

Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, April 17, 2025

12:15 - 1:50 PM

Slaughter Hall 2220-2240

Attendance: See Below

Agenda Item No. 1: Call to Order; A. Newman (12:15)

Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; A. Newman (12:15)

S. Johnson: I would like to propose that we move the NTT stuff to another week and bring in the ICC vote in person.

A. Newman: I was planning to bring that up in new business.

S. Johnson: It's not technically new business though. It's old business. I'd like to get to that in person and not do it via email.

A. Newman: Fair enough. Do I have a second to amend the motion?

M. Ruhling: Second.

A. Newman: Any further discussion? Seeing none, now we'll vote.

Motion to add the ICC vote to the agenda.

Approved 20:5:8

A. Newman: The agenda is amended to add the ICC vote in place of New Business. Is there any objection to approving the revised agenda?

M. Ruhling: Point of order. The motion I seconded was to remove the NTT working group and replace it with the B2/ICC item.

S. Johnson: Yes, that was my original motion. I don't think we'll have time to do both

H. Ghazle: Okay, we need to vote again.

S. Malachowsky: I think the NTT item is an important element of today's agenda. Are we saying we want to replace NTT with ICC, or simply add ICC? I don't want it to be one versus the other.

Motion to replace the NTT item with the B2/ICC item.

Approved 14:11:9

Motion to approve the amended agenda.

Approved by acclamation

Agenda Item No. 3: Communications Officer's Report/Approval of Minutes; S. Aldersley (12:23)

Minutes of Senate meeting of 4/10 approved by acclamation

[April 10, 2025 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes](#)

Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; A. Newman (12:24)

- We held a faculty governance summit this past Saturday, which ended up being incredibly successful. We had 14 individual schools represented, including Albany, Buffalo and Brockport, the president of SUNY-wide faculty senates, and the president of NYS community college faculty groups. It was a very interesting meeting and we're hoping it will help us form a coalition of faculty governance groups across New York state.
- Members of the Executive Committee and FAC have been asked to speak at the Provost's Council to discuss the motions that have recently been approved by the Senate.
- 244 people have responded to the NTT title survey. A very good response rate seeing as we calculate there are between 300 and 350 NTT faculty at RIT.
- I've been informed by the chair of ICC that the ICC has agreed to allow the latest version of the B2 ICC motion to go forward. Neither side is perfectly happy but I think we're ready to put this matter to rest.
- Next week we have three colleges presenting to Senate on specific experiences of shared governance in their units. We're hoping this will encourage further activity on behalf of faculty governance in all of RIT colleges.
- President Muson's farewell will take place in the Polisseni Center on May 14th. Please remember to RSVP if you have not already

S. Aldersley: If I can add to your report on the faculty governance summit. Also attending were an associate dean from Cornell, the executive director of the CUNY system and a contingent of faculty from the University of Rochester. We are hoping that UR will host a follow-up meeting in October.

Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; R. Hisert (12:26)

We haven't met yet since last week since our schedule is bi-weekly. This afternoon's meeting will include voting on several policies to vote on and our leadership election for next year.

Agenda Item No. 6: Student Government Update; J. Anderson (N/A)

Not present

Agenda Item No. 7: Standing Committee At-Large and other University Committees; H. Ghazle and C. Hull (12:28)

C. Hull: We have a slate of people who have agreed to run for the open at-large positions on standing committees. None are contested so are there any objections to voting in all the nominees by acclamation?

R. Zanibbi: Not an objection. Does the LRPEC still exist?

A. Newman: Yes, until the faculty at large have voted on the B2 amendments.

M. Laver: Also not an objection. I would be happy to continue serving as the Senate rep on Student Government.

S. Johnson: When does Staff Council meet?

R. Hisert: Every other week at 2:00 PM on Thursdays. Half of our meetings currently are on Zoom.

A. Newman: So we have Scott for Senate rep to Staff Council. We need someone for the Eisenhart Nominations Committee and it has to be a tenure-track member.

