

Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, March 6, 2025

12:15 - 1:50 PM

Slaughter Hall 2220-2240

Attendance: See Below

Agenda Item No. 1: Call to Order; A. Newman (12:16)

Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; A. Newman (12:17)

Approved by acclamation

Agenda Item No. 3: Communications Officer's Report/Approval of Minutes; S. Aldersley (12:17)

Minutes of the meeting of 2/27 approved by acclamation

[February 27, 2025 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes](#)

Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; A. Newman (12:18)

- The Senate luncheon with President Munson is on the 27th in the Bamboo Room. RSVPs went out earlier today, so please respond.
- Good news about the DSO. We have received a lot of the data and materials that we asked for, including a master list of accommodations, and ideas about additional resources, such as having a Senate representative working with the DSO over the summer. We'll be putting out a call for volunteers once that idea is finalized.
- The President has approved the addition of a clinical faculty category.
- The President has not approved the lecturer title change. However, the ExComm is working with members of the FAC and the Provost and will be setting up a small task force to come up with an alternative which we will hopefully be able to put before Senate before the end of the semester.

S. Johnston: Wasn't that proposed as one motion? How can they be separated?

A. Newman: The Administration can do line item vetoes.

J. Capps: What was the rationale?

P. David: The President and I are both in favor of a teaching professor title. The concerns with the current proposal are threefold: mapping lecturers to teaching professors without any difference in expectations; converting 4-500 NTT faculty to professors, when there is the expectation of terminal degrees. We don't want the rank of teaching professor to be constrained by needing to have a terminal degree; and third, a simple change doesn't benefit anyone, except maybe as a psychological boost. I think it's much better to think of 'teaching professor' as a new kind of title that actually provides benefits in terms of compensation or career progression.

A. Newman: Clyde is the Senate representative on the task force working on the federal executive orders and has some interesting news.

C. Hull: It was made clear at this morning's meeting that the task force is recommending we stand firm and only make changes to programs if we are legally required to. The task force is still thinking about using a rubric and making a list. I asked what such a list would be used for and the answer was we'll figure that out after we make it, which I thought was inappropriate and said so. If we have time in new business, I'm going to ask the Senate what might be some things that we could do proactively to maintain ourselves and what we do? If we have time in New Business, let's try and come up with some things that we could actually use such a list for before we make it so it serves the purpose that it's being created for.

L. Williams: I just want to be clear that an inventory of all DEI programs has existed since 2018 in accordance with RIT's legal requirement to identify any program that treats anyone differently. Student programs and faculty programs have to meet a strict scrutiny test. So all of these have been legally tested and as of January 20th before the executive orders came out, they were deemed neither illegal nor discriminatory. The question is are there other programs that haven't been considered or haven't been reviewed.

C. Hull: If this list exists, why are we making another one?

A. Newman: Let's reserve further discussion for new business. One final thing: on Monday the Executive Committee met with our incoming president, Dr. Sanders. We had a really good conversation during which we talked about some key elements of concern to faculty, particularly the need to create more infrastructure to support teaching and research. We also talked about the two sides of the RIT coin where we are very dedicated to teaching but also to research, and how these two elements will exist in our version of an R1 institution. He indicated that he is very open to hearing from different groups.

Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; Ross Hisert (12:28)

No major updates. We're working on getting information from Segal, the consultant for the Staff Architecture project.

Agenda Item No. 6: Student Government Update; J. Anderson (12:29)

We had two Paw Prints that passed this past week which referred to similar action items: cutting ties between RIT and Tesla and disinvesting in stock that supports fascism. We also discussed transitioning our Greek senator into an RSO role. RSO stands for 'representative student organization.' Current examples of RSOs are the ACA, LGBTQ+ and Student Athletes, basically large bodies of students that need to be represented by a governing council. They have officers and receive funds Student Affairs budgets to help conduct their business.

Agenda Item No. 7: Policy C23.0 (Consensual Romantic or Sexual Relationships) Edits; S. Smith (12:31)

My name is Steph Smith, I am the senior HR business partner. I am here to present to you proposed changes to Policy C.23 policy, RIT's policy on Consensual, Romantic or Sexual Relationships. This is a longstanding policy which we feel will better support the RIT community with the changes that I'm putting forth to you today.

