

Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, April 3, 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 (12:16)

Approved by Acclamation

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

Minutes of the meeting of 3/6 Approved by Acclamation

[March 6, 2025 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes](#)

Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; A. Newman (12:17)

- Coming attractions at future Senate meetings this semester: Enid Cardinal co-chair of the strategic planning committee to talk about the state of the plan to date; Mary Lynn Reed, to review the updated policy on academic freedom; and, Shelitha Williams, to talk about DSO.
- The DEI task force met this week and is focusing on the need to protect RIT values and our core mission.
- Regarding the DSO, I'm pleased to report that after the ASSA Committee spent three years trying to come up with a way to create a formal mechanism for interaction with faculty, we have now reached a point where we have things in writing. This includes a master list of accommodations, and a large amount of data that we will be sharing with faculty in the next Senate newsletter. The DSO has also agreed to establish an advisory committee consisting of faculty members from each college. And most recently, the Provost agreed to establish a DSO fellowship position, with a faculty member serving as a liaison for the Senate within the DSO. Keri Barone has been selected as the inaugural fellow and will begin working in this role over the summer.
- The Provost is holding a town hall tomorrow at 1:30 pm.
- The Celebration of Teaching and Scholarship is next Wednesday, April 9th at 4:30 PM in the Fieldhouse

- The Executive Committee has been working for some months with Todd Sadano, the chair of the Faculty Assembly at St. John Fisher, to put on a faculty governance summit on April 12th. To date, members of the executive committee members of 13 institutions across the State have registered. I'd like to introduce Todd who is attending Senate today as our guest.
- This Saturday, Dr. Munson is speaking at the NYS AAUP Spring conference which is being hosted by RIT. Please see the e-mail I sent out regarding registration for the conference, which you can attend even if you are not a member.

Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; N/A (12:22)

No representative present

Agenda Item No. 6: Student Government Update; J. Anderson (12:22)

Elections are over and results have been posted on the SG website. *Update on a number of Pawprints.*

C. Hull: How do Pawprints happen?

J. Anderson: Any student can put an idea on the website and then students decide whether to sign the petition in favor. There is a minimum number of 200 signatures that a Pawprint needs in order to get assigned to a committee chair. However, committee chairs are free to choose any Pawprint to work on as they wish.

A. Newman: This is something that I'd like to try out for Senate, and we'll be talking to SG to see if they can implement something for us as well.

Agenda Item No. 7: Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) Proposals regarding Annual Review; Cristian Linte (12:25)

Today, we're proposing the revision of the faculty evaluation criteria from five to three. Corinna Schlombs brought this to Senate on December 3rd. Prior to that we had conversations with Legal, the deans and with HR. We did a survey of all RIT faculty and had conversations in various college meetings. I'm going to address some of the issues that came up. The five rankings in the current system are Meets Expectations, Exceeds Expectations, Outstanding, Does Not Meet Expectations and Unsatisfactory. Oftentimes this ranking of faculty between the three categories, Meets, Exceeds and Outstanding, becomes very cumbersome and very subjective and often leads to a lot of unpleasant conversations and administrative favoritism.

If you look at the merit raises which are associated with these particular ratings, we're talking about 3%

merit increases in the past decade, below the increase in the cost of living, with some years zero. High performers often go unnoticed and unrewarded. And the whole thing is a zero sum game where rewarding some comes at the cost to others. This plot at the bottom shows how well RIT has been able to keep up with the cost of living. The curve at the top shows the inflation rate and the curve at the bottom shows the gap that has been opening up between cost of living and RIT compensation. This was also one of the subjects of disappointment in last year's COACHE survey. So this is not news to anybody. The plot at the top also shows the percent increase in terms of merit increase between the various ratings. So you can see it's about a two and a half percent give or take when you meet expectations. But then when you go up to Exceeds and Outstanding, we're talking about half a percent. To give you an idea what half a percent means, if one were to make 200,000 a year, half a percent would be a thousand dollars. By the time you pay tax and contribute to your pension plan, you're looking at about \$30 a pay period, which is about one lunch a week. If you make a lot less money than that, you're talking about a coffee per week. So this is essentially what it means to be a 4 or a 5. It means getting a coffee per week or a lunch per week depending where you are. So nothing to write home about. Our faculty survey about a year ago showed 53% in favor of reducing from five to three merit review criteria. We had about 22% against and about 25% indifferent. So I would say there was strong support in favor. In terms of concerns that were brought up to us, one was would compressing the top two categories prevent the recognition of top performance? Not really, because there are other mechanisms for recognizing outstanding performance, and also if you look at the whole picture, there are high performers who don't necessarily get rewarded every year. And high performers sometimes end up getting threes and fours, a lot of the time because it is really subjective and not at all an objective process, especially because there are no clear criteria within colleges or across the Institute as to what it takes to be at a three, a four or a five. So altogether by reducing this from five to three categories it would reduce the subjectivity.