C. Hull: We may have to vote on that one later. How about if we vote everybody else and move on?

A. Newman: We also need a full professor to serve on the Grievance Committee.

M. Laver: If I give up my role as Grievance counselor, I am willing to serve on the Committee.

Slate of nominees approved by acclamation

[Nominees for Open Positions](#)

Agenda Item No. 8: Policy C08.2 (Code of Conduct for Computer Use) Edits; K. McLaughlin and Duane Hannam (12:33)

We took the recommendations from the last meeting and you should have received a Word document with the changes that were made in the red line document. Based on a lot of the conversations we had last week, we realized that in an attempt to create a sentence or two about the policies that were cross-referenced, we got ahead of ourselves. So we took all of that language out and just referenced the policies

themselves. Otherwise, most of the changes are grammatical, spelling, things like that. Hopefully that takes care of any of the concerns that came up in our last conversation.

M. Ruhling: Just a word of thanks for taking the suggestions as seriously as you did. It's now a cleaner document and easier to use.

E. Williams: One of the concerns was there was a sentence about faculty having the inviolable freedom to teach and a responsibility to foster and safeguard the freedom of all students to learn. Has it been removed?

D. Hannam: That was from an update in October that we didn't catch because we did this in July. So rather than to get out of synch again if something changes, all we did was link to the relevant policies.

Motion to approve the changed language in C08.2

Seconded: M. Ruhling

Approved 32:1:2.

[Policy C08.2 Edits](#)

Agenda Item No. 9: EMBA Updated Curriculum Proposal; C. McCalley (12:37)

The EMBA graduate program is a longstanding graduate program that graduates from 30 to 40 students per year. The proposed changes fall into two categories. We're updating the credit structure to align better with RIT's current calendar, so going from six to eight week sessions and going to predominantly three credit courses versus two or four credit courses. And we're making some updates to some aspects of the curriculum just to modernize some of the topics to align with the current needs of executives. This was passed unanimously by the Graduate Council on Monday.

H. Ghazle: In the proposal there was something about reducing the number of courses.

C. McCalley: Yes, it's gone from 24 to 17 courses and from 47 to 48 credits. Most of the changes involved combining courses and altering the number of credits.

I. Puchades: Is there an accreditation body that this has to go through?

C. McCalley: Yes. The step after senate approval is to go back to New York state with this updated program.

Motion to approve the Graduate Council's recommendation

Approved 35:0:0

[EMBA Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 10: Policy E02.0 (Principles of Academic Freedom) Edits; M. Reed (12:40)

I'm here today to ask that Senate vote on two motions. First, in February, you voted to adopt a statement on academic freedom based on the Chicago statement. Subsequently, RIT Legal reviewed the document, and as a result, we now have a couple of edits to talk about. Our committee looked at Legal's comments and we're bringing these for a vote. Legal's first recommendation was to change the first sentence to make it clear that RIT is committed to freedom of speech and expression 'in accordance with applicable laws and policies'. Before it just said RIT is guided by the following principles. So we're recommending that that would now become the first sentence of the policy. The second is a question that actually came up in the Senate discussion before. There was language that said 'teaching will be aimed toward achieving the educational objectives agreed upon' and the prior policy then said 'by faculty, administration and the board of trustees.' Our committee had recommended removing 'board of trustees' as we felt it wasn't really necessary. But Legal asked why that had been removed and pointed out that if the faculty and administration disagree on something, the board of trustees has the authority to step in and make a final decision on behalf of the institute. Our proposal is to leave the language as we have written it because we feel that the educational objectives should be set primarily by the faculty and administration, and, given that the board of trustees has this authority to step in, if there's disagreement, we don't feel like they need to be named. So those are the two items that are edits to the statement that was approved in February.

G. Tsouris: Are we discussing the red line version that was shared with everyone recently?

M. L. Reed: Yes, and you can see Bobby Colon's comments.

G. Tsouris: His comments are 'legal.' Are we allowed to remove them?

M. L. Reed: The first comment was the legal comment, and we're recommending to adopt it.

G. Tsouris: I'm asking about the removal of 'board of trustees.' Are we being asked to vote against his legal advice?

M. L. Reed: No, that's not what I'm proposing. We think that the board doesn't need to be named because they have the legal authority to make the decision.

S. Aldersley: Do you have an example or can you expand on what the word 'policies' means in the second line? And we use the term 'administration' a lot and it's never clear to me what it means, especially in something like this.

M. L. Reed: So the ones that were pointed out in the red line version were policies like sexual harassment and things like that.