In summary, C.23 applies to all faculty and staff, but not to student employees who must adhere to the standards listed within the student handbook. The overarching purpose of C.23 is to provide guidelines for romantic or sexual relationships between staff, faculty, and administrators, in order to safeguard against ethical, legal or administrative risks. It includes such things as sexual harassment or perceptions of undue advantage or disadvantage.

Some of the changes extend upon existing verbiage and context within the policy and in some we are adding to the context and the verbiage. Finally, there are some pretty minor HR title changes to be more reflective of the titles in current use.

Within the definition section we changed the definition of 'relationship' to highlight that it can be defined in many different ways, including casual, serious, short-term or long-term. We also extended the policy to include a relationship between two RIT members where there may not be a direct supervisory relationship but one party may find themselves in a position with employment-related authority over the other person.

Finally, in the policy violation section, we recommend adding C.27, the policy on Title IX, as an additional policy that may be addressed if there is a C.23 violation to the already existing C.6 policy on retaliation and sexual harassment.

B. Thomas: If someone violates C.23 it automatically bumps up C.27, is that correct?

S. Smith: Those would generally be the two policies we would probably refer to to help address the issue.

B. Thomas: I'm asking this question because I've been on the Grievance Committee in the past and there was a case that came to HR on a different policy and HR bumped up two additional policies on top of that case that had no place there at all. So here C.23 is talking about consensual or sexual relationships. You are adding prohibiting discrimination and harassment. That's a C.6 policy. The Grievance Committee will have trouble separating those out.

S. Smith: I hear you. If there were to be a suspected C.6 violation, the investigation would help flush that

out. We would do the due diligence probably through the Title IX or the OCE to make sure that we get all of the facts to determine if there is consideration for an additional policy violation. It's not to say there would be, it's just if there is, those would be the two that we would primarily probably look at as coming out of the C 23 violation as well.

E. Williams: I imagine this situation where we have two RIT employees, faculty or staff, who are partners and maybe they're not directly reporting to one another, but they collaborate, for example, as co-PIs. It's not completely clear to me whether that would fall under the disclosure requirement.

S. Smith: I think it would be case by case. We would have to see the implications of that collaboration. Could there be the possibility or is there a threat of undue advantage or disadvantage? HR would have to talk to one or both of the parties to determine what steps would need to be taken or what risks there might be.

J. Johnston: I would just want to point out that people can utilize the ombuds office in these sorts of situations. There are times when employees come to us not sure whether they need to disclose, and their question can be asked anonymously through the Ombuds.

H. Ghazle: When you refer to C.6 and C.27, are you trying to separate between faculty, staff and students. Because C.6 is not intended for students. So now I'm trying to figure out if those two policies are intended for everybody, or are you saying one policy is intended for faculty and staff, but not students. Because when you talk about student conduct, it's D.18 and D.19 that come into play.

S. Smith: That's a very good point. I'll take that back.

Motion: To accept the proposed edits to Policy C23.0.

Seconded: S. Johnson:

C. Hull: If we approve this, will it be five years before any further changes to policy C.23 can be made? Would you be willing to come back again next year with further edits if necessary?

S. Smith: Yes. These policies are for the betterment of all of RIT. So if there are things that we need to address, we will address them in as timely a manner as possible.

Motion passed: 37:0:3

[Policy C23.0 Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 8: Motion on Adoption of Okanagan Charter; M. Ruhling (12:43)

I brought this motion up four weeks ago with the intention of questioning the Administration's decision to unilaterally sign RIT's name to the Okanagan charter. In making this motion, I want to emphasize that this is not a negative criticism of the charter itself. Rather it is based on the premise that, since it includes mandates for curriculum and research, which are the purview of the faculty, it should not have been entered into without faculty senate having the opportunity to consider it.

The motion reads: **“The Faculty Senate rejects RIT’s entrance into the Okanagan Charter, announced to the RIT community by President Munson in an email January 24, because the decision was made by RIT administration without appropriate consultation of and approval by Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate welcomes an invitation from RIT administration to consider entrance into the Okanagan Charter, at which time it can charge appropriate committees to carefully consider the Charter’s ramifications to faculty regarding curriculum, research, and other matters that are the purview of faculty governance.”**

Second: J. Capps.

S. Aldersley: I would normally support this wholeheartedly, however, I'm not going to vote for it because the Provost came last meeting and made a plea to the Senate to let this go. It's very unusual for a provost to come to a faculty body and apologize for having overlooked something like this. We have a lot on our plate right now in Senate and you have to pick your topics. I think we owe some deference to the Provost on this particular matter. It's been pointed out that a huge number of universities have already approved this.

