, in the second set of our benchmarks, you can see we still have a pretty decent amount of red showing up in the pie wedges. Leadership again has some real significant hits just overall. But we start to fall into more of the grays regarding governance, trust and productivity. Collegiality seems to be almost entirely in the grays, which is nice.

And then we have appreciation, recognition, departmental quality, etc., which are back in the red. That, I guess, is not very surprising to us.

On that note I will hand the presentation over to my colleague, Sarah Sarchet

S. Sarchet: This line provides a subgroup analysis that compares different pairs of faculty subgroups. Where you see a word appear, that indicates that that particular group within the pairs had lower satisfaction. So, for example, in the top row, 'nature of work research'. We see the word 'tenured', so that means tenured faculty had lower satisfaction than pre-tenure faculty As a reminder, words that appear in gray and white have only a small difference between the two subgroups, whereas words in yellow have a moderate difference between the subgroups and orange has a large difference between the subgroups. In some places you'll see there is no word, there's a blank, and that indicates there is no difference between subgroups. On the right side of the table, you can see 2019. This gives us a quick comparison between the 2019 and 2023 data. Where you see a plus sign, that indicates that we have a greater amount of satisfaction than 2019, and where you see a negative sign, we see worse satisfaction than 2019.

Returning to the left side of the table, in some of the rows at the bottom, you will see there's an NA (not available) which indicates that some groups were not asked to respond to a specific item. For example, you'll see the columns that indicate non-tenure track faculty - NA, because they were not asked to respond to tenure related items.

Moving to the next slide. Here are the other benchmarks. The following faculty subgroups were more likely than their counterparts on average to give lower ratings in their survey responses. Tenured faculty had more areas of lower satisfaction than pre-tenure faculty. Tenured faculty had more areas of low satisfaction than non tenure track, associate professors had more areas of low satisfaction than full professors. Women had more areas of low satisfaction than men. White faculty and faculty of color had a similar number of areas of low satisfaction. White faculty and Asian faculty had a similar number of areas of low satisfaction and white faculty had more areas of low satisfaction compared to underrepresented minorities. Moving to our next slide, faculty were asked to select the two best aspects of working at RIT. On the left side of the slide, the four bullet points are the most frequently cited best aspects of working at RIT. These are quality of colleagues, support of colleagues, quality of undergraduate students, and cost of living. Looking at the table, along the top, you can see there's five demographic groups. For clarity, 'overall' means all faculty combined, and the word associate means those at the rank of associate professor. You can see that there are some columns where there are more than four items in red, and that's because there were ties in some cases. Moving to the next slide, faculty were asked to select the two worst aspects of working at RIT. And again on the left side, the four most frequently cited are pulled out: compensation, teaching load, too much service or too many assignments, and quality of leadership.

And again on the right for the different subgroups, it's highlighted and red, therefore, most frequently cited worse areas. Finally, faculty were asked to rate their satisfaction with their department as a place to work and with RIT as a place to work. So, looking at the very top, the first bar, 66% of all faculty were either very satisfied or satisfied with their department as a place to work.13% of faculty were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with their department and 19% of all faculty were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their department as a place to work. Looking at the lower set of bars, 53.2% of all faculty were very satisfied or satisfied, 23.7% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and finally 22.7% were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with RIT as a place to work.
And with that I'd like to return the presentation to Laverne.

