

Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, December 5, 2024

12:15 - 1:50 PM

Slaughter Hall 2220-2240

Attendance: See Below

Agenda Item No. 1: Call to Order; A. Newman (12:17)

Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; A. Newman (12:18)

Approved by acclamation

Agenda Item No. 3: Communications Officer's Report/Approval of Minutes; S. Aldersley (12:19)

We didn't approve the 11/7 draft meeting minutes at our last meeting on 11/21 because they omitted the wording of one of the motions (Agenda item #9, Policy E33.1). That omission has been corrected together with an updated red-line document in the drive and I move that the revised minutes be approved.

Approved by acclamation

Having received no suggestions for edits to the draft minutes of the 11/21 meeting, I move they be approved.

Approved by acclamation

[November 7, 2024 Meeting Minutes](#)

[November 21, 2024 Meeting Minutes](#)

Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; A. Newman (12:20)

I'd like to remind everyone of the Senate retreat at the Tait Preserve on the 12th of December. We have received 28 positive RSVPs and the food has been ordered. I am looking forward to a very good discussion on key topics that we've been working on over the past couple of years, so please come prepared for discussions on shared governance.

The executive committee was invited to attend a portion of the Provost's council of deans at their regular meeting this week. We covered three major topics: compensation and benchmarking; the DSO; and the recommendation of the FAC to extend review cycles for full professors and principal lectures. There was no discussion of this last item but we did have a robust discussion of the impact on faculty of the

excessive number of accommodations, and a long discussion on benchmarking and compensation, during which we recommended that the administration give faculty a pay bump of something like 10% to account for the fact that salaries have not been keeping pace with increases in the cost of living for a number of years.

I want to thank Joe Lanzafame who represented the Senate at the CTL presentation this week and provided a detailed report. It looks like there are areas where the Faculty Senate is going to need to weigh in on this in January.

We had a very productive meeting with the chair of the St. John Fisher Faculty Assembly last week. We will be working with him to organize some kind of faculty governance summit of colleges and universities in the western NY region in the spring semester, so stay tuned for more details on that.

Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; R. Hisert (12:24)

Thanked faculty for being vocal in support of staff dealing with a lot of similar issues to do with HR and benefits. Operation Tiger Cloud is occupying us and we're hoping it goes very smoothly. There's a lot of worry about the staff career ladder project.

Agenda Item No. 6: Student Government Update; J. Anderson (12:26)

Hoped everyone had a great Thanksgiving. SG has been working closely with the parking transportation office to get the buses back and running, especially given that finals week is around the corner. A PawPrint that has been responded to is to keep the student health services open on weekends.

M. Ruhling: On a point of order, we did not have any discussion after your report, but I would like to say something. On two different occasions so far, and I want this in the minutes, I have asked a question about benchmarking regarding those departments whose benchmark amounts were cut by 10% this last year. That's a substantial adjustment, to say nothing of the cost of living issue that's been raised. I have yet to have an answer to that question from anybody. The Provost talked about the number of people affected in a benchmark range, but he did not give an answer as to why some departments saw such a drastic decrease in benchmark. So in the spirit of squeaky wheelism, I would like to once again bring that to the attention of the Senate and request that we get an answer to that question.

A. Newman: From the discussions that we have had with the Provost about the benchmarks, categories that were egregiously lowered were reversed. I think Laverne might be able to give us some more information on this.

L. Williams: My understanding is that the Provost worked with the deans to make adjustments for all the faculty who were impacted. In some instances we saw significant decreases in terms of the benchmarks, but the number of faculty impacted was relatively small. Of course, if you were one of

those people, you're not going to consider it small, but everyone who was impacted was to receive some type of adjustment.

A. Newman: Yes, we were given to understand that they were going to treat it on an individual case by case basis. I take it that didn't happen?

M. Ruhling: I've said what needed to be said.

A. Newman: As for why the actual benchmarks were lowered, it had to do with the number of schools that were included in the pool. We went from a pretty small pool to 146 universities representing a not very aspirational mix of R1 and R2 institutions, including institutions like the University of South Alabama, North Dakota and Idaho, which just in terms of cost of living are incredibly different from New York State. We have pointed that out to HR and to the Provost, which is one of the reasons why there is a benchmarking committee now being formed.