R. Zanibbi: How binding is this agreement in terms of curricular criteria?

P. David: It is not binding. I do respect Michael's point here. It's true that we did not realize the academic component was specifically stated. The emphasis in the charter is on community wellbeing which is one of the pillars of the strategic plan and the self-study. Without reading the fine print, I considered this to be a good idea, and voted for it in the president's cabinet. I've looked at other universities who've signed it, the SUNY schools, the University of California schools, many others you think of as topnotch institutions. Technically Mike is right. But I would much prefer that a technicality not drive this.

E. Williams: If this is a document whose implementation is taken seriously, I do have a concern about the content where it says that health, wellbeing and sustainability should be integrated across every discipline and every curriculum.

J. Lanzafame: I thank Michael for bringing this forward. I think the spirit is correct and perhaps the policy issue is correct, but we still maintain all the checks and balances we need to prevent any discipline or curriculum being disrupted by it. And it strikes me as being far more harmful as a public relations move to pull out of it just to decide later to re-enter it. So while maybe it shouldn't have proceeded this way, I don't see the harm in continuing along this path.

M. Ruhling: I would suggest the discussion we're having proves the point of the motion, namely that there is a lot to talk about regarding this. For example, Dr. David just made a statement that it's not very binding. Do we know that? Has legal counsel looked at this from a legal standpoint regarding RIT's obligations?

P. David: Yes, they have.

J. Capps: What's frustrating about the situation is I think if this had come to us, it probably would've passed overwhelmingly. One thing that we've talked about a lot has been the frustration this body feels that faculty input often gets overlooked. Maybe even with the best of intentions, we're not in the right room at the right time but nobody thinks to put us in the room and it gets exhausting. How going forward

can we ensure that people remember to consult this body? And if that means we need to vote on this, I think we should. But would you accept a friendly amendment to have this brought to a vote rather than referring it to a committee?

M. Ruhling: I agree with what you said in some ways. However, I would not accept that as a friendly amendment. I would still hold that there are complex issues that the appropriate committees of the faculty senate can best address in the most efficient and knowledgeable way.

P. Padmanabhan: The RSC is discussing interdisciplinary research as one of our charges this year. We're not sure where we'll end up, but there are implications here that could affect all of that as well.

C. Hull: I've previously seen things go by where it's been said 'we're not going to enforce this, just vote for it now and we won't take it seriously later. And then, well you voted for it. It's a policy and we're going to do it.' Not necessarily under the people who were there when the thing got passed in the first place. The point is if this gets approved, however it moves forward from this point, it's now policy. I really like the idea of wellbeing and sustainability. But enshrining a mandate to put anything in all curricula is not something I think we should be supporting. But do we have to announce it to the world that Senate hasn't approved it yet? I think there's probably some sort of peaceful internal process by which we could eventually resolve all of the issues and say 'yes, we're joining it, but any specific changes to curricula must be approved in the standard way'. In other words, we are not committing to having the Gravitational Waves faculty teach people how to be healthy. I don't quite know how to get there from here, but I feel like letting it go by is not right.

E. Williams: Dr. David, you said Legal looked at it. Does that mean there are no legal obligations?

P. David: There are no legal obligations.

E. Williams: What are the repercussions to RIT if there's a kerfuffle about whether we join or not?

P. David: It's mainly a public relations kind of thing. Here's RIT priding itself for its leadership in sustainability and the Faculty Senate voted against the charter. This would be in the Chronicle tomorrow and it would be unnecessary because that's not what we're voting on. The upset is with the process, not the Charter itself, but that's not how it would be framed. It would come across as the faculty senate did not approve the university's position. I suggest a solution to this is to say we support the mission of the charter, however related to the academic mandates should fall normal curricular procedures.

S. Johnson: I think we mostly agree that we want to accept this, but the issue I see is we're setting a precedent that allows the Administration to sign our name to something without coming and talking to us. Remember One Payroll, where they just tried to steamroll it through. We don't have to make it public that we didn't approve this right now. We could just say we want to vet it a little bit more and then come back and maybe withdraw from it later. Otherwise, we're setting a precedent that we're okay with the administration saying we're going to sign your name to this without even talking to us.