L. McQuiller: Thanks, Sarah. Now the next set of slides provides us with a glimpse at the faculty responses to the question: 'What is the one thing your institution could do to improve the workplace for faculty?' The five most common themes were summarized by COACHE as #1 Compensation and Benefits, which should come as no surprise, particularly in light of Kara's previous presentation; #2 Facilities and Resources for Work, #3 Nature of Work, general, #4 Culture and #5 Nature of Work, teaching.
Now briefly stepping through each of these themes, compensation and benefits emerged as the most frequently discussed topic in the feedback, underscoring its significance. Feedback regarding compensation primarily expressed widespread concern and disappointment that compensation was insufficient and needed to be improved. Suggestions offered were primarily focused on three areas: #1 increasing base salaries and addressing salary compression, #2 the concern with the merit raise process and #3 need for improved benefits. Specific suggestions from faculty for improvement can be seen on the slide under the compensation section.
Now, apart from compensation, feedback and suggestions related to facilities and work resources were frequently mentioned, making it the second most discussed category. The majority of comments here were concentrated in four areas: #1 physical workspace; #2 work resources, and here the feedback underscored a common concern related to a perceived lack of support and the need for additional resources to cultivate a robust research culture and support the teaching mission; #3 support in the areas of staffing and technology; and, #4 reallocation of resources to departments and colleges, with a suggestion by some to move to an activity based budgeting model.
The third most frequently cited theme was nature of work-general. This reflected the faculty's desire for a balanced workload and clarity of expectations and processes for tenure, promotion and annual review. Now, feedback contains suggestions about how specific university-wide aspects of faculty's work life could be improved, ranging from addressing faculty workload directly, as well as clarifying processes for tenure, promotion and annual review.
Now, culture was the fourth most frequently cited theme, where comments underscored the faculty's aspiration for a culture that values all employees, encompassing faculty of our ranks, disciplines, and colleges. Now a culture that appreciates and values shared governance was deemed equally important. In this context faculty members suggested that leadership should enhance mechanisms to incorporate faculty input into decision making at all levels. There was also a desire for an environment that celebrates and acknowledges faculty contributions, specifically beyond scholarship. This last comment really stems from a perception held by several faculty that their contributions to teaching and service often go unrecognized or are not valued.
The nature of work-teaching constituted the fifth largest category of responses. Suggestions for improvement in this area centered on the need to recognize and reward teaching excellence, especially in tenure and promotion processes, establish policies that support and recognize interdisciplinary teaching and programs, foster a sense of appreciation and recognition for lecturers, and provide additional resources for teaching to aid faculty with supporting students, namely, to assist supporting students' mental health and well being, as well as supporting students with accommodations.
The last slide offers a retrospective analysis with the 2019 open comment results. And this retrospective can be particularly useful to assist senior leadership in targeting areas that persist and are seen by faculty as important levers to positively impact the workplace environment. The themes, based on the count of associated comments that coincide with the 2023 analysis, include #1 compensation, #2 facilities, #3 faculty workload, #4 work resources, #5 research support, and #6 tenure and promotion clarity.
I will now turn the floor over to Provost David to address action items to improve faculty satisfaction.

P. David: Thank you. There is no way to positively frame all of this at this point. Clearly these are important findings. I take them to heart and we should go to work on them. There's a lot of work to do.

But I think there are strengths as well, and as we think about what we have to do, one of the things that I find most appealing is the faith and trust people have in their colleagues and the people of the institution. I think that's the social capital that we have, and we should continue to nurture that and to find ways to build on it as a community.

The compensation question, I can go through the benchmarks. Although all of you have gone through this in the past and you know how this works, but if you are new to this, the website has a rich set of resources.

My plan is to work with senior administration and Faculty Senate to develop a databased argument on what is reasonable. Once we determine that, then figure out where the resources are going to come from. And I think that's the other challenge, right? We have been in a resource-tight environment over the last few years starting with COVID. But trying to come up with a plan to address compensation is one of my top priorities. If you ask me exactly how I'm going to do that I don't know but I do know that is important to you. It's important to me, and it should be important to us as a community. Let's go on to the next slide. The research expansion, facilities I hear about this. We talk about an R1 institution. Where is the infrastructure? A variety of things have come up in the past. Here all I'm going to say is, we have made some progress in terms of creating square footage through the SHED conversion, Brown Hall, as well as the new research building. We're adding. Is it enough? There's always room to grow. But there are other important areas that I've heard from faculty, which I have passed on to the VP for Research, Dr. Rafaelle. He knows this, too, and we're working on this: grant submission, grant administration, computational resources, equipment, all these things come up and are certainly on our radar. Major work, the tenure and promotion guidelines, the E5.0 revisions, I think that was an important step forward. This allows faculty to receive feedback from the mid-tenure review, and allows them to make adjustments. We also approved the five year and three year, right, Laverne. Where is that one?