Would compressing the lowest two categories be an issue? Well, those two categories are very rarely awarded. And even if they are awarded, it takes a number of years before a performance improvement plan is even started. As a result, you're talking about a large number of years where one has to underperform before anything is done. If you want to look at the dismissal for cause, it has nothing to do with the performance evaluation categories. The policy says consistent documented incompetence in teaching, research, scholarship or administration. None of these words here mentioned either of the two categories at the bottom

As for whether three ratings would be sufficient versus the current five, again, we're talking about subjectivity. A three is often looked at as merely a good performance but not great. Oftentimes evaluators are looking at a four and they go down to a three or up to a five. So you end up with people who are doing really well, but they end up with a three and some people who are doing okay or not that great who could end up also as a four or five. There's a huge amount of subjectivity. So I think narrowing that down and giving less choice will reduce that. Merit increases are correlated to but are not determined only by the performance evaluation. And market adjustments are not based on the evaluation. They're actually based on the benchmarks that the university publishes every year. Nothing to do with evaluations.

When it comes to tenure and promotion, would a reduction in the number of ratings have an impact? I've been on a tenure committee for six years in Engineering. I chaired for two years and I also had the added bonus of sitting on the university tenure committee for two years. Typically, if a candidate consistently meets expectations year after year, it's not an issue for tenure. What is an issue for discussion is when you see performance evaluations coming in, which don't square with the documentation submitted by the candidate. So like I said before, you've got some people who are doing really good work and end up with three and fours, and you've got some people who are just doing okay, and they're in the four to five range. This miscalibration is a bigger issue than the overall performance evaluation being unsatisfactory.

Lastly, what would happen if this were to be approved and then somebody was to be hit by this in the

middle of their probation period? Would going from an outstanding to an exceeds expectations be a detriment? No, because their plan of work would be adjusted and it would show that for the first three years they were actually under the 5-rating scale and for the next three years under the 3-rating scale. It would be a change in the measurement system, not in their performance.

We're also proposing to update the policy, clean the language up a little for style, flow and clarity. Like, for example, replacing department head with unit head, cleaning up the grammar and the sentence structure a little bit here. All of these are in the document you're reviewing. For clarity, we're going to add a couple of words here and there. And we're going to replace evaluation with written evaluation.

So we're asking for a vote on two motions. Motion #3 is to approve the proposed policy language regarding reduction of the review ratings from five to three. And Motion #4 is to approve the proposed changes in language for flow, style and clarity.

A. Newman: Let's start with discussion of Motion #3.

S. Aldersley: The merit system is clearly broken, it's been broken for decades. You mentioned there's a correlation between performance evaluations and increments. It's a very small correlation. It's hard to find. The merit system has been a disaster. You mentioned there's been years when merit has been zero. I could quote here the historical merit increments for some of our upper administrators. You would be surprised, but I won't embarrass the administration by adding that at this point. This is a proposal that will rationalize the system. Everybody wants to be a five. I've served as a chair and a dean and I will tell a little story here if the Senate will allow me. When a new group of faculty came into my department, when it came time for the first evaluation cycle, I gave this one particular professor a four, whereupon she marches into my office. What's this four? I've been here 28 years and I've always gotten a five. And so I said, well you had a good year, but in my judgment it wasn't outstanding. She goes over to the dean who happened to be Chris Licata at the time and complained about her new chair, that is, me. Chris called me in and said, is this a fight you want to fight? So the faculty member got a five for the 29th year in a row. The system is broken and this is a much-needed improvement.

P. Padmanabhan: I want to really commend the work FAC does. You brought up subjectivity and I think the problem is not with the policy itself. The problem is not holding administrators accountable. There doesn't seem to be an actual definition of what constitutes a three and what constitutes a four and what constitutes a five. This new system is still going to be subjective and people who should be getting twos are going to get threes and people who should be getting threes are going to get twos. So I don't think this is really solving the problem. The solution is to bring more objectivity. KGCOE has a rubric now detailing a full spectrum of activities, like a menu and you can decide how to craft your plan of work based on it. So I think there are other ways that we can try to fix the system and I don't necessarily believe this policy change is going to do it.