M. Ruhling: With all due respect, Dr. David, to characterize this as the Senate being upset about the process I think is disingenuous. It's not that we're upset about it, rather my motion seeks to try and get a proper process in place. To describe it as an emotional response, I think is not very fair.

C. Hull: I would also like to point out that it's not just the process. The Charter specifically mandates that all curricula will have this content and I would oppose that kind of a mandate.

The motion passed: 10/5/27

B. Thomas: Is there a timeline for faculty to vote on this?

P. David: I think this would be a protest vote. I believe the President probably thought that he had the prerogative to sign the charter. The faculty can object to some parts of it, specifically the curricular parts. You could say we don't want these mandates and we have the right to steer our own curriculum. But I don't know that you can force the University to withdraw from the charter. But there is no timeline. The President has already signed it.

A. Newman: Unfortunately, we weren't in the conversation at all, did not have any warning about it. Perhaps we can ask Enid Cardinal to come and talk to the Senate about it.

P. David: I think that's a terrific idea. While I understand the point of the motion, there is a list of 379 institutions who have signed the Charter, Berkeley, Irvine, Delaware, Cornell, all the SUNY schools. The intent of the Charter is to show that we care about the environment. It's an aspirational document. It's the spirit of this document that's important rather than the letter of the law.

M. Ruhling: Point of order. A vote is a vote.

J. Anderson: On a point of order, before there can be a revote, someone from the winning party has to call for it.

H. Ghazle: There has been a vote. The motion has passed. The process is that we will now send it to the provost and the president and from that point they will make their decision.

[Motion on Adoption of Okanagan Charter Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 9: Inter-college Curriculum Committee (ICC); M. Indelicato (1:08)

M. Indelicato: I'm joined here by David Yockel, Gretchen Wainwright and Carl Lutzer and we are here to present our opposition to the motion concerning B2.0 pertaining to ICC. This opposition was voiced to the Executive Committee at this time last year by the then ICC chair Heidi Nickisher. We don't feel it was communicated accurately or possibly at all to senators. A couple of weeks ago we had a Zoom meeting that Atia and Stephen attended. I'm not sure the information went further from there. That prompted us to send emails out this week that senators may have seen and we also sent e-mails out to individual faculty. In this presentation we will go through a distilled version of those quite lengthy emails. The idea behind the motion which we feel is a very bad idea is that these subcommittees of ICC would essentially become discretionary. The concern about the modification is that it would no longer be defined explicitly and it would place a lot of workload on ICC. I've served on ICC for six years and am chairing it in my last year on the committee. There's a tremendous amount of work that we do, and to take the work of the three subcommittees and put it into ICC, which is essentially what would happen, is really not good. It's very important to look carefully at courses, curriculum and programs. These three bullets show the reasons for the modifications being proposed. Sometimes when you standardize something you lose track of the details. And we don't believe that there is going to be any reduction in faculty service workloads. The charter calls for the ICC chair to request the Senate to initiate the college elections, which we don't do now. Currently, in CET, we handle the elections ourselves. We populate all these committees so I don't think we are asking the Senate to take on any more work. We weren't consulted about any of the proposed changes. I think it might be that you're busy or you just didn't have time to do it.

?: That is against policy. The charter says the Academic Senate is supposed to consult with the subcommittees. Any matters coming before the Senate should be reviewed by a standing committee or an ad hoc committee of the Senate prior to placement on the Senate agenda. The committees were never informed about potential changes before they were put on the agenda.

M. Indelicato: So obviously we have certain objections and we have expressed them for about a year now for all the reasons that are explained in the second bullet right there: cohesion, consistency, strong effective curriculum review.

?: To add to what Mark is saying, if these subcommittees go away, the expertise and the institutional knowledge and history that comes from those members that stay on those committees from year to year is lost. If we ask somebody who's just joined the committee who doesn't have that expertise to vet a writing intensive course proposal and then you go back 13 years to before the university writing program existed, where people start communicating that writing intensive courses are not being taught correctly. So we really need to keep these sort of protocols in place.