S. Aldersley: So it means 'RIT policies'. I'd like to suggest a friendly amendment to add 'RIT' there.

R. Zanibbi: I didn't follow the motivation for adding this to the Chicago statement when it's already been adopted by hundreds of schools. What was the motivation given for this particular legal statement? The whole point of adopting the policy is to support freedom of expression. I'm unclear about Bobby's motivation.

M. L. Reed: You'd have to ask him. He's saying that legally that's what needs to be there.

R. Zanibbi: Second, I asked about this before and it hasn't come back to the floor. I don't understand at the end of the policy why it says independent study and research are things that can be done after other responsibilities are completed. Many of us are required to do research as primary activities in our jobs. I realize that's not in the motion here, but it seems like that's another thing that's a little inconsistent.

M. L. Reed: I'd have to look back at exactly where that appears in the policy.

R. Zanibbi: It's in the very last paragraph.

A. Newman: "Independent study and research is encouraged for members of the faculty subject to the proper performance of their other responsibilities to the university."

R. Zanibbi: But research is the primary responsibility for most of us.

M. L. Reed: It's a good question. That part is part of the old policy that wasn't edited by us.

R. Zanibbi: My goal isn't to hold up your motion here but I think that's something that should come back at a later time. But I still don't see any really enticing reason to modify the Chicago statement with Bobby's statement.

M. L. Reed: If you look at his, that addition is not actually changing the Chicago statement.

A. Kwasinski: Going back to that first sentence, to me it's curious to have a policy that has to be subject to law. Aren't all our policies subject to law? So I don't understand why we need to say that. Is this the only RIT policy that has a statement like that? Does that mean we have that line to all our policies? My other question related to policies. This is a policy itself. So we're subjecting this policy to other policies? Are we not therefore creating a second tier of policies?

C. Hull: I am prepared to vote against Bobby's revision. When I was getting my Master of Business Administration, I had to take a business law class and the instructor was a lawyer. He said it's not the purpose of this class to teach you how to be a business lawyer but to teach you how to deal with lawyers in your organization. One of the things I still remember is that you don't ask the lawyer if you can do something because they'll say 'no' to keep you out of trouble. Instead, you say, 'I'm going to do this thing' and the lawyer's task is to help you do it without getting into trouble. In this particular case, we are committed to freedom of speech and expression in accordance with all applicable laws and policies. That means that if somebody passes a law in South Dakota that says RIT can't have free speech anymore, we're OK with that. If a department chair says, it's my personal policy that you can't say that, there's a policy and that limits our freedom of speech. So I feel very strongly that this particular edit, and I think we should not make this change.

E. Williams. On your second point, you're proposing to leave the board of trustees out of the list? Did Bobby explicitly say 'if this is gone, it's a legal problem?' Or was he just saying he'd rather see it there, but it's not really a problem?

M. L. Reed: There was follow up with Provost David, but I don't know what if Bobby Colon was copied.

A. Newman: He was not copied. However, it didn't seem to be an incredibly controversial thing to leave it out.

J. Lanza fame: Isn't the intent to exempt speech that would violate harassment laws? I mean those are the laws and policies we're talking about. We're not talking about laws designed to specifically restrict speech.

M. L. Reed: I believe my committee and I certainly would be quite happy if the Senate decides not to accept that first line.

S. Aldersley: I would hate to hold the whole thing up simply because we don't like that one sentence, which I don't like either. But I don't know what the mechanism is here.

H. Ghazle: We have three things on the floor. Should we move to table this till next time given all of these questions? Or should we work with a friendly amendment? Or should we move to vote? Because right now the committee has a motion to approve the changes.

M. L. Reed: Our committee would like to see the statement adopted and become policy.

H. Ghazle: OK, so the motion is on the floor and we need to vote whether to adopt the proposed language or not. The Chicago statement has already been adopted. The discussion is not about adopting the statement. It's about whether to accept these two changes to the policy itself.

M. Ruhling: Just for clarification Hamad, are you prepared to make a motion to end discussion and move to the vote or are you in a position to make a motion to table this?

H. Ghazle: I'm saying we need to go ahead and vote on the committee's motion and if it gets voted down, we'll go from there.