C. Linte: I appreciate that comment and I'd like to take a minute to answer it. KGCOE's new evaluation plan has three different portfolios: research intensive, balanced and teaching intensive. Funnily enough, we have three categories: meets expectations, exceptional, and notable. There's nothing mentioned about not meeting expectations because that situation is very rare. The system focuses on meeting expectations, notable and exceptional. There has been some effort trying to identify what distinguishes each one, but the problem, as you mentioned, is indeed the fact that there are no clear guidelines about what it takes to be a three or four or five, not in a department, a college and even less across the institute. And that's why when you look at tenure decisions and tenure dossier from different departments and colleges, it's very mixed. The opinion is very mixed and quite muddled.

M. Laver: I agree with you. I guess the only thing I would add is that it's fine to talk about merit

increments and break it down and say it's a cup of coffee or it's a lunch, but having a cup of coffee is better than not having a cup of coffee, right? For example, service? People are forever saying, well service doesn't count, but service doesn't count because we have chairs that refuse to hold people accountable for doing service? That's a problem with the system and no amount of changing the thing from three to five is going to change that particular aspect. So it doesn't really matter. Five or three, I'll go with the majority but I agree with you that a lot of it is accountability on the part of who's doing it.

E. Williams: I'm curious to know more about what the administrators think about this change. What was your interaction with administrators and what's your general take on this change among them?

C. Linte: We talked to HR last year and they said they are not against it. They said that there is a distinguishable terminology between meeting, not meeting and exceeding expectations. So they were okay with that. Legal didn't seem to have any issues either. Our dean's representative spoke with their colleagues, and their opinions were mixed. Some were more in favor than others, but there were no particular clear reasons as to why. Some prefer the higher granularity because they feel they can reward some of the faculty a bit easier by having a four and a five. But at the same time, I think if the categories are defined, I think it's easier to define three categories than five. And again, there are other mechanisms that enable supervisors to reward exceptional performance that are not part of the merit process and that's been happening, like individual negotiations, all sorts of other things. I don't think this will preclude those sorts of things from happening.

H. Ghoneim: I fail to see how moving from five to three will solve the broken system. Can you elaborate a little?

C. Linte: By moving from five to three, instead of having to decide between meeting, exceeding or outstanding, the chair and the faculty member would only have to identify the difference between meeting and exceeding expectations. I think it will reduce subjectivity. Currently I think three is really viewed as not doing that great. So most of the time the evaluation kind of starts at a four and goes up to a five or down to a three and that's pretty much what happens. As opposed to in the new system, you would essentially probably be between meets and exceeds expectations.

S. Johnson: I'm for this because I've always tried to do well and get a five but the goalposts keep moving for what's a four and a five in my department. My chair has always told me there's only so many fives I can give. So I'm now competing adversarially against my colleagues to try and fight for that five. And my department head actually once showed me not the person's name but their evaluation and said you need to do stuff like this person to get a five. And I did it the next year but they moved the goalposts again. They only have so many they can give out now. This proposal puts all your fours and fives together so you don't have to worry about that competition.

C. Linte: I think this will have to happen by having established guidelines that clearly define what it takes to meet expectations and exceed expectations. Not having those clarified is not going to help.

J. Capps: First of all, it's becoming really clear how practices vary tremendously across departments and colleges. In my unit there's no cap on the number of outstandings, it's just did you do a good job or not? So someone's success doesn't have to come at someone else's failure. That strikes me as a bizarre practice. I'm really torn on this because sometimes, I'm very cynical about the whole process, but I'd like to think that there could be some good that comes from this. One question I have is whether we'd be giving up some leverage by moving from five to three. And this is a scenario I have in mind. At least anecdotally over many years, every once in a while I believe deans have sometimes been given pots of money to reward the highest performing faculty. And how do they divvy up that pot of money? Well they look to see who has the outstandings or if someone can say, look, I've been outstanding four out of the

past five years, that sets that person apart from everybody else and it provides a basis for rewarding the highest performing faculty in the unit. I worry that if we move from five to three, we give up that little bit of leverage. It's not much but something. And I think it's worth holding on.