M. Indelicato: The second bullet is the main one on this slide. They are intended to be compulsory. These subcommittees are very important to the work that we do. They help to inform ICC. They are very important for the entire institute. We want to protect that. We don't believe that they're going to be protected if they're not in the charter. If they're in policy, they could be voted out of policy at any time in the future. We think that's a very bad idea. What we have now with the subcommittees is we have a consistent approach to the approval of specific curriculum and courses. The overarching learning outcomes, we try to manage that as well. I think these are obvious positive points that the subcommittees will help us to maintain. This next is a very important slide when it comes to accreditation. If we don't have accreditation, none of us really need to be here. We don't have an institute, we don't have programs. To show that a strong infrastructure is in place that is dedicated to keeping integrity in programs and courses and having the ICC and its subcommittees in place and protected goes a long way to making that happen. Representation on all these committees is important because it represents the entire institute. The Honors Curriculum Committee applies to every student as well as writing and GE consistency across the curriculum. I think this is obvious.

?: The preservation of institutional knowledge that would disappear within any kind of ad hoc formation.

M. Indelicato: In summary, these are the four points, backed by policy and procedures. It's well thought out and intentional. I think GEC at some point in the past was its own standing committee and now it's a subcommittee. I'm not sure when or why that happened.

?: A few years ago, it was renamed as a sub-committee. Nothing has functionally changed.

M. Indelicato: So for all the reasons that we mentioned, we strongly recommend that you vote no to the proposal which would eliminate all the protections that the sub-committees of ICC currently have in academic charter.

J. Lanzafame: I've communicated with some of you since you communicated with me that it's probably worth tabling these suggestions until they can be looked at again. But I think there's a slight bit of misinformation in this presentation in two ways. First, the original proposal from ExComm in February, 2024 did seem to want to eliminate the subcommittees as permanent subcommittees of ICC. The current proposal no longer calls for them to be removed as permanent well-defined subcommittees. Second,

something does need to be done because, to Mark's point, having your college elect members automatically to any of these committees could be read as violating B2 since it requires the ICC chair to ask Senate to institute elections. So I do think that it should be rewritten, but I agree with everything you're saying about the curriculum and the importance of those subcommittees.

G. Wainwright: The subcommittees were put in the charter to make them uneditable. Moving them out of the charter allows the ICC or others to change their make-up, determine whether or not they form and when they form, etc. By taking them out, the protections go away. That's the greatest concern. To your second point, there is a simple language modification that we've been discussing that will address that. And we agree that that's an appropriate thing to do. The bigger disagreement about the existing language with reference to the committees is whether or not they should be removed and put somewhere else.

A. Ray: At 8:30 this morning, we received a new proposal. So we've had four and a half hours to digest it. In some ways we like the idea that these subcommittees would now be guaranteed, but we also have reservations about removing the protections of being in the charter.

C. Lutzer: It's been mentioned that this morning there's been a modification to the proposal that we've now no longer removed the committees from the charter. You recently talked about the fact that a decision was made without consulting you. We're getting this information this morning and not from Faculty Senate. I'm chair of the honors curriculum committee. I have not gotten language sent to me about any changes. The most recent document that I've seen is from December of 2024. And in that document, the language regarding ICC had all the committees stripped out. So if that's changed, that's great. As far as we're concerned, we think it's really important that the faculty lay down the structure for curriculum oversight bodies. If that's changed, that's great. We'd like to be able to inform Senate about what we do and what's important to the functioning of these committees.

H. Ghazle: Point of order. You are talking about receiving something at 8:30 this morning.

?: The email that went out with the documents, including our presentation.

T. Brown: That was just an update of the documents after Mark sent us the presentation. When you get those emails, those documents are loaded into the Google Drive. Whatever is in the Google Drive, I send a PDF or Word version of those documents to Senators. So that's probably what Amit is referring to.

A. Newman: It's been in the drive for a while.

P. Padmanabhan: When the email went out on Monday, we heard really strong objections to the motion especially from people on the ICC and UWC. It's challenging that this is moving all the time. Every time we discuss this, the motion has changed or something else has changed, and it's happening live on the Senate floor. I think it would be helpful for senators if the discussion had occurred and could be presented to us so that we can take action. When we poll our constituents, they don't have the most updated information. So the information we get back from them is also not consistent and they may be misinformed in what they tell us. I think it's creating a lot of friction and bad blood for my constituents.

R. Zanibbi: We also contacted our constituency and there was also a lot of opposition to the proposed motion. Something I wanted to point out here though is the fact that GEC, UWC and HEC are called subcommittees seems like an unfortunate artifact. We really have four standing committees that are inappropriately named. They are full-membership committees, not really subcommittees. When I chaired research and scholarship, there were 14 of us and three or four would break off as a sub-committee. The

only thing I get out of this is ICC is like the organizing committee and that's it. Everything else is work. That's what I got from people that we consulted.