M. L. Reed: Can I ask a procedural question? My understanding was the Senate voted to adopt this, but it has to be signed by the provost or the president before it becomes policy. So these were comments that were made by legal counsel. Our committee took that as we should really look at them because maybe it won't be signed if they aren't addressed.

A. Newman: At this point there's a motion on the floor. Obviously the committee has done their due diligence.

M. Anselm: I'd like to hear what the provost has to say about both of these changes. Can you add some clarity Dr. David?

P. David: The first amendment right has limits and that's the time, place and manner pyramid we have. If you look at the spirit of the document, and you read the red line section, there's so much there that really exalts first amendment rights. So to me that was a small concession to make and I said that's fine. On the other point, because the board of trustees is always there to referee a disagreement between administration and faculty, that's a blanket understanding. So on point number two, even if it's not there, it's always implicit that the board would jump in.

C. Hull: I would like to move that we approve this without the change in the first sentence.

S. Aldersley: Seconded.

H. Ghazle: Point of order.

C. Hull: Sorry. I would like to move to amend the motion on the floor to delete the change in the first

sentence.

S. Aldersley: Seconded.

H. Ghazle: Now we're in good shape!

A. Newman: The motion to amend is on the floor.

Motion to amend

Approved 30:3:3

A. Newman: Now there's the motion on the floor, which is to accept the second change to delete the phrase 'board of trustees'. I just don't want to say it and get it wrong.

S. Johnson: Seconded.

T. Brown: With regard to the first sentence, the information sent to me, as policy coordinator, is that it does have to be in the policy somewhere. So if we do not vote on it today, more than likely we are going to see it somewhere at a later date.

C. Hull: With all due respect to Bobby, if he thinks that it must legally be in the document, I think he should come to Senate and explain to us why. Maybe he has a very reasonable explanation for it.

H. Ghazle: Point of order. A motion was put on the floor and it was approved. Now it goes back to the provost and the president for further consideration.

E. Williams: Adding to Clyde's point about getting an explanation from Bobby Colon, the thing that most concerns me is the phrase 'applicable laws and policies'. It sounds so blanket that it could be anything.

M. L. Reed: I think it should be pointed out that that sentence was not in the policy before. The policy's been on the books for a very long time. We did not take it out. He just added it in.

S. Aldersley: Going back to 10 minutes ago, I again ask what 'administration' means? Are we just talking about the provost and the president?

M. L. Reed: That's a good question. I don't know that it's defined anywhere. I think it's probably understood to be the provost and the president, maybe the deans. I don't think it's well-defined.

M. Ruhling: To Stephen's point, I've been scouring through the policies and the word 'administration' is not defined anywhere although 'Officers of the University' is. Maybe we should put defining it on the agenda for next year.

A. Newman: We will now vote on the motion to delete the addition of 'board of trustees' to the policy.

Approved 25:5:6

M. L. Reed: Given the importance of academic freedom particularly right now, the second motion our committee would like to make is that Senate vote to establish a permanent committee on academic freedom and freedom of expression as outlined about a year ago when I was here making these original proposals.

We propose that such a committee would be primarily educational and informational and policy based. Whether this passes or not, there are going to be remaining issues, which the committee would look to make sure that policies across RIT are consistent with the Chicago statement. It would also be educational and informational, for example, going to college meetings and having a representative from each college as the local expert on academic freedom. We do not view this as an additional grievance committee. If someone were to bring something to our attention and we thought there was an issue, we could point them in the right direction.

J. Lanza fame: Shouldn't this be a charge for the FAC who could determine for example what the structure of such a committee would be?

A. Newman: Generally the Senate would be the body that forms a standing committee but that would be a vote and a change to the charter.

M. Laver: I really appreciate the work the committee has done in getting the Chicago Statement adopted. However, I'm opposed to forming another committee. In my college, as big as we far, we've found it very hard to staff committees. If issues pertaining to freedom of speech and academic freedom come up, the Senate is fully capable of dealing with them.

H. Ghazle: I'd like to propose a friendly amendment. We have been trying to reduce the number of standing committees. Would you be amenable to having a task force instead?

M. L. Reed: Yes, I think that our committee would agree to that. We believe there should be a group that faculty can go to, but it could be a task force.

S. Johnson: I think this is too vague right now. What is their charge? What is their makeup? What are they going to do? We just have a couple of bullet points saying we want to create this, but what are we creating?