L. McQuiller: That is a little bit later on.

P. David: The mid-tenure review has been approved and is being implemented. The promotion to full; there is a nice document that Chris Licata and Laverne have put together that is coming out soon. I hope to get it out within the next week or two. Maybe over spring break we'll work on it and when we come back from Spring Break I hope to have it out to faculty. Travel support: this question came up earlier. Funding currently is about 66% of pre-COVID level. During the budget process, I have asked the President and Dr. Watters, if we can find ways to get us back to pre-COVID levels next year. The intent is there, the challenges, it's a zero sum game in terms of money. If you take away money from one thing, you have to put it somewhere else. So given the current constraints, that's one of the reasons why it's at 66%. But my absolute goal is to get this back to a normal level as soon as possible. Workload guidelines: I've heard this for the last few months. I know it's an ongoing challenge for our campus. Our goal is to work as a group next year to dedicate to workload guidelines. And I think what people are looking for is more transparency and more consistency. And we'll do our very best to keep those values in mind as we take on workload guidelines. The next one is teaching. With regard to non tenure teaching faculty appointments, there were two important steps forward which I think is certainly progress. We heard non tenure track faculty asking for a longer contract period. So senior lecturer contracts have now gone from three to five years and principal lecturers from five to seven years. This has passed the Senate. I am strongly supportive. Upper administration has to approve this, but I'm going to advocate for it. I don't want to say I'm confident, but I'm optimistic, certainly, that we should get this through to the finish line. And culture: many of those other things require investments and money. Culture is not that, it's just a mindset. And across campus how to build a caring, compassionate culture that really values all contributions, research, teaching and service is something that we should work on. I hope to work with the Faculty Senate and various faculty groups to create an environment where people feel valued. It comes from the top and leadership setting the tone and listening to faculty. And it could be small things, but being action-oriented about it. I'll stop there. I know we're out of time, but are there any questions?

S. Aldersley: I don't have a link to the town hall on this topic tomorrow, and I wonder if that can be sent out to the faculty. I never saw the link that we were told we were going to get, so perhaps we can make sure that goes out to faculty asap.

L. McQuiller: I'll make sure that the office of the Provost re-sends that. We have a good number, as of this morning we already have 179 registered for the Town Hall. I'll ask that be sent out again.

B. Thomas:   I want to thank everybody who participated on the committee. I particularly want to thank the Provost for his comments on this COACHE survey. My one question, I have several, but one question I have has to do with grant support. Many times when we're writing grants, to NIH or to other federal organizations. When I came to RIT, it was a completely different system to what it is now. Staff are not in the office. When you have to reach out to SRS staff, they're not there. You have to be sending emails, and it takes them a while for them to respond. And the support system, you need, it's just non-existent. I'm sorry. That's why, when I write grants, I request one particular person in the office work with me. I think the Provost can help us to address that so that staff can be available. For example, I submitted a grant two weeks ago. The deadline was 5:00. The grant went in at 4:50, ten minutes before the deadline. It was scary because there are times the government system can be down and if that went down that will have been a mess. So, please, that is something I would like you to take a look into and see if that can be improved.

P. David:  Yes, Dr. Ryan certainly knows this, and you know they lost some personnel in the unit. For various reasons, health reasons as well as some folks who left the university. We know this is a concern. I'll certainly pass this on. It will be addressed.

S. Malachowsky: I was kind of surprised to see in the report just how low the satisfaction with the Dean's level was. And this is kind of a Provost question. What are your thoughts for that in terms of addressing that. We were far below our peers, and far below even the scale, if you look at that diamond.

P. David: Yes, we have to think through that part clearly. I noticed it, too. The leadership across got pretty poor ratings in the survey compared to our peers and cohort. One could be just dissatisfaction with the work environment. Who's to blame? Has to be the leadership, could be that or could be something specific about leadership. But leadership training is something that we have to do as part of the culture issue which I discussed, the fifth item, we will tackle leadership training as well. Department chairs, deans, upper level administration. We will try to find ways to recognize this.

I. Puchades: One of the things that I find surprising, but not surprising, is the satisfaction with the culture. One of my feelings is that this has been happening because we've been asked to change our culture so many times over the last few years. We started as a teaching college. Then we've gone to a research college. Now we have to pivot a little bit and add in the Performing Arts, and it just seems like we don't know. Maybe it's time to do a critical review of all those changes that we're being asked to do, and whether this could be a common long term theme, where we can all get on board, and not have all these diverging ideas. Some are here for teaching, some are here for research, but it's just very confusing. And you know I've been here for a few years. The longer you're here, the more you feel like you're being split in many different directions. So some critical thinking on that would be useful.

P. David:  Very good point. Clearly, an institution in transition right? There was a strong teaching institution identity. Now an R1 drive. All of this is certainly contributing to some of the data we are seeing. Very good point.

A. Newman: Okay, so we are over time and on that note, I will conclude the meeting. However, we will put out a quick motion to extend the deadline for nominations for the Executive Committee because we want to extend that past the spring break. Thank you to everyone for being here and for staying late. Have a wonderful spring break.

[COACHE Presentation](#)

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

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

## Attendance 3/7/2024

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

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

**Interpreters: Nic Crouse-Dickerson and Jennifer Mura**

**Student Assistant: Molly Kohli**

**Presenters: Leonie Fernandes, Kara Maki, Bruce Hartpence, Matthew Lynn, Heidi Nickisher, Atia Newman, Sarah Sarchet and LaVerne McQuiller Williams**