R. Zanibbi: To disagree with all of my colleagues who spoke previously, I think there's a resource issue here in terms of the time and effort we spend. And I wasn't going to say this, but I will very quickly. I recognize that I have a lot of exceptional colleagues and they're exceptional in different ways at different times. I come from a culture where I'm less worried about making sure that the exemplar is always visible. I'm more concerned about resources and time and effort by faculty administrators being allocated according to the resources involved. If there were to be something where there were a large raise involved and I think a different evaluation mechanism is needed, but as a way to put two or three per cent in people's pockets each year, I would suggest that we really have a three level evaluation system now and all we are doing is leaving ourselves open to additional discussion and people going to deans and arguing that they're excellent because we have this sort of exemplar mentality. I think it would be better to do this in a practical manner which will better reflect what actually happens.

E. Weeden: I understand there is a level of inconsistency regarding the current levels but that could still persist with reducing the number of levels. For example, the expectations for what constitutes an exceeds expectations could now be a higher bar leaning towards the current outstanding than what it is now.

A. Newman: I'm going to call orders of the day. I know everyone has things to say, but we're over time and at this point we need to vote.

Motion #3: To approve the proposed policy language regarding reduction of merit review rating categories from five to three

Passed: 22 11 5.

Motion #4: To approve the proposed policy language to update policy and improve flow and clarity

Passed: 37 0 3

[Faculty Affairs Committee \(FAC\) Proposals Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 8: Policy E17.0 (Faculty Leave of Absence); H. Nickisher (12:50)

I'm here to discuss changes to E.17.0 proposed by the FAC in regard to the continuing charge: "Investigate the venues for allowing NTT faculty a periodic leave of absence or sabbatical."

This first came before Senate at the end of March of 2023. At that time it was suggested that senators needed more time to think about the changes and it was agreed to bring it back at the next meeting. That didn't happen. Since then, the FAC has added an introductory paragraph to the policy and updated the scope to include professors of practice who were previously excluded and also clinical faculty. The only other thing the committee added was bullet points to make the policy read a little more clearly. Otherwise the language has not been changed, though we did add bullet points and moved portions around.

R. Zanibbi: Was the original motivation to make sure we were including the professors of practice that

had been added to policy at that time? I was just wondering what the specific ranks were. So now it would include professors of practice and clinical faculty.

E. Williams: As I understand it, there's also a resource issue because I think it's the provost's office who funds salary during those times. So if this is passed, with some multiple factor of more people applying, is the provost prepared to double the budget for professional leaves?

H. Nickisher: The policy says that if one is asking for this kind of leave, that is, outside of family medical leave, or military leave, or professional development for tenured faculty as is described in E.18, a leave of absence may be granted for good cause, if satisfactory arrangements can be made to cover the person who's leaving. So I guess that's an indirect answer to the resource question.

P. David: So I have to think about this. The other question is usually when someone requests a sabbatical, they say they're going to do some kind of research work.

H. Nickisher: That is presently what is in policy. I know that there have been non-tenure track faculty members who have actually received this leave of absence to do scholarship. I guess the idea has been that as long as what they plan to do is deemed beneficial to their college and therefore to the university it can be approved. I know of two personally who've received this leave and I understand from Laverne there have been others. I don't know how often it's been employed, but again that language is in the policy already.

H. Ghazle: The policy states that it is only granted on a case by case basis, and not automatically. The request has to be evaluated and assessed, and then the administration will make the decision whether they're going to honor the paid leave or not.

H. Nickisher: Thank you for that clarification, because, maybe coming back to you Eric, what we're talking about here is for the most part already in policy. We're just making it more clear that there is this option for it to be paid. All we're adding is the reference to all NTT faculty.

S. Johnson: If I remember, the last time we spoke about NTT faculty actually using this policy, it was no more than five times in the last 15 years. In practice, it rarely ever happens for NTT faculty to be approved for a paid leave.

P. David: Currently it is possible for NTT faculty to get a paid leave?

H. Nickisher: Yes, to get your salary, not just a stipend. And there are instances of that already. They have happened. They might be really rare, but they have happened.

P. David: Do we know for what reason?

H. Nickisher: I'm not comfortable saying what the reasons were for the two I do know about, but they were professional reasons.

Motion: To approve the proposed changes to E17.0

Passed: 37 1 2

[Policy E17.0 \(Faculty Leave of Absence\) Presentation](#)

[Policy E17.0 Edited Document](#)

Agenda Item No. 9: Graduate Council Presentation- Proposal for a new Advanced Certificate in Health Information; C. McCalley (12:59)

This should be pretty straightforward, at least it was for Grad. Council where it was supported unanimously. This is an advanced certificate program building off the existing MS in Health Informatics. It's a typical certificate program with three required course plus an elective. These are all courses currently part of the master's program. So no additional courses, no additional teaching. There's space in these courses already. The reason for this is there's growing demand in the healthcare industry for people who are trained in informatics and data science. So this meets the demand in the community to have healthcare professionals who have this additional training, but not with the added time commitment of a master's degree. It's all online. There's also demand for this in RIT's Dubai campus. It would also connect well with RIT's planned bachelors in nursing science, providing an opportunity for those students to get additional training in skills that are in high demand in the healthcare industry.

