

## Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, March 21, 2024

12:15 – 1:50 PM

Slaughter Hall 2240/2230

Attendance: See Below

Agenda Item No. 1: Call to Order; A. Newman (12:17)
Meeting called to order.
Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; A. Newman (12:17)
<b>Motion: A. Ray</b> <b>Seconded: S. Johnson</b>  <b>Approved by acclamation</b>
Agenda Item No. 3: Communication Officer's Report/Approval of Minutes; S. Aldersley (12:18)
S. Aldersley: Good afternoon. As you may remember, we did not vote on the minutes from the 2/15 meeting last time and so we have two sets of minutes to approve. There was one edit to the 3/7 minutes which has been corrected. I would like to move approval of both sets.  <b>Seconded: M. Anselm</b>  <b>Approved by acclamation</b>  <a href="#">February 15, 2024 Senate Meeting Minutes</a> <a href="#">March 7, 2024 Senate Meeting Minutes</a>
Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; A. Newman (12/19)
A. Newman: This is going to be a slightly irregular meeting, because today also happens to be the last day of the budget hearings, to which I am invited. I accepted this before we lifted the hold on today's meeting. So now, being double booked, I'm going to hand the gavel over to Sam Malachowsky, our vice chair, after my report. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• We have received a couple of questions about the proposed changes to the charter. We have been buried with other agenda items recently, but we will be bringing B2 back to the agenda shortly. In order to have this taken care of before the end of the semester, we plan to start with small groups of motions at a time. That will then give the university faculty the opportunity to vote on them this year.</li><li>• I want to apologize for carrying out the vote to postpone the nomination slate electronically. The COACHE survey and the addition of other items to the agenda at the last meeting meant that</li></ul>

we did not hold the vote as part of the meeting. However, the motion was approved, and I will dig up the numbers and share them with the Senate.

- I will now hand the gavel to Sam.

Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; K. Ehrlich-Scheffer (12:21)

K. Ehrlich-Scheffer: At our last meeting, Staff Council had presentations on Imagine RIT, Student Conduct and the Campus climate survey. The biggest issue concerning staff right now concerns the eclipse on April 8. Since the University is officially remaining open, staff are being forced to take a vacation day. Additionally, there has been no official allowance made to enable scheduled staff to view the eclipse, instead relying on the discretion of each individual supervisor, compared to the autonomy faculty and student workers are being provided.

R. Ulin: I just think, as senators, we need to speak to this and let the upper administration know that this is really shameful that they would have to take a vacation day for childcare. They should have every right to view the eclipse like any of the faculty.

Agenda Item No. 6: Student Government Update; A. Shuron (12:22)

A. Shuron: Student government is holding an election townhall tomorrow and this is open to all, so please come and ask questions if you like. We are also considering revisions to the bylaws.

Agenda Item No. 7: Graduate Council Charges; J. Venkataraman (12:23) *Presentation linked below*

*This presentation and accompanying discussion was largely not picked up by the audio recording. For detail, please see the slide deck.*

J. Venkataraman: Hi, everyone! I am Graduate Council co-chair with George Thurston. George and I had a natural division of labor. I took care of the charges, and George the new programs. I have four charges to discuss today which are unconnected from each other. I'd like to take and vote on one at a time. The first is a carryover charge from last year which was originally self-assigned by the GC. It concerns the provision of a structure for programs to use on tables regarding the term and usage of "electives" which would be clear for reviewers, students, and can be implemented in Degree Audit.

The first thing we did was we wanted to understand what's going on in all the programs and so we did some data collection. We did not divide into subcommittees, we discussed everything as a group. Each committee member recorded what was going on in their college regarding the usage that they had in their course descriptions. We found that there is a common thread

*Recording inaudible*

N. Eddingsaas: What about existing programs?

J. Venkataraman: It is not our intention to make everyone go back and revise the existing 56 programs.

***Motion: Charge #2 - Accept course nomenclatures proposed by Graduate Council. These will be inserted in 'New Program Proposal Guidelines'***

***Approved: 36-0-0***

J. Venkataraman: Next, we have Charge #3 "Review Policy D.1 Curriculum for Advanced Certificates (Graduate Certificates), to determine whether it should be comparable to the policy on undergraduate certificates," and Charge # "Propose Guidance for the development of Advanced Certificates. In developing this guidance, refer to the policy in place for the development of undergraduate certificates to determine whether the principles of developing Advanced Certificates should mirror the principles already in place for undergraduate certificates."