J. Capps: Part of what's strange about the situation is the respect I feel for the work that your committee does and the work that the Executive Committee does. A lot of it takes place behind the scenes and I'd be interested to hear what the Executive Committee might have to say when the motion is brought forward. Can there not be some way of these two bodies coming together and arriving at a solution that you're good with, then presenting that. Your recommendation is to vote no. Would you be open to a motion to table these changes until there's an opportunity for a solution to come?

H. Ghazle: Point of order. Ivan is next.

C. Luzter: He asked a question. You don't want me to answer the question?

H. Ghazle: No, we want to, but what happens sometimes when multiple people ask questions, it's much better to let others comment on the same point. This way you can address all at once.

I. Puchades: I'd like to express my support for John's suggestion to table the motion and have these two groups work together to arrive at a conclusion that's good for all of us.

?: I think John, we'd probably have to talk about that before we would answer the question. But just as a caveat, we're up here arguing to do more service work. That's all we're asking for.

F. Deese: I have a point of clarification. Could you switch to the summary slide? I keep hearing this in email discussions. Part of my question goes to the Executive Committee. When we discussed this at the retreat two years ago it was my understanding it was to save on service hours that suck up faculty time. It wasn't to lower our workloads, it was to lower the number of slots on the committees. Am I wrong about that, because that's been something I was discussing with my constituents.

A. Newman: B2 itself has been under discussion since December of 2022. The earliest version of our suggestion was indeed to reduce and actually eliminate the subcommittees entirely. After that, we spoke to the ICC chair and a variety of other people and the conversation who told us 'you don't want to just remove people willy-nilly, you need to let this be something that is actually looked at in a much more refined way, so that we can come up with a better solution overall.

So the conversation then turned to how can we possibly make our charter more cleanly worded as Joe mentioned, and still allow these committees to run unimpeded. Also the service workload is one of actually two or three goals that we had when we were addressing B2 overall. We wanted to make sure we were in line with the core tenets of the Senate, which meant trying to make sure that we don't accidentally give voting rights to deans and provost representatives, etc.

A lot of our motions have actually addressed two or three goals at the same time, sometimes simply to match our current practice. Our current practice is to have Tamaira reach out to the colleges and ask them to run elections which means that essentially the subcommittees form automatically. However, the way the charter is written, it actually is a requirement that the ICC chair has to request the Senate to run the elections to form its subcommittees. And if that were the case then because all committee chairs are elected in the fall after the committees have been convened, we wouldn't be able to run the subcommittee elections until fall instead of in March. So it then made sense to say we need to address that particular element to match how we're working. The other thing we recommended, again because of the language issue and consistency, was to pick up the language and move it to D1.0. If you look at D1.0, it includes the requirement for all three of those committees to exist. The only thing the charter does differently is

relates to committee membership. And if we move that over, then honestly nothing changes because it's as discretionary as it is now.

A. Ray: As we understand it, moving the subcommittees from B to D would require only a majority of the senate to make any changes. Keeping it within B means it requires a majority of the faculty. That's a rather large difference.

A. Newman: Except the current version of the charter still requires the ICC chair to call for the committees to be formed. They're discretionary now. If the ICC chair doesn't call for them, they don't get formed.

G. Wainwright: I agree with Amit, and we agree that the language calling upon the Senate to form those committees should be modified, but we do not agree with modification of any other language in that section of the charter.

S. Johnson: My concern is we keep saying we want to move it from B2 to D1, but we're not seeing the changes to D1. It seems like we're saying we need to vote on removing it from B2 and then sometime in the future we will see the changes to D1. I don't think they're mutually exclusive. I think they need to happen at the same time. That's an issue to me. I don't like voting to remove one thing with the hopes of another thing happening.

J. Lanzafame. Would the chair entertain a motion that might both resolve this issue for the time being and get us back on schedule? I will move that we create a short-term task force co-chaired by the head of ICC and a representative of the Executive Committee, to discuss language changes that appropriately enshrine the importance of these bodies and also clear up the language issues.