A. Newman: The charge to this committee was given when Clyde was still chair.

C. Hull: That is true. A COLA faculty member not currently on senate suggested this because there were attacks on faculty members at various universities for saying things and you wind up getting 500,000 people on some website somewhere demonizing you and you as an individual might have a hard time dealing with that. The thought behind this was that we would have a committee that would come up with a way of protecting our faculty from being mobbed on line. Back in the really early days, we had walls around our universities to protect us from the mobs but that doesn't work so much today. It's true we have a lot of conversations about committee creep and too many seats on too many committees. Does every college have to send somebody to every committee? Could this not be given to the FAC?

M. L. Reed: I want to offer one piece of current info that might be useful here. Right now, we have this committee and I'm listed as its chairperson on our website. And because of that, with everything going on right now around the country, I was contacted by the University of Massachusetts, and invited to attend a meeting of a number of universities who are talking about academic freedom issues and share what we are doing to protect our faculty. I did go and it was a very interesting meeting.

J. Lanza fame: Is this a proposal to make this ad hoc committee permanent? Because again, we don't have language on the details. Are we to approve the committee and then fill out the rules later, or can we think about it and get back to it?

F. Deese: I'm a member of this committee, the ad hoc committee and I strongly support some kind of permanent committee, whatever you want to call it. I think now more than ever in 2025, this is needed. Attacks on my academic freedom and the academic freedom of my colleagues have not come from outside. They've come from inside the house and they are serious. And a lot of my colleagues don't really understand what academic freedom means. I think anything that's educational or advisory would be very valuable in the current environment, both inside and outside.

M. Ruhling: It's a little disingenuous to talk about this as, 'especially in the current environment'. This kind of thing has been going on for a long time in many ways for different groups of people at different times. There seems to be a little bit of a political side-taking here that I'm going to object to because these issues are not just now. They've been going on for a long time. And as part of that, I will speak against forming a permanent committee because freedom of speech is freedom of speech. And if there's a problem with it, they can go to a grievance committee. But any committee is going to actually put constraints on speech, on what constitutes freedom of speech. Who gets that freedom is going to be something that this committee is going to have to deal with.

C. Hull: I would like to speak against my earlier position. Regarding the whole committee creep thing, we wind up trying really hard to get a bunch of people to sit on the committee that they don't care about and make them do a bunch of work they don't want to do and that's one of the bad things about how Senate works. If we have a group of dedicated faculty who feel passionately about a task they want to take on, then I would be in support of allowing them to have a task force to take this forward. We can just say we'd like to charge you to carry on next year. A task force can last indefinitely and it can be dismantled if it doesn't need to exist anymore.

A. Ray: I'd like to challenge what my colleague Michael Ruhling just said. This is not the same thing as what's happened in the past. What the Trump administration is doing to universities across the country is changing the definition of particular terms in such a way as to weaponize them and taking away their funds. They're threatening Columbia with receivership because of the idea that being pro-Palestinian is somehow antisemitic. That's nothing like the way this particular issue has played out over the last quarter of a century. Obviously it's not a new issue, but the way the administration is dealing with it now is fundamentally different.

A. Newman: There is a motion on the floor to turn the ad hoc committee into a task force so that it can continue the work that they've been doing.

F. Deese: Seconded.

Approved 25:5:6

[Academic Freedom Presentation](#)

[Policy E02.0 Edits](#)

Agenda Item No. 11: CLA BS Program -Global Futures; L. Hall (1:19)

I'm here representing the College of Liberal Arts as well as my colleague Jessica Hardin, chair of

International and Global Studies in the College of Liberal Arts, to propose a revision of the International and Global Studies degree. There are a number of reasons for this. First is that we have a very significantly declining enrollment in the current degree. We've struggled for years with a lack of coherence in the interdisciplinary curriculum. We've had multiple stakeholders with lots of conflicting views. So we're proposing both a name change to Global Futures and a curriculum revision to make it a more methodological program that would be much more attractive in the 21st century and align more clearly with the new-economy majors that RIT is hoping to build.

You can see the rough framework here. There are four modules: global technologies and ethical futures, global issues and concepts, a professional technical core where students will take courses primarily outside COLA, and a fourth module on qualitative and quantitative methods. It ends with a bookend course, IMGS 300 Methods for Global Change.