M. Ruhling: In response, I ask that that committee really drive this hard because there are people on my faculty whose benchmarks dropped significantly and have not been offered any kind of compensation.

S. Aldersley: When Dr. David talked about his reaction to the decreases you talked about, he mentioned there were 25 faculty who were going to receive an adjustment.

The Provost sent out an email yesterday with a draft charge to the committee, noting that it should report by March 15th. The executive committee has given a draft proposal for a revised benchmark to the Provost which you can find in the Senate drive. That proposal includes a rationale for the selection of benchmark institutions. I think the rationale is particularly important because at the Provost's Council Atia referred to, one of the deans said that we are dealing with a zero sum, in other words you can only give a 10% increase to one faculty member if you take an equivalent amount from another faculty member, because there's a finite amount of money that's available. That's wrong. There's not a finite amount of money available. Jim Watters decides what's available and the deans don't appear to understand that. That's the issue we are dealing with here.

A. Newman: We can continue this discussion on the 12th at the Tait Preserve.

Agenda Item No. 7: General Education Revision; L. Hall and W. Middleton (12:35)

L. Hall: I'm one of three co-chairs of the General Education Task Force, together with Elizabeth Hane and Leah Bradley, and today I'm joined by William Middleton, co-chair of the General Education Committee. The standing charge of the general education committee is to assure that there's an ongoing review of the general education curriculum to determine any need for modification. The GEC explored the need for revision and provided recommendations in May of 2024. Based on these recommendations, Provost David created and charged a GE revision task force, which kicked off in September of this year. The GEC was looking at showcasing what's really unique about RIT and felt also that there is a lack of shared experience. When we switched from quarters to semesters faculty pushed hard for a shared first

year seminar or some kind of first year academic experience. That was rejected at the time for various reasons, but we are hoping to bring it back.

There are several issues the GEC identified in the current framework. There are too many learning outcomes. It's really hard to assess them because faculty don't see them on the course outlines, so they end up being irrelevant. And then there's no translation to what's actually happening in the classroom. It's obviously a problem if we're claiming to do something with a course but no one's actually doing it.

Another issue is there's a lack of current issues other than sustainability and social justice. The third issue is that while the GEC looks to see if courses adhere to the broad requirements for what constitutes general education, there's no attempt to create a cohesive curriculum. And since New York State requires a large number of GE credits, especially compared to some other states, we're missing a real opportunity here.

The vision for General Education that comes from Provost David is to provide all students with a core curriculum that is future-oriented and interdisciplinary, with cohesive first and last year experiences, to align with RIT's mission and showcase the transformative and interdisciplinary power of an RIT education. As a quick reminder, NYSED provides very clear guidelines which only give us a little bit of wiggle room. For example, there are very clear definitions of what constitutes general education: humanities, natural sciences and mathematics and social sciences. Courses cannot be directed towards specific occupational or professional objectives. The GEC has also seen New York State for the first time kick curriculum back. So we've actually started seeing courses previously approved as GE by our curriculum committees get questioned by the State.

This slide shows the current GE learning outcomes. There's a lot of them. We have two primary ones: communication and critical thinking, and then we have these perspective domains that students have to take one course in each.

Next, the proposed timeline. In Spring of this year, a task force and an advisory council composed of faculty and staff were formed to conduct research through this year. The task force will research GE frameworks at peer institutions and national initiatives and collect feedback and ideas. We've already started doing that with visits to colleges and meetings with advisory groups as well as advisors council and many other stakeholders. We plan to meet with faculty and various stakeholder groups in an iterative fashion and get lots of feedback. The goal is to take all of that input and create some sort of draft curriculum by May which we would present to Faculty Senate for deep and ongoing discussion. In 2025/26, we will collect more feedback and talk about implementation and resource questions. So we're really in the very early stages. We're trying to figure out what pain points exist among faculty, what kinds of things faculty love about our current general education curriculum and what people think we could improve.