*Presentation largely inaudible*

*There was no discussion.*

**Motion: Charge #3 & #4 – At the present time, Grad Council recommends no changes to RIT Advanced Certificates**

**Approved: 37-0-0**

J. Venkataraman: The next part pertains to a new charge given to us: "See how many new programs approved over the past 5 years have actually been implemented and give a summary of a) why those programs have not been implemented as yet, and b) give a summary of the state of the programs that have been implemented including availability of appropriate staffing." Because we keep approving programs and we don't go back, sometimes the job is to look at the past five years of programs. The committee members went back to their colleges and tried to find as much data as they could and then after that we had enrollment management help us.

*Recording inaudible*

S. Aldersley: So, each program has a target, and they achieve the target or get close to it. Has your committee discussed what would happen if they didn't get close enough to the target.

J. Venkataraman: We can only alert the deans and the provost, because it's their responsibility. We are doing this only when the new programs come in. How can we make the decision? We can say, 'This is what happened in your college before.' That is all we can do.

*Recording inaudible*

M. Anselm: Would this end up in a policy? Where would this terminology end up?

*Recording inaudible*

E. Williams: When I was on Graduate Council, I recall that there's an office at RIT, I don't recall the name, that does projections for enrollment to make sure they're realistic, and they have

their own expertise. It's really hard for GC to know this, so we trusted the office to do their job. And now you're saying, if we have this past data on other programs, we're going to judge this very complicated thing? It seems a reach to me to make that kind of judgment based on a limited data set. Is the GC really going to start stepping in and say 'Hey, look at your past programs. They're not good.'

J. Venkataraman: We wouldn't say that. We might say, 'you've been overly optimistic in your previous programs' and maybe we'd suggest they could go back to that office and have them look at the numbers again. I don't think we are going to take a hard line. That's not our responsibility.

M. Laver: I agree with Eric. I put together the PhD in Cognitive Science with others on the administrative side of things. It's a long process involving all kinds of institutional data, market analysis, enrollment projections. They do all of it. You could say, 'well, maybe these enrollment projections are too optimistic. I think you have to trust that process. But then the other thing is I don't really support viewing one degree program in light of other degree programs which, and, as everybody knows, every degree program has its own set of variables, timing for example. And past enrollment may or may not be an indicator of success of future degree programs. I see that as somewhat fallacious and would not support that. You can get the data if you want.

E. Weedon: Most colleges have multiple units and I'm against this from the perspective of if you have one unit which has a "failing degree program", and another unit within the college is proposing a new degree program to potentially be negatively impacted based on this data. I think the data has value in this merit. But I disagree with the connection of tying it to new separate degree programs.

J. Venkataraman: My answer to that is that GC would not make a decision just based on numbers. There will be a college representative on the GC and we will look at it from different angles. We might simply say 'why is the projection like that?'

E. Weedon: I just think that it should be decoupled and be a separate process.

N. Eddingsaas: The way I look at this is that data has already been accumulated and put together and I'm not sure why a program that is being put forward has to go and search for this data. I don't know why we would want to be looking at the performance of another program when a different program is being considered. Why don't we just rely on the Graduate College to accumulate this data and make it available?

J. Venkataraman: This charge was given to us Faculty Senate. They would have us in physicians for the future programs to come to us. This was not our idea.

N. Eddingsaas: That's all well and good but terms there, but if the data is already available, you can tell them you need to look at this data and understand what's there, but I don't understand why they have to go and find it.

R. Zanibbi: I agree with Nathan's comment that the data should be readily available. However, I also think that having this context, when evaluating programs, makes sense, because programs effect operations and it makes sense to take this into account. I completely sympathize with why GC should look at this data.