C. Hull: I'd like to second the motion and call the question.

Motion: To approve the Health Informatics Advanced Certificate Program

Passed: 37 0 2

[Graduate Council Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 10: Policy Review for C08.2 (Code of Conduct for Computer Use); D. Hannam and B. Woelk (1:03)

Good afternoon. I'm Kelly McLaughlin, director of support for ITS, and I have with me my colleagues, Dwane Hannam and Ben Woelk. We're here to talk about Policy C08.2, the Code of Conduct for Computer Use. There aren't a lot of major revisions this year. There is a lot of red lining, but it's mostly grammar and consistency and reflection of other policies. But we do want to talk about some slight changes in the policy pertaining to the Internet of Things, privacy concerns, harassment in digital environments, which we know is becoming more and more prevalent, intellectual property and the acknowledgement of incidental use.

Regarding the Internet of Things is basically a consumer-like device which you can bring in and connect to a network without having to do a lot of forethought about security, and we wanted to make sure we reflected that in the document to ensure that as people bring devices to campus, they're thinking about safety and security. Here are some examples of things we've seen people bring to campus that they want to connect the network. Facilities has a lot of cleaning devices and clocks and cameras and those sorts of things. And on the flip side, the question about personal devices that came up at University Council. It's not our intention to control any personal devices, like a phone, but we want to make sure that they're

being connected safely and securely. We have a lot of intellectual property and content that we want to make sure doesn't get inappropriately distributed through a personal device.

B. Woelk: A lot of the changes pertain to definitions in other RIT policies that were current at the time and that we've now brought up to date or, in some cases, have referenced the other policy. The prior version of the policy had no acknowledgement of incidental use. Pretty much you can use it strictly for RIT business or you can't. But as you all know, there is permission for incidental use using a computer, a copier, the network, a printer, all of those sorts of things, but not with the intention of setting up your own business within RIT. So that's why I wanted to make sure we had the incidental use piece in there and generally just making sure that everyone understood the other policies that impact the code computer use.

K. McLaughlin: The other question that we get a lot is about privacy. There is a separate policy that talks about privacy. In this one, we just refer to it. OLA actually owns the privacy policy itself.

C. Hull: There are a fair number of business professors who consult on the side. Can you be more clear about where the line is? If somebody wants to do some consulting work, can they not use their RIT email address?

B. Woelk: I want to make sure that yes, we can use our own devices, we can use our RIT computers, we can use our emails. It's correcting the previous policy, which basically did not have any allowance for that at all. So we weren't really trying to define what is having a business or what's not having a business, but just clearly communicating that yes, you all consult, all of you may develop things for outside agencies or different places, coursework, anything like that. And recognizing that we are still able to use our RIT-furnished equipment to do that work.

S. Malachowsky: How does this intersect with loss of administrative privileges and locking down our computers and preventing us from doing our jobs?

K. McLaughlin: It really doesn't, but we hear you loud and clear and it's my expectation we'll be coming back to talk about that specific issue. We want to make sure we're working together to balance the security piece, while at the same time making sure you are able to do what you need to do.

J. Capps: I have a question about the red line document and the section on freedom of speech and expression. It seems that despite what you said, some of the changes are pretty significant. It's now twice as long as it was before. It refers to faculty having an inviolable responsibility to foster and safeguard the freedom of all to learn by creating an orderly environment in the classroom and on campus. And that seems like a really big mandate beyond just computer use. And I'm curious about what an inviolable responsibility is and what it's doing here?

B. Woelk: That references a different university policy. It's not language we came up with. We were attempting to pull in and reflect what was in the other policy.

J. Capps: Does this reflect the updates from a few weeks ago when we voted to adopt the Chicago Statement?

B. Woelk: That's a fair question. I think we need to go back and look at that.

A. Newman: Tamaira, would you be able to pull up the document for C.8 on the screen so that people know what we're talking about?