This slide shows the members of the task force. You can see we have representation from a number of colleges. I'm not going to list the advisory council in detail but we did want to get global campuses involved because anything we do obviously impacts them directly.

With regard to parameters, there are some things that can change and some that can't. We can't change NYSED's definition of what constitutes general education. In addition, some of the accrediting bodies and some of our colleges have their own definitions of what constitutes Gen Ed. Those too we cannot change, though we can make minor changes to GE articulation agreements in terms of transfer credits and things like that. The real change, and this is what we really want faculty and staff and student feedback on, is the structure and the pathways that students take to navigate the curriculum. How do we want students to think about this curricular experience? How do we want them to think about the broad humanities, liberal arts and sciences classes, how they enhance their existing curriculum and how they

move through them over their years at RIT. So we need lots of ideas from stakeholders: what should a first year academic experience look like? What are the key foundational knowledge and skills that students need? What themes should we consider for required courses? Should we throw away the perspectives and immersions and think about something totally different or should we just tweak them? Should we think about them in a new kind of way? And then what's missing from our current model that we would like to see as a community?

We have a website that has a feedback form that goes straight to the task force. It's available now, and you can link to it from my slides which should be available to all senators. If you google GE revision task force in RIT, you'll find the website with the feedback form.

We've already had meetings with COLA, CAD and CAS. We have GCCIS scheduled with other colleges in process. We've met with global campuses, we're meeting with Faculty Senate. We have met with some of the advisors. We want to be really clear that these are iterative meetings. It's not a one shot deal. We will come back to these groups multiple times so we can solicit layers of feedback as we move through the process.

S. Aldersley: Can you clarify the relationship going forward now between the task force and the GEC?

L. Hall: Right now the task force is updating the GEC at every meeting and the GEC is providing feedback on questions to the task force as they are raised. We have three current and two past members of the GEC on the task force. We want there to be a lot of cross pollination between the two groups.

M. Ruhling: Who developed the vision statement?

L. Hall: Provost David in consultation with the GEC.

M. Ruhling: Can you define the phrase future-oriented?

L. Hall: I think the goal is to think about the kind of curriculum that will help students navigate the 21st century. One theme that's come up in a lot of the stakeholder meetings is information literacy. So how do we help students understand what kind of information is adequate for their purposes?

W. Middleton: I've been on the GEC for many years and served as chair for five years and I've been thinking about this a lot. When I was an undergraduate in the 1970s, we had science, math, and dead white men. Now the dead white men have gotten a little more inclusive, but there's not a lot of difference. And when you think about what's happening in the world today, what are the existential issues that our students are going to face? Climate change, sustainability, changing environments, social justice. I mean over the past four years there has been a firestorm of these issues. How are we going to prepare our students to face them? So what we are thinking is the information of the past is important, foundational, but we have to also think about the future, especially the future that our students are going to be living in after we're gone. That's what future thinking means, at least to me.

L. Hall: I don't think anyone's arguing that a lot of what we already teach is irrelevant, but it's about making connections, making the connections more clear to students and making navigational pathways more explicit, making it more clear how the interdisciplinary connections happen. That's one of the things

we would love to hear from faculty on in terms of what you all think would be really useful for students.

M. Anselm: Is this questionnaire the primary mechanism for getting responses or are there going to be other mechanisms?

L. Hall: There will be a lot of others. There'll be an email going out this week that will have links to two open Zoom forums in January. I think there'll also be two in February. We want to make this as inclusive as possible. We'll be doing in-person meetings with the various college stakeholders and various other folks. We'd love to see students at these Zoom meetings. We also hope to meet with student government. But the feedback form is the easiest way to provide your ideas.

H. Ghazle: How do we align this with the current Middle States reaccreditation process and the future growth of the University? We're currently trying to invest in healthcare yet I don't see any representation on the Task Force from CHST.