J. Venkataraman: So you want this statement here removed?

*Recording inaudible*

**Motion: Grad Council recommends the enrollment and resources data/year be provided for all approved and implemented programs over the past five years in the college proposing a new program**

**Approved: 24-10-4**

J. Venkataraman: Charge #1 is a carry-over charge from 2021: “Support ICC in developing policies needed to support effective curriculum management in the context of ABB budgeting at RIT. Report to the Senate with policy changes as needed. Basically it is to make sure there is no course duplication. We had a very good discussion with Provost David and he said that in his opinion ABB cannot solely be based on credit hours. It has to be also value-based. Consideration should be given to colleges with high enrollment and underfunded colleges as well. This charge is not about ABB and the Curriculum Management System has not yet been implemented. Based on that discussion GC believes that it is premature to take any new action. Programs already have to justify how new courses differ from existing courses in their own programs or programs in other colleges, so we already have that. Therefore, until ABB is defined and implemented and the Curriculum Management System is in place, GC recommends that we continue to follow our existing practices.

**Motion: Grad Council recommends that no action be taken at this time regarding Charge #1 until ABB is defined and implemented and until a Curriculum Management System is in place**

*No discussion*

**Approved: 37-0-0**

S. Malachowsky: Thank you very much for your service and your presentation.

[Graduate Council Charges Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 8: Advanced Certificate in Diplomacy and Conflict Management; G. Thurston (1:01) *Presentation linked below*

G. Thurston: The Advanced Certificate in Diplomacy and Conflict Management is a very thorough proposal, and it's based on a long-standing summer program, the Peace and Conflict Studies that's been offered in Kosovo. They have an extensive network of experienced diplomacy professionals on whom they can rely to provide students with experience which will then give them a leg up getting jobs in foreign service. The program currently doesn't give students a credential. And so it's anticipated that if this is done, then this will be more attractive to recent RIT graduates. As you can see, there are three graduate level courses, one of which is a practicum. This was presented to us on Tuesday and it is one of the most complete proposals I've ever seen on GC. The application to New York State Education Department is ready to go and we voted unanimously to submit it to Faculty Senate for your approval.

B. Thomas: So this would be a self-sustaining program?

Lauren Hall: Yes.

**Motion: Grad Council recommends approval of the Advanced Certificate in Diplomacy and Conflict Management**

**Approved: 35-0-1**

[Advanced Certificate in Diplomacy and Conflict Management Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 9: Executive Committee Nominations; C. Hull (1:06) *Presentation linked below*

S. Malachowsky: Since Clyde is not here, we will postpone this.

Agenda Item No. 10: Calendar Revisions; S. Johnson (1:06) *Presentation linked below*

S. Johnson: As you know, Clyde and I have been on this committee two years now, trying to figure out what's going on with the calendar. Every five years we're supposed to go through this, but it hasn't been done in a while. Last year we proposed a lot of changes and basically, Student Government said 'no.' We then tried to do more changes, and we got some more 'no'. So we decided to do smaller, incremental changes with the goal of getting smaller things approved and slowly working more and more over the next few years to get more and more implemented. The basic idea was we're trying to get an additional week of time at winter break. Staff requested this because they need to be able to do academic actions before students return and often they only get six or seven days after we come back to do anything. Well, students are already on campus by then and imagine finding out you cannot attend classes in the spring after you've already arrived.

What we're proposing here is less of a drastic change. The idea is we're going to bring back, and I know a lot of people did not like this when we had it before, but the whole idea is in the fall break where we get the Monday and Tuesday off, we change that Tuesday to a Monday schedule. That gives us, and I'll scroll through it here in a minute, the removal of that dangling Monday at the end of fall which will allow us to do five days of finals and that gives us that week back. So, if you notice right here, this is what 2025 would look like. We have two separate proposals. The first one is to start the semester a week later and that will just affect when winter break begins. The other one is to start where we currently are, and the major idea here is where we obtain that additional week. Is it before the break, or after the university closes. The major changes are going to be, currently we have the two days with no classes here, it becomes one day of no class, and then the Tuesday after that Monday follows a Monday schedule. Currently, we end on a Monday, then we have Reading Day, and then we have split days of finals. What we want to do is get rid of that extra Monday, by moving it to that Tuesday of fall break and then have just five days of finals instead of six. Joe Loffredo said we can already make this happen. He rarely uses the sixth day anyway. We'll talk more about finals in a minute, after this conversation, because there will be a new system for determining finals. So if you notice, instead

of ending here, in this one, we end here, we have our finals, three days before RIT closes. The other option is to start at our normal time, and have the week before winter break. Other than that nothing else will change other than when spring will start based on the two. Spring will be exactly the same structure. It'll just either start a week a week later, or stay at the current time. Other than that spring will not change at all. It will still have the dangling Monday, but there's nothing we can do about that.