You can see how different skills map onto each of these modules, including critical thinking, analytics, design thinking, teamwork, communication skills, adaptability, a tactical toolkit as well as quantitative and qualitative research and analysis. The governance and structure will not change dramatically. A wrinkle in this process has been that COLA has an endowed chair of international and global studies, which requires us to have a curriculum in international and global studies. We think we've built a really exciting and innovative bachelor's to replace the existing major. Just for reference, the current enrollment in that major is under ten, so we've seen a really dramatic job over the last 10 years. The International Global Studies Council, the participating departments, including all departments that offer courses in this degree, the COLA Curriculum Committee and the COLA Dean's office approved of this revision in fall 2024 and it was approved by the ICC a couple of weeks ago.

There are lots of connections to RIT initiatives. There is a lot of excitement around futures thinking, particularly at some of our global campuses. Dubai has a master's program in future foresight, and there's a lot of excitement about potentially creating some accelerated options because the global futures does require an international experience and so we're really excited about creating connections with our global campuses, including possible exchanges. It also links to a number of other RIT initiatives and strategic goals, including accelerated degrees, double majors, interdisciplinary learning, project-based learning, as well as AI and new economy initiatives.

There are lots of futures programs around the world including at Carnegie Mellon which has a number of futures initiatives including a PhD in Future Studies. Arizona State has a College of Future Studies. So this is a growth area and something that it would be really neat to have the College of Liberal Arts be able to participate in. We also think that this revision links up closely with employer needs and demands with lots of career pathways, for example, graduate and law school, public and private sector security, diplomacy, policy work, interdisciplinary computing and engineering. Like the current program, it's still very flexible, allowing students to do double majors with a range of other disciplines.

H. Ghazle: One of the slides talks about healthcare strategies. We have a global health program on campus. What is the synergy between the two? Have there been any discussions with global health?

L. Hall: This was a chicken and egg problem that Jessica Harden has struggled with. She has a very strong vision for reaching out to all of the colleges, especially CHST, because as a medical anthropologist, her work is very tightly linked to questions of global health. The question has been how much work should she do before we know if the degree can move forward? She's been a little bit hesitant to reach out to other colleges and possibly waste people's time if the degree itself was not going to move forward. So the hope is that as soon as we have the approved revision and it heads to New York State, then we can pull people in. The hope is that we can add in each of these categories, global technologies and ethical futures, global issues and concepts, these would be obvious places as well as the professional

technical core where CHST faculty can contribute, as well as GCCIS and a number of other colleges. It was difficult to know how much outreach to do when we were not sure whether the administration was going to support this revision.

C. Hull: We have a perfectly good curriculum committee that vetted this degree and passed it unanimously. Let's agree that the ICC did its job and move on to approve their recommendation.

Motion to approve the revised degree program as proposed.

Approved 34:1:1

[CLA BS Program Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 12: NTID AAS - Precision Manufacturing Technology; M. Lynn (1:30)

I'm here to present a proposal for an AAS version of our existing Precision Manufacturing Technology program. NTID has offered a diploma and an AOS degree in manufacturing since the early eighties. We keep it up to date constantly. We offer a number of associate degree programs, specifically using the phrase 'career focused'. We currently have such programs in five areas. The AOS and the AAS versions have exactly the same major name, while the business program has a slightly different name. The one I'm presenting today, PMT, is the only one where we have an AOS version but not an AAS one.

The technical coursework in all these programs is exactly the same across five semesters. They are career focused, so we require a co-op. The difference between an AOS and an AAS is that the former requires 15 credits of English, math and professional communication courses which are distinct from the university writing curriculum. The AAS programs don't have those 15 credits, but instead follow a 24 credit subset of the Gen Ed requirements in RIT bachelor's degrees. About two thirds to three quarters of the credit is transferable depending on departmental agreements.

Students are able to switch between AOS and AAS. However, whatever time it takes them to complete the English, the math and the communication courses would be extra. This is a snapshot of the curriculum. It includes blueprint reading, precision measurement, a four semester sequence in precision manufacturing technology focusing on polishing, grinding, lathe work, milling, and a CAD course.