S. Malachowsky: First, it's an interesting suggestion implying that discussion hasn't already occurred or that nothing like that has been happening. The second thing I would say is we're considering the three committees as the same and they're not: Honors, Writing and GEC are not the same. I would argue that some of them would have different support from different people in terms of eliminating or absorbing them.

A. Kwasinski: What we are witnessing essentially is a real time debate on something that should have been already discussed. The motion on the floor is actually addressing that.

C. Hull: I would like to call orders of the day.

H. Ghazle: Point of order: The ICC came in with a recommendation, not a motion. Joe moved to form a committee headed by the ICC chair and a member of the Executive Committee. So that's the motion on the floor and it was seconded by Michael Laver.

Motion approved: 34:3:1

[Inter-college Curriculum Committee Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 10: Policy B02.0; A. Newman (N/A)

Omitted

Agenda Item No. 11: Policy E01.2 (Nepotism) M. Polowchak (1:41)

This is a follow-up from our discussion last week about proposed changes to policy E1.2, our nepotism policy. I'm here this afternoon to make a motion that the Faculty Senate accept the edits to the policy as these are noted in the presentation documents. Happy to answer any questions or entertain discussion.

Seconded: Betsy Dell.

E. Williams: I brought up this concern last time and I'm going to vote against it, not because we don't need a policy, but because I feel there's a long list of actions, such as resource allocation and things that are described as employment-related decisions that feel unclear. For example, this issue of faculty spouses, partners working together, will this apply to them or not? I still have concerns about that.

I. Puchades: I also have concerns that dual career hires are not addressed by this policy, so I'm also going to abstain.

Motion approved: 25:4:10

See above.

[Policy E01.2 Presentation](#)

[Policy E01.2 Red-line Document](#)

Agenda Item No. 12: New Business; A. Newman (1:44)

C. Hull: A quick update on the nominations process. There are six people running for five slots with at least one for each slot. We have two people running for chair, and one running for each of the other positions. I encourage you to get additional nominations to me soon.

Regarding the task force, the Executive Orders and DEI, I have now received some proactive suggestions. One came from somebody in GCCIS who suggested that a bot going through the internet looking for DEI stuff to cause trouble, wouldn't be able to find it – though I'm not sure what that means. Another idea, actually my idea, comes from the fact that I've been teaching strategic management for over twenty years, and when one of your major suppliers becomes unreliable you try and reduce your dependence on the supplier. When I said this in the task force, the immediate response was, it's impossible to reduce our dependence on the federal government to zero and what I heard was that because it's not possible to reduce dependence 100%, we shouldn't try at all. However, the difference between a 50% and a 20% dependence on the federal government is significant and our survival down the line may depend upon it. And with all the respect to people who feel like nothing can be done, something can be done. I will offer myself up as a case study. As it happens, mine is the only RIT grant that has so far been formally terminated and since I learned that, I have been migrating my center to a non-federal funded model and I am over 90% of the way there. If I can do it, others can too. Otherwise, I ask Senators to please keep the proactive ideas coming

R. Zanibbi: What are the other funding sources that you are using? Are they all private or are they state? Is there a list that you would recommend people look to for alternative funding?

C. Hull: I would prefer to finish before I explain how I'm doing this. But non-federal funding includes things like New York state funding, foundation money, money from non-US governments. It includes services for hire. We are actually making a considerable amount of the money that's coming in right now in terms of services for hire because as those of you who do grants realize me asking for a grant today, even if I get a favorable response, doesn't mean I get the money tomorrow. But I'm about \$5,000 a month away from being in the black compared to how my balance sheets looked on January 25th, the day after I got frozen. I just need a little bit more time to finish closing some deals and then I'm in the black. At that point I'll be much happier to present myself as a case study.

I. Puchades: On behalf of the task force on the new faculty activities software, I'd like to announce that the vendors will be here after break. We have to select down from three to one so we encourage all faculty to attend the demos and the hands-on experiences. There'll be an email sent out soon with details.

E. Weeden: Can we get a copy of the DEI list that was previously created?

L. Williams: I learned about the list for the first time this morning. I'll let Clyde and Betsy chime in if they've heard anything different about this list which I understand was developed back in 2018. But the Task Force hasn't even seen it.