E. Williams: I'm sorry I'm not getting it. I thought you said the objective was to have this administrative time to process applications. How does starting a week late enable this?

S. Johnson: Instead of having four weeks of winter break, we have five. We gain an extra week between the fall and spring semesters. So, for instance, we normally would end right here. We would end here for this one and then we would end up coming back a little later.

E. Williams: So it's only the third option that achieves the objective.

S. Johnson: Both of those options gain us the extra week. It just depends on where it is. Is it before the winter break and the university closes, or after?

J. Lanzafame: *Inaudible*

S. Johnson: Reading Day would become Reading Weekend, it's been called.

Senator ?: Is Student Government OK with that?

S. Johnson: This is one of the sticking points that Student Government has with this and they're presenting it to their group to get their feedback.

F. Dreese: What's the desire to get rid of the dangling Monday?

S. Johnson: That's the only way we can gain this week that staff needs to do their job over break. That was the only way we could come up with not having that additional time.

F. Dreese: Then the only way to do that is to take away a day at fall break?

S. Johnson: Yes. We went through every other possibility. We were not allowed to shorten classes. We have so many contact hours, so we could not just drop that Monday. We went through a lot of iterations. We considered starting a day earlier, and having the Friday before classes start as a Monday. But then you get two Monday classes in a row which causes a lot of problems. So this was the easiest solution we could come up with to get that extra week that staff needs. We went through hundreds of iterations of this calendar to come up with this.

Senator ?: I'd like to make a comment. From an instructional viewpoint, that dangling Monday is horrible. If you are teaching one section on a Tuesday/Thursday schedule and another section of the same course on a Monday, Wednesday, Friday, one class ends on a Thursday, and then several days later, on the following Monday, you're closing the other section. It's nuts.

S. Johnson: One of my pushes was to get rid of that dangling Monday, because our classes for our intros only have lectures on Monday, and then labs on the remaining days of the week. And when we lose that Monday, what do we do to hold our labs? We can't make it up later.

F. Dreese: I have a comment. This is personal. I'm not representing my college. As an instructor I really value these little resting places. I didn't do anything fun over spring break. I caught up

and now I can breathe again. *Inaudible*. Is there any other solution to alleviate the burden on staff?

S. Johnson: So going round and round with Staff Council representatives on this, they kind of need this time, because what brought this whole conversation up is one time after break they had only five days to actually process everything. And they can't process anything until the Registrar's Office processes final grades, and they don't get that information till after break. And now students are on campus finding out they can't continue with their classes. They have to get new classes because they failed a pre-req, that sort of thing, so they need this time to process.

K. Lewis: *Inaudible*

S. Johnson: This is just the summary right here of what those slides show. But a more important thing that came up from this is the Registrar's office is going to be implementing a new system on how we handle final exams. You all will receive a survey in the coming weeks, asking you a few questions and those questions are going to be: Do you need a final exam time? Do you need a classroom for that final exam time? If you do not, you just say 'no.' That will help us with rescheduling and determining how many final exam days we actually need. Because right now I have a few classes that I do not have a final exam in, but I have a time scheduled and a room scheduled. So the Registrar's office is now going to start putting out a system whereby you will receive a Qualtrics Survey for every one of your classes in the fall asking your plans for final exams. And this is okay by policy. You do not have to have an in-person final. You do not have to have a scheduled final exam time. You can have some final experience, which is an on-line final that's open the whole week or a paper that is due during that week. You do not have to have a final exam. You just have to have some sort of final experience during that week.

M. Anselm: Can you just go to option one. When would grades be due in the option one schedule. It looks like the holiday starts on the 25<sup>th</sup> less than a week later.

*Inaudible*

S. Johnson: Currently policy says, all final grades must be in within 48 hours of when you give your final. But technically they've been allowing it to be 48 hours after the last final.

D. Newman: You just said you don't have to have a final. When they took a week away from us a few years ago, they said they're reducing the calendar, and we lost a full week of instruction and they said you have to use that time as it's instructional time. I think what you're saying is you still have to have something. But I think what you're going to find is that a lot of instructors are going to say, 'fine, I'm not using the final.' That's how they're gonna interpret your survey.