B. Thomas: We are not able to access computers the way we used to be able to. For example, I could be in England or Sierra Leone writing grants and teaching classes and I used to be able to access my computer. Then a few years ago we got locked out, and nothing could be done because administrator privileges had been taken away. There's also a difference between Macs and PCs. I'm not sure if that is part of this discussion, but I'm just bringing it up as something that's very worrisome to many of us.

K. McLaughlin: It's not. If you don't mind, I'm going to snap a picture of your name tag and I can follow up with you. And then with anybody else who's had challenges regarding international regulations and security. There's a lot going on here in the US and as those things change, our ability to protect information when it goes out of the country has shifted. If you're on a Mac or a PC, we don't always have the luxury of being able to handle things consistently. This may be a situation where you haven't gotten the right information about being able to use remote access and I know we've got a lot of people remotely accessing information. I will follow up with you and if there's anybody else having the same issue, please let me know.

I. Puchades: Let's say a student wants to bring an IOT device to his room. Could you walk us through, what he would have to do and how that has changed?

K. McLaughlin: It's really about giving us the Mac address so that we can register it and ensure that it has the proper protocols. There are a lot of different gaming devices, computing devices and other things that students are bringing. Very rarely do we say a device absolutely cannot be connected to the network. We just want to make sure that we know of it, that we can make sure that it's safe and secure and then we log it and approve them to be able to use it. That really hasn't changed in the last few years since I've been here.

B. Woelk: The other piece of that is because all of these Internet of Things devices are quite different in terms of what you can do to configure them, there's an expectation that as much as possible, the person turns the security controls on, instead of just hooking up some device. The idea is to just make sure that they're protecting things properly and not transmitting data. Most of those requests are common things that we see but if it's a unique thing, we might have to have more conversation with the student or with whomever is bringing that device to campus.

J. Capps: I'd like to move to postpone vote on this motion until you've had a chance to look at this section, IIIId, to see how this fits in with our current policies on freedom of expression and also to clarify the meaning of the language and its appropriateness.

K. McLaughlin: For sure. That makes perfect sense.

E. Williams: I second the motion. Related to this, I'm trying to square the statement that not much has changed with the document I'm seeing where large blocks of text have been just erased and new text put in. I'm looking at privacy and there was language in the original text about search and seizures of computers and data and that's not in the section anymore and it's also not in the privacy policy as far as I can see. Where you've eliminated things, perhaps you can explain, yes, we removed this, but it's in this other place. That will make it easier to understand.

R. Zanibbi: Section E appears to be new. I'm curious how incidental use of computers applies here, because all the policy does is refer to other policies. Is it covered in other policies?

B. Woelk: I don't think RIT has a policy specific to incidental use yet. That's why there are multiple links to it. The reason we have it in there at all is it was not mentioned in the previous policy, so that was

basically barring incidental use because there was nothing permitting it. So the goal here was to acknowledge that incidental abuse does exist. If we need to add a sentence or two to provide more context, that makes perfect sense.

R. Zanibbi: Does this pertain to Ivan's earlier question about a student bringing devices to campus or is this a separate issue?

B. Woelk: No, this is really for faculty and staff.

R. Zanibbi: So it would be helpful to have some language in there to provide context because currently we just refer to the policies,

B. Woelk: For the student side, there is language that the student is not supposed to run their own business per se. So in that sense it would be applicable to that.

K. McLaughlin: The nuance there is that RIT provides most faculty and staff with the device that the institution is purchasing. It's owned by the institution. And so there's a different set of expectations if a student or a faculty member is bringing their own laptop or their own phone. It's not meant to tell you what you can do with your own phone, your own laptop. It's only when it's connecting to the network to ensure that you're doing things that are safe and secure and protecting the institution.

R. Zanibbi: A preamble to that effect here would be very helpful.

K. McLaughlin: Okay, will do.

H. Ghazle: There's a great deal of emphasis in the policy in terms of what's permissible and what's not, but there's been no talk on what happens when you report a violation and the process that follows. As I go through the policy itself, it's very confusing. Sometimes it talks about the student, but this policy is talking about faculty and staff. How would you determine that a faculty member is in violation of the policy? And what is the recourse for the faculty member who you deem to be in violation? So I join my colleagues in making the motion to hold off on a vote. Maybe we need to take another look especially at what recourse faculty have? Do you have a committee that will take a look at violations? Who is on the committee? There's not much in there beyond saying that violators will be either referred to human resources or to public safety.

K. McLaughlin: It's hard with something like this because there could be a variety of reasons. It's hard to list every single one of those, but I hear your point and we can talk about language that can do a better job of articulating what that process looks like.