P. David: What happens is the list was generated because very often we get people challenging us on gender equity. Why are you doing this special program for women or why are you doing special programs? So when these inquiries come to us, we have to do searches and we compile these lists and say okay, this is what we have and they are in compliance with the law and some things we remediate as necessary. So that's how the lists come about. I don't know if there is just one list. There may be more than one in response to previous questions. So there are three arguments against making a list. The first is that someone can exploit it. The second is the psychological effect on our colleagues who've worked so hard on DEI and now they may feel 'you identified us as the folks that someone's going to go after'. And that is not a trivial one. And the third argument is many faculty and staff feel this is overreach and there is a feeling we should not react to it. The argument in favor, on the other hand, is that it's not difficult to do a computer search for certain kinds of programs, especially since we already have these lists as a response to earlier queries. Here's my challenge. Without a good understanding of the potential programs and the response plans we have for these, we could be flatfooted in our response, something big could happen and we'd have no plan as to how to respond. All of a sudden we have 77 programs, how are we going to deal with that? Each one would be very nuanced and a blunt response would not be enough. So a thoughtful response to save as many of these things as possible is the best approach. Finally, it's not about using these lists to make changes, but to try to preserve as much as possible. There may be some modest changes we can make while preserving the spirit. So in general I think we should be prepared whether it's via a list or not. Being thoughtful and being prepared is much better. Not having to show our hand but internally making the preparations, doing the work in case something happens.

Attendance 3/6/2025

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	Laver, Michael	CLA Senator	X
Anselm, Martin	CET Senator		Lee, James	ALT CET Senator	
Barone, Keri	Treasurer/CLA Senator	X	Liu, Manlu	SCB Senator	
Boedo, Stephen	ALT KGCoe Senator		Malachowsky, Samuel	Vice Chair/ GCCIS Senator	X
Brady, Kathleen	ALT NTID Senator		McCalley, Carmody	ALT COS Senator	
Brown, Tamaira	Senate Coordinator	X	McLaren, Amy	CAD Senator	
Butler, Janine	NTID Senator	X	Newman, Atia	Chair/CAD Senator	X
Capps, John	CLA Senator	X	Newman, Christian	GCCIS Senator	X
Chiavaroli, Julius	ALT GIS Senator		Olles, Deana	COS Senator	
Chung, Sorim	SCB Senator	X	Olson, Rob	ALT GCCIS Senator	
Cody, Jeremy	COS Senator	X	O'Neil, Jennifer	ALT CET Senator	X
Coppenbarger, Matthew	COS Senator	X	Osgood, Robert	ALT CHST Senator	
Crawford, Denton	CAD Senator	X	Padmanabhan, Poornima	KGCoe Senator	X
Cromer, Michael	ALT COS Senator	X	Puchades, Ivan	KGCoe Senator	X
Cui, Feng	ALT COS Senator		Ray, Amit	CLA Senator	X
David, Prabu	Provost	X	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	X	Shaaban, Muhammad	ALT KGCoe Senator	
Eddingsaas, Nathan	COS Senator	X	Song, Qian	SCB Senator	X
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	X	Sweeney, Kevin	ALT SCB Senator	
Hardin, Jessica	ALT CLA Senator	X	Thomas, Bolaji	CHST Senator	X
Hartpence, Bruce	ALT GCCIS Senator		Tobin, Karen	NTID Senator	X
Hazelwood, David	NTID Senator	X	Tsouri, Gill	KGCoe Senator	
Hull, Clyde	ALT SCB Senator	X	Van Aardt, Jan	ALT COS Senator	
Jadamba, Basca	COS Senator	X	Warp, Melissa	ALT CAD Senator	X
Johnson, Dan	CET Senator	X	Weeden, Elissa	GCCIS Senator	X
Johnson, Scott	GCCIS Senator	X	White, Phil	ALT GCCIS Senator	
Kray, Christine	CLA Senator	X	Williams, Eric	GIS Senator	X
Krutz, Daniel	ALT GCCIS Senator		Worrell, Tracy	ALT CLA Senator	
Kuhl, Michael	KGCoe Senator		Zanibbi, Richard	GCCIS Senator	X
Kwasinski, Andres	ALT KGCoe Senator	X	Zlochower, Yosef	COS Senator	X

Interpreters: Nicole Crouse-Dickerson, Sarah Schneckeburger and Deanna Stawnychy

Student Assistant: Ben Bui

Presenters: Stephanie Smith, Michael Ruhling, Mark Indelicato, Amit Ray, Carl Lutzer, David Yockel, Gretchen Wainwright and Michelle Polowchak