S. Johnson: The idea is you have to give some sort of equivalent experience during the last week. Whether that be a paper, a project, or something of that nature, you cannot just do nothing. In the past we used to be able to do nothing, but now we actually have to have some sort of experience during that time. What we're looking for is people who are doing papers like in an English class, or something of that nature and they don't need a specific time and place to do that. You still have to do some sort of activity during finals week, but it doesn't have to be a pen and paper final at exactly the time given to you by the Registrar.

Senator ?: I have a related question. I heard a similar statement. Is this policy written down somewhere?

*Inaudible*

M. Laver: I can speak to that policy. It actually comes from NYSED. NYSED includes the final week. They count minutes per semester. When you propose a new course, it has to meet the time requirement and that includes the final exam week, so if you're not doing anything during the final exam week, you are not meeting the number of content minutes for NYSED.

*Inaudible*

S. Johnson: When we set up the survey asking you how you did your final exams last year, we included that policy on that survey, and when we send out the new survey that policy will be attached to it with a message from the provost office saying that that's okay.

*Inaudible*

Senator ?: Just to reference D.11, the policy where you can find the verbiage on this.

Senator ?: I honestly do not see how giving an assignment of a paper is equivalent to instructional hours.

S. Malachowsky: Unfortunately, we're getting a little bit off the main topic here, which is the calendar. I would recommend maybe having some discussions later or taking a look at the policy.

S. Johnson: If you have any questions, comments or concerns, please feel free to email me and Clive, and we will pass them up when we have our next meeting with the provost and everybody.

[Calendar Revisions presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 11: ASSAC - Minors and Transfer credits; A. Lawrence (1:24) *Presentation linked below*

A. Lawrence: Hello, everybody. I am here to deliver the report of the ASSAC. There are three parts. The first charge called for us to "explore ways to streamline the process of declaring a minor." The current policy today is that it's done manually with paper and the form that it's done on

*Inaudible.*

The key finding is that this is a process that should be digitized. There's certainly a large volume of minors that we're processing, this semester, 2,019 students. 90% of minors are offered by five colleges. So this is well trafficked business application. It being paper, it suffers from traditional paper-based problems such as people don't pull it out correctly, they don't fill it out all the way. You can see the quotes up there from some of the people we did research with, basically the academic advisors and some of the people in the colleges. So there is a problem. It's big enough to deal with, we probably should deal with it. Most people would like to see this integrated into SIS. The good news we found out when we did some more investigation with the Registrar's Office and Joe Loffredo we already have a platform actually, in fact, already used it to digitize. They've actually used it. It's been working. And they're ready to tackle this problem. Basically, the recommendation is, let's go ahead and move forward with streamlined digitizing. It's currently scheduled for academic year 24/25. The process is starting now.

*Inaudible*

S. Malachowsky: Can I ask for clarification. Currently scheduled for 24/25. Who is doing that?

A. Lawrence: Joe Loffredo.

S. Malachowsky: Is that office regardless of what we're doing or our recommendations, they intend to move forward with this.

A. Lawrence: Yes, they do.

S. Malachowsky: So you're recommending that we go with the flow?

*Inaudible*

H. Ghazle: Point of order. This should come in as a motion, so we vote and get the approval of the Senate.

In terms of our system, it's better to have a motion on the table. So recommendation, I guess it's a motion to move forward.

A. Lawrence: I'm not familiar with Senate processes but it can be a motion.

**Motion: To move forward with the digitation with the cooperation of Joe Loffredo's office**

**Approved: 35-0-1**

A. Lawrence: The next one concerns transfer credits. Our charge related to changing the grade requirement to receive credit for transfer courses from "C or better" to "C- or better," the rationale being for sequential classes. If someone came in and presented the transcript and in Calc. I they got C minus and in Calc 2, 3 & 4, they got Bs They couldn't transfer in their C-. Our system business rules do not allow any C- credit. And there is no exception. So this was the driver for this. I did have a chance to talk to Carol Marchetti to take a look at it.

Here's the key findings that we have. Essentially, we don't find that it's big enough to warrant any change.