There are two reasons to set up this program. One, to have an A+B option for students. We currently can't market the A as leading to a bachelor's degree and the specific bachelor's degrees that it would lead to are these in CET. We've negotiated an articulation agreement with these three programs as part of the proposal. We already have the faculty, we already have a really nice lab space. We've got co-op, and career center, we have academic advisors. We do expect to have eight more students as a part of this and that would require us to hire one more instructor who would cover the extra students in the first year of the program.

Motion to approve the AAS degree program in Precision Manufacturing Technology

Approved 36:0:0

Agenda Item No. 13:B02.0 ICC Motion; A. Newman (1:38)

We now come to the B2/ICC vote, which is our last pending vote before we put the amendments to the charter out to a vote of the entire university.

I was able to work with the ICC on the disagreements that were happening and that were discussed last time. We tried to form the task force proposed by John Capps but eventually it came down to taking information back and forth. In the end, we were able to get to a point where there was agreement to move forward with voting on a motion to move the sub-committee language to policy D1 and there is a red line document to that effect in the folder for today. In addition, we have edited the language to require the chair of ICC to call on the Senate and we've also added the words, the 'honors curriculum'. Also, we wanted to make sure that the ICC needs to request the Senate to form any additional subcommittees. In the succeeding pages of the document, you will find more detailed information regarding the discussion itself, as well as the red line language that was edited as we went along. So the motion is on the floor.

A. Ray: Did you say you worked with John Capps?

A. Newman: No. John Capps was the person who made the motion to form the task force.

A. Ray: OK. We put together a task force which never met in its entirety. Richard Zanibbi was supposed to be there as was David Yockel but they didn't meet. So it was only three of five. The scheduling happened the day of the meeting and I was only able to join because I was able to make my class online. We did not approve this as a body. We agreed that the honors language should be brought back and moved to the right place. We agreed on putting the elections in line with practice. But we did not agree to remove the language about the subcommittees or their composition out of the charter and into policy. We actually polled the entirety of ICC and its three subcommittees and by more than a two to one vote, we agreed that should not happen. The rationale for doing all this was that there are no other subcommittees named in the charter. The reason why that language is there in the first place is that, unlike all the other standing committees, our committees deal with curriculum. Curriculum for faculty is sacred. And for things like accrediting bodies, having language surrounding ICC and its subcommittees in the charter is particularly important.

A. Newman: I don't want to re-litigate our entire discussion. A month ago, the ICC, along with all of the subcommittees, including yourself, Amit, were here and you presented your arguments. The point of the task force was to create a place of agreement. As to why it was not able to meet, I had recommended inviting Richard Zanibbi to join. However, the chair of ICC was unable to choose one other person to represent the ICC. You can try to slow walk something in the hope that it will just go away. But the fact is, this is a motion. There is a very good reason why this is on the floor. It has been on the floor for two years. Crying foul or attributing some form of secret agenda is inappropriate. We have discussed this to death. All of the issues you have brought forward, the concern that the curriculum will lose its representation is not valid. It's right there in our charter. It's in our preamble. It is what we do. We have always defended it. At this point in time, there is a process. This motion has been discussed. Unless there is brand new information that we have not yet heard, I would like for us to just vote on it. And I'd like to remind everyone that this is what has been agreed to this motion. This motion went to the ICC who

looked at. It was not looked at by just three members of a task force or four members of a task force. It went to the entire committee and I have it in writing that they agreed to let this motion proceed.

M. Indelicato: The motion was not agreed to. It was two to one basically. But we did agree to let it come to a vote. We had very good reasons that have been articulated as to why we don't think this is a good idea. Two of the things on there are very good. The third one is not. And one more thing, I was able to get folks to come to the committee as we agreed. I think you said I wasn't able to.

A. Newman: You asked for two and then you weren't able to name the second until days later. And then we had trouble scheduling. We have a lot of emails.

Y. Zlochow: My understanding was that there were questions about what the changes were. We brought ICC here. There didn't appear to be agreement. Then there was a motion to have a task force to work things out. If it's the case that the task force did not yet come to an agreement, that's important information. It seems from this email here that although it was not unanimous agreement, there was at least a majority vote. Is that the case that all the motions presented here were at least agreed by the majority of ICC. And I would also like to know just how significant of a majority that was.