L. Hall: I think what the Provost was thinking when he put the task force together is he wanted a heavy representation from the colleges that provide the bulk of the GE curriculum. One concern that obviously COLA and to a certain extent COS faculty have is that any change to the GE curriculum will impact our workloads and how our departments are structured. But we will be meeting soon with CHST faculty. We went to a Gen Ed conference last spring and we heard about a number of existing health-related pathways. The limitation is that professional health sciences courses can't count for GE, but that doesn't mean there are not lots of opportunities for the political, social and ethical implications of healthcare systems, different kinds of biomedical technologies, which could be included in the GE curriculum.

R. Zanibbi: When we talk about interdisciplinarity and being future oriented, do we actually imagine there's a difference in the concepts and informational skills that will be valid in the future? Or is this really more about content delivery and examples?

L. Hall: That's something we want to hear from faculty.

R. Zanibbi: My take would be that what you need to know to be a mature member of society has not changed. We've had existential crises before. I remember growing up in the eighties, and I'm glad we don't talk about nukes every day. There are always technologies to develop and problems to solve. The real question is what are the intellectual skills and concepts you need to do that. The old dead people, maybe we should diversify that set, but the idea that philosophy isn't valuable? I know that's not what you're saying but when those terms get used and we talk about interdisciplinarity, it's like it didn't already happen. Maybe there's a way to frame this so that people can provide more concrete curricular ideas. Otherwise, I worry terms like 'future-oriented' might confuse people a little bit.

W. Middleton: One thing we can assure you is that there is no plan right now. This is the era of the deep state and conspiracy theories, but we don't have a plan. We don't think we have all the answers. That's why we are going to the colleges, going to students, to see what ideas people have.

R. Zanibbi: Let's remember what the academy can provide before we worry about what's hot in the news.

A. Newman: Please provide any other comments over email.

[General Education Revision Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 8: FAC Proposals on Annual Evaluations and POWs; FAC Self-Charge and FS Statement on Work-Life Balance; C. Schlombs (12:54)

C. Schlombs: I have two items today. The first one is the third proposal related to annual reviews of the plan of work. I am bringing this forward as an informational item only. With the holiday week last week there was not enough time to bring this forward to a vote. I will ask you to send any feedback by email so that we can bring this forward in the spring semester. The second item is related to a self-charge that we proposed in our annual report on work-life balance.

Regarding the first item, the proposal to reduce the number of merit categories from five to three. We began this charge with a literature review and we found that one of the pros to an evaluation process is transparency: it's a clear process and it's devoted to faculty development. But there are also costs, for example, it imposes a high workload. Another concern in the literature is that there are often very low merit increases, sometimes zero, with the result that high performance sometimes does not get rewarded, particularly in humanities disciplines, for example if a book hits in a year with zero merit increase. So we already have a system in place that can be problematic. I think it's also important to realize that merit increments are a zero sum game. If high performers are rewarded from the merit pool, that means that other faculty in the same unit need to receive a lower merit increment.

It's also important to consider that the merit rating does not determine a certain merit increment. A rating of outstanding does not determine how much one will get above the merit pool. There is a correlation but I know from hearsay that that is not always the case.

We also have heard that most disputes are between exceeds and outstanding. And one of the intents of reducing the categories is to reduce the number of disputes.

Faculty overall are in favor of the proposed change. We have lots of question-response slides which we have made available to senators and I invite you to send me questions or feedback by email so that FAC can take that into consideration before we bring back the proposal in the spring.

The second item on my agenda relates to work-life balance considerations. Last year FAC noticed that a number of our charges touch on questions of workload and work-life balance. The summer deadlines charge, for example, E4 faculty responsibilities, also the annual review charges. And we felt that addressing this question of workload and work-life balance would really help us get at the larger questions behind a number of the charges we are asked to consider.

As we brought up this discussion again in FAC this fall, we learned that the Provost has charged deans to work on faculty workload in the spring semester. And so this is very timely. However, since FAC will not be able to bring forward a policy proposal to guide that process, we propose that Senate pass a statement on work-life balance to demonstrate that you feel this is an important consideration.