Basically, this situation is fairly infrequent. There's only 2.5% of students who have a C- on their transcript

Basically, it's a very low frequency. There are workarounds, for example, you might tell a student 'Okay, you have to take a different makeup class'. One of the comments we got from someone who responded to our query, 'this might be something that's more of a solution seeking a problem.' We did some research with the peer institutions. We have a list of about 17 which I got from Ellen Granberg last year. For most of our peers, it's a "C" or better. There are some exceptions. We looked at SUNY schools to see if there's anything going on there and they accept C-. We conjectured this might be due to post pandemic practices or, it might simply be their strategy for the kind of students that they want to come to their institutions. We actually went out and asked people in the colleges about this: should we change it or not? Basically, they were surprised. Some people said, 'Maybe', but a lot of the people we talked to said they had concerns. If someone comes in with the C-, are they really prepared for their sequential classes? Or, how is this potentially going to impact graduation rates? If we have trouble in the beginning and it continues as a pattern, and people are actually going to fail, and not graduate at all? We don't know the implications.

*Inaudible.*

So this is the current language on the website. One of the things that we did look at was the word

“usually.” The way this is written, you could get a sense that there might be some wiggle room in terms of whether or not you could or could not, and maybe the decision rights were actually at a lower level, at the system level, at this point in time. So we came up with a slightly better, improved way to change the language and make our position on transfer credit more clear and then use the rest of the information here to talk about whether or not the courses themselves can be transferred. Because there's some equivalencies.

*Inaudible.*

S. Malachowsky: Are you making a motion based on your recommendation?

A. Lawrence: I would make a motion to not change policy and to reword the policy itself to make it clearer.

S. Malachowsky: So the motion is to retain the C rather than C-. And then to make these other minor changes to remove the ambiguity of the policy. Just to be clear, what policy is this?

A. Lawrence: It's policy D2.0, Admission.

H. Ghazle: May I make a suggestion? Because you're making a motion to retain one thing, and then to modify the policy itself. Maybe it would be good to first modify the policy, so senators can see where you're modifying.

And then we vote on the entire policy.

S. Malchowsky: I don't see any reason to separate them, because one includes the other. Is there a red line version so we can see exactly what's changing?

A. Lawrence: This is the language that is in the existing policy straight from the Internet. And this is the suggested change.

S. Malchowsky: It's so similar that we can't see the difference.

*Inaudible*

**Motion: Retain C or better designation in existing policy and make the wording change.**

**Approved: 38-0-0**

[ASSAC - Minors and Transfer credits/DSO Testing Accommodations presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 12: ASSAC - DSO Testing Accommodations; A. Lawrence (1:29)  
*Presentation linked below*

A. Lawrence: I have one more to do. This was the charge that was handed to us. This is actually a carryover charge from work that started last year. We're asked to "Investigate what are best practices for a university of our size for providing disability accommodations for students, specifically as they relate to extended time and other accommodations for in-class exams and quizzes."

*Inaudible*

Basically, the rationale is that we are getting an increased number of students being approved for accommodations. Roughly 70% of those include testing accommodations which is creating a burden on current resources. So we're looking for alternative ways to solve the problem. The current practice is that the DSO does this with a centralized resource set. The findings indicate that we probably should expand the capacity in some way. This is data that I received from the DSO Office. You can see roughly how many more students were registered

*Inaudible*

The other data that I pulled out from the information the DSO provided is that 55% of those had testing accommodations which could be provided in other locations.

So in fact, there's volume there, but not everybody needs to be there to actually take their test. So are there different ways that we can address this problem? The first thing we looked at is are there any inefficiencies in the current process? This was data from our survey that we did with faculty last year.

You can see that there's probably some room for improvement and you can see some of the quotes here.

*Inaudible*

Of course that creates an undue burden on DSO staff because they have to adapt and react to that quickly, and they only get a short window of time. I think that on both sides there's room for improvement in different ways. One of the ways is to push exams online. We talked about that before

*Inaudible*

We looked at peer institutions. Most of them had a centralized DSO Test Center predict All but one had one. Some also employed online proctoring to help facilitate their tests online. They do this mainly to protect against cheating.

*Inaudible*

This is definitely the direction some of our peers are investigating in order facilitate moving things online to make it easier for students to access and at the same time

*Inaudible*

Basically, we looked at three options.

Option 1 - Utilize online test proctoring software to reduce load on current DSO resources and move more exams online

There's some benefits and risks here. This is not a one size fits all. For the 55% or so there might be candidates,

you can do it. Something that easily scales. There is a learning curve

*Inaudible*

Option 2 - College level DSO Test Centers. Build 800 sq. ft. centers at top 5 colleges (25 workstation 10 private room total)

Build out college level DSO centers. This is something that might be good. You put more college level resources where students are. A lot of students have requested that when they take tests they would like their instructors around. The risks here are the quality of service, and these things being decentralized, there has to be some kind of coordination for standards.