Motion to require further consideration of the proposed changes to Policy C.08.2 in line with the comments during the discussion

Passed 40:0:0.

K. McLaughlin: If you think of anything between now and when we come back, please ask us so that we can make sure we reflect on it and come back with answers so we can move through it.

A. Newman: I have a feeling you will be inundated pretty soon.

K. McLaughlin: That's great. The more you have for us, the better we can be prepared when we come back.

A. Newman: If you'd like, maybe the executive committee can prepare a small survey so senators can put everything in.

[Policy Review for C08.2 \(Code of Conduct for Computer Use\) Presentation](#)

[Policy C08.2 Edited Document](#)

Agenda Item No. 11: RABC Standing Committee Report; S. Williams (1:24)

The RABC has been working this year on three thrust areas, two of which are carryover charges. I'll first go over an analysis, both qualitative and quantitative, of the Qualtrics spring survey which sought to gain an understanding of faculty views on compensation. The survey hit around the April/May timeframe. There was a total of 643 respondents, with 211 open-ended written responses. The subcommittee took these responses and thematically coded them. It's noteworthy that every college was represented with fairly large numbers. Clearly this topic struck a nerve amongst the faculty across the institution. With regard to the coding, multiple passes were taken and 25 separate themes emerged, though there was overlap. The raw data and accompanying analysis is in the shared drive in the RABC folder. The themes range anywhere from the benchmarks being too low, to a lack of understanding of how the salary process works, and how the incremental increases work. The top theme was there is a lack of transparency in the compensation process in general. A large number of responses said that salary is too low, which shouldn't probably shock anyone. Others said that salary generally is below whatever the benchmark standards are, that NTID salaries seem to be below those of similar disciplines in the rest of RIT and that salary discrepancies across colleges are too large.

Here are some of the verbatim responses that the committee believes are important to relay to give a feel for the sentiment that exists out there in our community. They range from comments like 'I've been here a long time but still haven't reached the benchmark,' to 'there is an issue when you're in the middle ranks of whether you'll even make the benchmark at all'. The comment that the committee thought was most important as a general expression of survey responses was "If faculty have voiced strong concern [about] compensation, it is an insufficient response by the administration to construct a website explaining why the benchmarks are correct and we are wrong." Indeed, the committee's view is that there is a gap between what the administration thinks the benchmarks are and what the faculty feel they are in terms of salary and compensation. Those were the qualitative results. CHST faculty member Barbara Lohse was awesome at statistical analysis and did a really good quantitative analysis. There's a lot of information to be mined in her analysis. But just to mention here, this bar graph which captures answers to the question, 'what is the level of understanding of how faculty compensation is determined'? You can see from the color coding that responses range from no understanding to total understanding and the no understandings definitely are greater than the total understandings. But what was interesting in the analysis was there's not a consistent understanding either across ranks or between the lecturer ranks and the professor ranks.

The next one is a Likert analysis (1-5 scale) of the question 'Are RIT's current market data sources for salary benchmarking appropriate'? And you can see the averages are all well below three towards the side of strongly disagree. Again, notice the difference in the professor ranks and the lecturer ranks and even

more of a statistically significant difference between each of the professor ranks. Lastly, this is a response to the question of timing to meet the salary benchmark when one consistently meets expectations in the annual evaluation. What's interesting here is that assistant professors believe that if they are ever to reach the benchmark, they need to do that as early as possible in their career here. The committee felt that this points towards an important retention issue. Again, there is a lot of really great information in the analysis.

A second subcommittee worked on the returning charge of looking at how RIT funds its academic affairs budget compared to benchmark institutions. The key struggle this subcommittee had was that every university seems to calculate their publicly available information differently. The committee did the best they could by defining the components of the academic affairs budget in terms of instruction, student services, libraries and academic support and dividing the total by the total operating expenses per institute. This analysis shows that RIT generally is below the 50th percentile of schools believed to be in our benchmark group. I will add some late breaking news that the committee is not aware of. When I shared this information with F&A they responded very quickly to say that they have a different view of our data – which just confirms that we all seem to have a different view about these things. The main point the committee wanted to stress, and this is coupled with the Qualtrics Survey analysis, is that if we want to raise our ranking amongst our benchmark group, RIT really needs to put more funding into our academic affairs budget.