That's the context for my bringing forward two motions today. The rationale for the first motion is that a healthy work-life balance is necessary to conduct research and creative work, which will after all in the end help RIT move towards a more research-intensive institution. It's imperative that faculty are able to devote the bulk of their time to research and teaching and the COACHE survey really brought forward

faculty concerns over this question. So we think this represents a set of issues that faculty governance should be involved in. In any case, the first motion is to approve the self charge.

B. Dell: I'm wondering what the reason was for not specifically mentioning service.

C. Schlombs: The feeling was that service is already taking too much time and therefore the intent was to enable faculty to spend more time on research and teaching and less on the amount that's required for service. I think the implication here is to enable a reduction of service and administrative tasks. I think we're seeing a creep in administrative tasks, for example with DSO. A lot of what are really administrative tasks are being put onto faculty. We can add service, but devoting as much time as possible to scholarship and teaching does imply that other tasks should be reduced.

R. Zanibbi: I want to point out that if our goal is to get to R1, which by the way I'm not very excited about, we do want to have more productive scholarship and effective education. But here's the problem. If you do not create an environment where people aren't overwhelmed, when we hire these star people we claim we want, they will not stay because they look around at us running around and exhausted and when they have an idea to share, we're too busy. And when they think about getting promoted, they think these are the people that I'll have under me. In my own college, there are lots of people getting hired, getting trained and then leaving. If we want them to stay, we have to have an environment where they're treated well. But even if we give them everything they want, they look down the hall and see that everybody else is exhausted. That has a more negative effect than almost anything else I can think of in our current institutional culture.

J. Lanzafame: I totally support work-life balance and I understand what you're trying to say here, but to Betsy's point, when we specify scholarship and teaching it sounds like we're trying to exclude things like service or administrative tasks and even advisement. Why are we phrasing it that way rather than simply proposing a policy that calls for maintaining a healthy working life balance, without directing what types of faculty work that refers to?

C. Schlombs: I think we should remember this is a charge that allows the FAC to address a range of issues. As such it is intentionally formulated very broadly. It doesn't charge us to implement a certain solution. If Faculty Senate wants to make changes to the text, I don't recommend wordsmithing the charge too much, but I'd be happy to accept a friendly amendment. I think we are very much in agreement here. With this charge FAC would be able to look at a whole complex of things and hopefully come up with reasonable solutions.

S. Aldersley: Betsy, I don't know if you meant your comment to be a motion, but if so I would second it because I do agree. I don't see why service would not be mentioned in the charge itself.

B. Dell: I'll make that motion.

A. Newman: Is there any discussion about adding service?

N. Eddingsaas: How is this going to be added? I am opposed to having faculty do more service.

H. Ghazle: Point of order. We have a motion on the floor from Corinna. Then we have a suggestion to amend. If Corinna is OK with that, we need to have the wording of the amendment before we move forward.

C. Schlombs: Something along the lines of 'to provide faculty with a reasonable amount of time to devote to research, teaching and service.' So, 'reasonable' rather than having 'as much as possible.'

S. Johnson: Instead of saying 'devoting as much time as possible', can we change it to saying 'support faculty in balancing service, scholarship and teaching.'

C. Schlombs: I think that would capture the intent.

S. Malachowsky: I want to get back to your original thinking because the reality is we probably have some people in this room, myself included, who want to do service or administrative stuff though not at the expense of teaching or scholarship. It presents a problem because if you sign up for something like this, you're signing up for poor work-life balance. Can you explain your original intent with this?

C. Schlombs: There are certain situations, particularly with non tenure track faculty, where signing up for service can be a really valuable pathway to balance workload. The rationale here is that the overall expectation of workload threatens to lead to faculty who are running around trying to pack things into the workday, and it often spills over beyond 40 hours. The intent here is to enable faculty to devote the time necessary to complete what they have agreed in the POW. For many faculty that will be research and teaching. We do need faculty to be involved in service and administrative tasks in support of the teaching and research enterprise that is the core of academia. And if someone decides that that is their role, they should be able to do that. In the end however, I think we should agree that faculty are here to do research and teaching and not to do administrative work or service.