*Inaudible*

Option 3 - Expand the current DSO Test Center, give them some more capacity. I don't know

what the right size is. How big is big enough is always the question. But they've done it. Every semester they kind of expand and contract. So there's probably the ability to do this. The problem is, it gives limited incentive for people to actually change. It puts it all in their court all the time. I think that there's an opportunity here to kind of shift in thinking.

*Inaudible*

So those are the options. Basically, our recommendation or the motion here would be to further evaluate options #1 and #3.

S. Malachowsky: We're at the end of our time. Would you be open to coming back and giving another quick overview, and then giving time for Senators to ask questions and discuss? That would also give Senators time to gather feedback from our constituents.

Senator ?: I'd just like to point out that this graph does not match data

*Inaudible*

S. Malachowsky: Unless I'm wrong, this is going to warrant a fair amount of discussion. So let's let's put this on hold.

Does anyone have new business before we adjourn.

[ASSAC - Minors and Transfer credits/DSO Testing Accommodations presentation](#)

Agenda Item 13: New Business; S. Malachowsky (1:42)

J. Faber: I think this is pretty important. On behalf of the Nominating Committee, we have one nomination for each of the five executive officers. Nominated are Atia Newman for chair, Samuel Malakowsky for vice chair, Hamad Ghazle for operations officer, Stephen Aldersley for communication officer and Keri Barone for treasurer. They should sound familiar. This is the current executive committee.

S. Malachowsky: The deadline has passed.

J. Faber: We do need to officially have an election, but it should be a fairly easy vote. It should be caked.

Senator ?: *Inaudible*

Agenda Item No. 14: Adjournment; S. Malachowsky (1:44)

## Attendance 3/21/2024

Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended	Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended
Abushagur, Mustafa	KGCOE Senator		Lanzafame, Joseph	COS Senator//LRPEC and ASSAC Rep	X
Adrion, Amy	ALT CAD Senator		Lapizco-Encinas, Blanca	KGCOE Senator	X
Aldersley, Stephen	Communications Officer/ SOIS Senator	X	Laver, Michael	CLA Senator	X
Anselm, Martin	CET Senator	X	Lee, James	ALT CET Senator	
Bamonto, Suzanne	CLA Senator	X	Liu, Manlu	SCB Senator	
Barone, Keri	Treasurer/CLA Senator	Excused	Malachowsky, Samuel	Vice Chair/ GCCIS Senator	X
Boedo, Stephen	ALT KGCOE Senator		McCalley, Carmody	ALT COS Senator	
Brady, Kathleen	ALT NTID Senator		McLaren, Amy	CAD Senator	X
Brown, Tamaira	Senate Coordinator	X	Newman, Atia	Chair/CAD Senator	X
Butler, Janine	NTID Senator	X	Newman, Dina	COS Senator	X
Capps, John	CLA Senator	Excused	Olles, Deana	COS Senator	X
Chiavaroli, Julius	ALT GIS Senator		Olson, Rob	ALT GCCIS Senator	
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	
Cui, Feng	ALT COS Senator		Ray, Amit	CLA Senator/ICC Rep	X
David, Prabu	Provost		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	X	Song, Qian	SCB Senator	
DiRisio, Keli	CAD Senator	X	Staff Council Rep	Kathy Ehrlich- Scheffer	X
Eddingsaas, Nathan	COS Senator//RSC Rep	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		Williams, Eric	GIS Senator	X
Johnson, Scott	GCCIS Senator	X	Worrell, Tracy	ALT CLA Senator	X
Kincheloe, Pamela	NTID Senator	X	Zanibbi, Richard	GCCIS Senator	
Kiser, Larry	GCCIS Senator	X	Zlochower, Yosef	COS Senator	X
Krutz, Daniel	ALT GCCIS Senator				
Kuhl, Michael	KGCOE Senator	X			

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

**Interpreters: Jennifer Mura and Catherine Kiwitt**

**Presenters: Jayanti Venkataraman, George Thurston, Scott Johnson, Andy Lawrence**