M. Indelicato: It was a two to one vote on the third item to move the charter policy.

A. Newman: The whole point of the task force was ultimately to bring back the language that was agreed upon. And at the end of the day, that was the language that was sent back to me because this document went to them for editing and commentary. The narrative of what was agreed upon and decided as we made those changes is actually written in this document. I asked them to edit the narrative too.

R. Zanibbi: I move to split the motion so that the things that Mark indicated ICC were in support of could be voted on separately. And apologies but I never got a formal invite to participate.

A. Newman: It was really in the initial conversation and then we just weren't able to find the time. So you want to split the first half and vote on this separately?

M. Anselm: I second Richard's motion.

D. Olles: I just want to clarify. ICC approved the first two parts of the motion or the task force did?

M. Indelicato: The ICC is in support of the first two parts of the motion.

A. Newman: Now we will vote on the first part of the motion, Motion #8, which is to move the language in B2 to D1.

H. Ghazle: First, we need to vote on Richard's motion to split the original motion into two.

Motion to approve Richard's amendment

Approved 27:6:1

A. Newman: Now we will vote on Motion #8

C. Hull: I would like to move to make another amendment. I'd like to add the words 'and the honors curriculum to article 10.6, formerly 10.7' to Motion #8 as the ICC approved.

M. Ruhling: Seconded.

Motion to approve Clyde's amendment

Approved 30:3:1

A. Newman: Now we will vote on Motion #8

Motion approved 27:7:0

A. Newman: Now we will vote on Motion #8.1, ICC requiring approval from Senate to form any additional subcommittees beyond those outlined in D01.1.

Motion failed 10:19:5.

[ICC Motion](#)

Agenda Item No. 14: New Business; A. Newman (N/A)

There was no new business

Agenda Item No. 15: Adjournment; A. Newman (1:55)

Attendance 4/17/2025

Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended	Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended
Adrion, Amy	ALT CAD Senator	X	Lanzafame, Joseph	COS Senator	X
Aldersley, Stephen	Communications Officer/ SOIS Senator	X	Laver, Michael	CLA Senator	X
Anselm, Martin	CET Senator	X	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	Excused	Newman, Christian	GCCIS Senator	X
Chiavaroli, Julius	ALT GIS Senator		Olles, Deana	COS Senator	X
Chung, Sorim	SCB Senator	X	Olson, Rob	ALT GCCIS Senator	
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	Excused
Cromer, Michael	ALT COS Senator		Puchades, Ivan	KGCoe Senator	X
Cui, Feng	ALT COS Senator		Ray, Amit	CLA Senator	X
David, Prabu	Provost		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	
Fillip, Carol	ALT CAD Senator		Staff Council Rep	Ross Hisert	X
Ghazle, Hamad	Operations Officer/CHST Senator	X	Student Government Rep	Joshua Anderson	
Ghoneim, Hany	ALT KGCOE Senator		Sweeney, Kevin	ALT SCB Senator	
Hardin, Jessica	ALT CLA Senator		Thomas, Bolaji	CHST Senator	Excused
Hartpence, Bruce	ALT GCCIS Senator		Tobin, Karen	NTID Senator	X
Hazelwood, David	NTID Senator	X	Tsouri, Gill	KGCOE Senator	X
Hull, Clyde	ALT SCB Senator	X	Van Aardt, Jan	ALT COS Senator	
Jadamba, Basca	COS Senator	X	Warp, Melissa	ALT CAD Senator	
Johnson, Dan	CET Senator	X	Weeden, Elissa	GCCIS Senator	X
Johnson, Scott	GCCIS Senator	X	White, Phil	ALT GCCIS Senator	
Kray, Christine	CLA Senator	Excused	Williams, Eric	GIS Senator	X
Krutz, Daniel	ALT GCCIS Senator		Worrell, Tracy	ALT CLA Senator	
Kuhl, Michael	KGCOE Senator	X	Zanibbi, Richard	GCCIS Senator	X
Kwasinski, Andres	ALT KGCOE Senator	X	Zlochower, Yosef	COS Senator	X

Interpreters: Holly Jentsch and Jennaca Saeva

Student Assistant: Ben Bui

Presenters: Kelly McLaughlin, Carrie McCalley, Mary Lynn Reed, Lauren Hall and Matthew Lynn