D. Olles: I was just going to say if we are going to make an amendment to this, which I do agree with, I would suggest that instead of saying 'and service', we say 'or service' because we have faculty where service is not their main priority, especially lecturers who are not at the senior or principal rank.

H. Ghazle: We have a motion on the floor. If we are going to make a friendly amendment, let's do it. Otherwise we'll vote on the original motion.

C. Kray: I'd like to suggest a friendly amendment to the friendly amendment. I think it doesn't read right with balancing, I would suggest 'appropriately allocating time' which would cover who's responsible for what.

H. Ghazle: Okay, we'll make that change.

A. Newman: Let's have the vote now because we've spent way too much time wordsmithing.

Motion: To approve the FAC self-charge as amended.

Approved: 34:4:0

C. Schlombs: My second motion asks Faculty Senate to make a statement recognizing faculty wellbeing as a top priority and that a healthy work-life balance is essential for the sustainable development of both faculty and the university. This includes but is not limited to current university policies on vacation time, sick leave, flexible work schedules and faculty leave, etc. A healthy work-life balance also entails reasonable work expectations, and consultation with faculty to meet the university's operational needs. It's a long statement and given the wordsmithing we've just been doing, I want to be mindful of the time.

J. Lanzafame: I'm just a little confused. Didn't we just charge the FAC to work on this?

A. Newman: When we did that we were speaking only to the committee. With the proposed statement we would be speaking to all of RIT.

M. Laver: I would move to table this in light of our previous motion. I'm wholeheartedly in support of it, but I'd rather see it as a result of the research that the FAC is going to do.

C. Schlombs: This will be a considerable amount of work. It's not going to come forward this academic year.

I. Puchades: This all seems to be coming as a result of the COACHE survey. Are we working with other governance groups on this or are we each doing our own thing? It seems to me we're almost on a collision course with the different branches of government at RIT. I would like us to collaborate, if that's at all possible.

A. Newman: So there is a motion to table. Corinna, would you like to withdraw your motion for the time being?

C. Schlombs: I'm happy to do that.

[FAC Proposals on Annual Evaluations and POWs; FAC Self-Charge and FS Statement on Work-Life Balance Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 9: B02.0 + E06.0; A. Newman (1:22)

This item was split into two parts, beginning with E06.0

H. Ghazle: The issue on the agenda is to vote to restore language to E.6 that was inadvertently left out after Senate voted in favor of it. However, since FAC is currently working on two issues related to E.6: adding new clinical faculty ranks and changing lecturer titles, I propose we table the vote on restoring the missing language.

L. Williams: The request to restore the missing language is coming from the Provost. Given the implications on contracts for lecturers, I think it's important that Senate take action today.

Motion to restore the missing language pertaining to the timing of notice of renewal for lecturer contracts.

Approved: 33:1:0

A. Newman: We are back to our academic charter revisions. The goal here is to make the charter work for us and represent what we actually do. We started with some simple goals: to reduce the number of faculty drafted to work on Senate standing committees; and to make the language of the charter consistent by removing anomalies including those related to voting practices and the roles of senior and principal lecturers. I'd like to catch everyone up on the motions that have been previously approved, Motion #1 was to remove voting rights from deans and provost delegates from each standing committee. We did not make any decision regarding student voting rights because at the time the Senate was pretty clear that they wanted to hear from students. Motion #2 discontinued the current version of the nominations committee and replaced it with a nominations officer. In Motion #3, we amended the charter, to include faculty responsibility for writing policy that relates to research and scholarly activity. Motion #4 was to change the number of at-large senators that need to be appointed for standing committees. In Motion #5 we discontinued the long range planning committee, and in #6 & #7, we included the Senate treasurer as a member of the RABC and removed the tenure requirement for membership on RABC.

We now have several new motions.

The first, Motion #11, proposes a change to senator term limits by allowing senators who have served two full terms to return after only one academic year.

M. Laver: On principle, I believe in turnover, I don't think we should have policy that mandates it, though I think we should strive for as much turnover as possible, but that is really down to the colleges

H. Ghazle: I move to vote on the motion to amend Article 5.5 to adjust term limits for two term senators.

Y. Zlochower: I am concerned about this. I think term limits are good for bringing in new ideas and changing leadership, but I think the question may be should we have term limits at all? And if so, I think there should be a bigger gap.

S. Malachowsky: I think to some extent administration likes turnover. I do think it is a healthy thing, but I'm in support of this motion. I think it's a reasonable compromise. There is still a break and somebody else can get in, but it still allows a person to come back.

T. Brown: To give some logistical background, we are having a really hard time filling slots. It's taken halfway into this year before we even had a whole membership list. People aren't stepping up to fill these spots. We've had people that have left Senate who want to come back but are prevented from doing so.

M. Ruhling: I think it's up to the colleges, how they want to be represented and to have the Senate require this goes against the real spirit of representation for the colleges.

Motion to amend B2.5.5 to allow senators who have served two full terms to return after only one academic year.

Approved: 22:7:1

A. Newman: The next two proposed motions pertain to the ICC. The first seeks to remove the language referring to the formation and function of ICC subcommittees from B2 and place it in D1. The language in the current description of the ICC prevents the ICC from changing their subcommittees. Moving this to D1 allows the ICC to pick and choose their committees and decide what they need. We are also proposing to remove the current language that requires the chair of ICC to call upon the Senate to form its subcommittees every year. This is just to match practice because in my memory we have never had a chair of ICC call on the Senate to form these subcommittees. These changes were a hot topic last year, and I'd like to leave this open for discussion right now.

H. Ghazle: Point of order, because we have some senators who have already had to leave for class. I recommend we limit this to discussion and wait to vote until everyone is here.

M: Laver: On that point of order, if we have a quorum we can vote.

H. Ghazle: I agree, but I think we should respect senators who are representing their constituents.

A. Newman: The other motion that is going to come up is to absorb the functions of the Academic Support and Student Affairs Committee (ASSA) into the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC). That's because the ASSA was originally created as a support committee for the AAC because of how much work that committee was being asked to do. However, we also know that we don't have people who are willing to be in these committees. We have a lot of committees right now, so we're trying to consolidate them and reduce the number overall.

Motion #10 is to absorb the Research and Scholarship Committee (RSC) and its functions into the FAC and make the vice president of research a member of FAC. It's easier to put people together, allow them to organize and hopefully we will end up with only the people who are interested in being there and not people who just want to mark something on their final annual evaluations.

I. Puchades: I was a member of the long range planning committee when it got absorbed into the budget committee. I would like to see the chairs of these committees that are supposed to be merged have a voice or at least be able to give feedback on these motions. I think it would be beneficial to have everybody working together towards the common goal.

P. Padmanabhan: I would like to see some numbers. The FAC is already doing a lot, RSC too. I agree that what you said is true, but it's also possible that there's too much work being done. I don't know how many committees have people who are not doing work and using it just to check off on their annual evaluation as opposed to people who are overworking. On RSC, for example, there are people serving on three or four subcommittees and working on three or four different charges. Ensuring an equitable distribution of work is definitely a challenge, but I'm not convinced that merging is the best solution.

S. Johnson: My concern with merging these two together is that we tend to have two different types of faculty. We have research-oriented faculty and we have non-research oriented faculty and if we merge the RSC into FAC, what happens if the membership of FAC is mainly non-research people who may not understand all of the intricacies pertaining to scholarship and research. As a lecturer, I don't have to do research, so it's not a concern for me. Keeping the two committees separate puts the people who want to concentrate on research in RSC and the people who want to concentrate on the faculty side of this in FAC.

K. Sweeney: This would be a lot of centralization of authority in the FAC. We've seen a lot of different things come from the FAC in the past few meetings. That's a lot of stuff for one committee and merging the two would concentrate a lot of disparate aspects of the decision making process in one body.

R. Olson: I'm worried that if we have a committee responsible for both faculty affairs and research, given that there are a lot of faculty very interested in research, that research issues may dominate faculty affairs issues.

[Policy E06.0 Presentation](#)

[Policy B02.0 Presentation](#)

[B02.0 Edits](#)

Agenda Item No. 10: New Business; A. Newman (1:49)

There was no new business

Agenda Item No. 11: Adjournment; A. Newman (1:49)

Attendance 12/5/2024

Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended	Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended
------	------------------------	----------	------	------------------------	----------

Adrion, Amy	ALT CAD Senator		Lanzafame, Joseph	COS Senator	X
Aldersley, Stephen	Communications Officer/ SOIS Senator	X	Lapizco-Encinas, Blanca	KGCOE Senator	X
Anselm, Martin	CET Senator	X	Laver, Michael	CLA Senator	X
Barone, Keri	Treasurer/CLA Senator	X	Lee, James	ALT CET Senator	
Beck, Makini	ALT SOIS Senator	X	Malachowsky, Samuel	Vice Chair/ GCCIS Senator	X
Boedo, Stephen	ALT KGCOE Senator		McCalley, Carmody	ALT COS Senator	
Brady, Kathleen	ALT NTID Senator	X	McLaren, Amy	CAD Senator	
Brown, Tamaira	Senate Coordinator	X	Newman, Atia	Chair/CAD Senator	X
Capps, John	CLA Senator	Excused	Newman, Christian	GCCIS Senator	
Chiavaroli, Julius	ALT GIS Senator		Olles, Deana	COS Senator	X
Chung, Sorim	SCB Senator	X	Olson, Rob	ALT GCCIS Senator	X
Cody, Jeremy	COS Senator	X	O'Neil, Jennifer	ALT CET Senator	
Coppenbarger, Matthew	COS Senator	X	Osgood, Robert	ALT CHST Senator	
Crawford, Denton	CAD Senator		Padmanabhan, Poornima	KGCOE Senator	X
Cromer, Michael	ALT COS Senator		Puchades, Ivan	KGCOE Senator	X
Cui, Feng	ALT COS Senator		Ray, Amit	CLA Senator	X
David, Prabu	Provost	Excused	Reinicke, Bryan	ALT SCB Senator	
Davis, Stacey	NTID Senator	X	Ross, Annemarie	NTID Senator	X
Deese, Franklin	CAD Senator	X	Ruhling, Michael	CLA Senator	X
Dell, Betsy	CET Senator	X	Sanders, Cynthia	ALT NTID Senator	
DiRisio, Keli	CAD Senator		Shaaban, Muhammad	ALT KGCOE Senator	

Eddingsaas, Nathan	COS Senator	X	Song, Qian	SCB Senator	
Fillip, Carol	ALT CAD Senator		Staff Council Rep	Ross Hisert	X
Ghazle, Hamad	Operations Officer/CHST Senator	X	Student Government Rep	Joshua Anderson	X
Ghoneim, Hany	ALT KGCoe Senator		Sweeney, Kevin	ALT SCB Senator	X
Hardin, Jessica	ALT CLA Senator		Thomas, Bolaji	CHST Senator	
Hartpence, Bruce	ALT GCCIS Senator		Tobin, Karen	NTID Senator	X
Hazelwood, David	NTID Senator	X	Tsouri, Gill	KGCoe Senator	X
Jadamba, Basca	COS Senator	X	Van Aardt, Jan	ALT COS Senator	
Johnson, Dan	CET Senator	X	Warp, Melissa	ALT CAD Senator	
Johnson, Scott	GCCIS Senator	X	White, Phil	ALT GCCIS Senator	
Kavin, Denise	ALT NTID Senator		Williams, Eric	GIS Senator	
Kray, Christine	CLA Senator	X	Worrell, Tracy	ALT CLA Senator	
Krutz, Daniel	ALT GCCIS Senator		Zanibbi, Richard	GCCIS Senator	X
Kuhl, Michael	KGCoe Senator	X	Zlochower, Yosef	COS Senator	X

Interpreters: Nicole Crouse-Dickerson and Jennaca Saeva

Student Assistant: Nilay Vaidya

Presenters: Lauren Hall, William Middleton, Corinna Schlombs