Our third thrust area was to find ways to allow the camel to peek under the tent more. After multiple meetings with F&A, they have promised two changes to the way they will interact with the RABC. One of these is to allow each RABC committee member to attend their own college's annual budget hearing. It dawned on me that what's really important about those hearings is the binder of information that is shared. It's a really good summary of the health of the institute that I think the RABC needs to have. And they have agreed to provide that. They're going to create a portal on the shared drive that will now be populated with information that can be securely shared with the RABC. So that was a commitment they made moving forward.

S. Aldersley: It's interesting that you point out that the faculty and the administration have different views. And as an illustration of that, beyond what you presented here, I'm told that at their February meeting, the Board of Trustees was informed that RIT faculty overall are paid at 97.9% of benchmark.

I. Puchades: That sounds like something from some country where there's a dictatorship. I would like to see some data from the administration to support their contention.

R. Zanibbi: I have a few questions about data sources. On slide 14, what was the source of the data for where you were talking about exemplary ratings? So, 'consistently meets expectations'. That would require evaluation data. Was this from an RIT database? Where did this data come from?

S. Williams: No, these are the responses from the faculty in the Qualtrics.

R. Zanibbi: So self-reported. Okay, now Slide 17. When you talk about the percentage expenditure for academic affairs versus total institutional expenses, was this taken from tax reporting documents or some other source of information when you were comparing RIT to other institutions?

S. Williams: This was all taken from publicly available website data, their budget sheets for publicly disclosed financials.

R. Zanibbi: What types of information did you include in these year over year dashboard data reports that you said were 'eye-opening'?

S. Williams: If you look year over year, you get a very good sense of the changes in budgets over a five year period. You get to see trends, for example, in student numbers, program health, financial health, those sorts of things.

A. Kwasinski: There's another benchmark that we may also look at and that is the one where RIT is facing a competitive situation for hiring. What is the salary that is going to be offered? Honestly, when you see what we are offering for an incoming assistant professor compared to someone already here, it's very disappointing.

B. Thomas: I have a question about Slide #12. What's the difference between solid understanding and total understanding?

K. Barone: It would be like the difference between exceeds expectation and outstanding.

C. Hull: I'm curious if we would consider doing some sort of straw poll to see how many people know what their benchmark is. And a separate question, how many people actually are even within 10% of their benchmark or for that matter, how many people among our constituents are within 10% of their benchmark? Because it seems like everybody I know is way below benchmark. In fact, I don't know anybody who is at or above benchmark.

S. Aldersley: Something that bears repeating because it's difficult to understand but is apparently true. In the eyes of HR, you are at benchmark, if you are within 85% of benchmark.

C. Hull: Just to be clear, I'm still not at benchmark.

[RABC Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 12: New Business; A. Newman (1:46)

C. Kray: I've been thinking quite a lot about our international students, some of whom are getting deported and others are fearing deportation or fearing they may be unable to come back to the United States after they go home for the summer. So I would like to make a plea that we think about ways to help our international students graduate even if they're not able to come back to the country or if they're so fearful that they otherwise drop out. For example, we might increase our offerings of online courses with faculty who might be willing to open up a Zoom option for their international students.

P. Padmanabhan: That sounds really nice. So who would help facilitate this? I mean is it entirely on the faculty or is there going to be some administrative support?

C. Kray: We could approach it in two ways and I've already made that plea to our dean. But I think also even if there isn't a top down mandate that some departments could decide on their own to do something like that.

P. David: It's a very reasonable request.

H. Ghazle: We do have an international student office here. Maybe we could consult with them, perhaps a

collaboration between the academic side and the international student office to see what we can do to help these students graduate on time. And that's very important for us because improving graduation will help our ranking as a university, as well as impact the budget because international students tend to pay more.

P. David: This is very important. Lots of students, and other members of our community are hurting. I'm going to try and address that tomorrow in the town hall. But words alone aren't enough. We live in a very precarious time. I had one thought on privacy: if you could get Legal to do a presentation, I think it would really be eye-opening for the faculty senate and the faculty at large to understand the privacy ecosystem that we have at RIT. People should know and shouldn't assume what kinds of protections they have.

The point I wanted to make though is that many universities are dropping the diversity statement requirement for faculty applicants. The president and I don't want to make a unilateral decision about this. I believe the protocol is to request the faculty senate to give us some recommendations, but I have a more specific request, that is to ask Senate to charge the DEI Committee to look at this quickly and provide a response by the end of this semester. And I would like to include Laverne on the committee.

Motion: To charge the DEIC to recommend action on the question of whether or not to continue to require a DEI statement from faculty applicants.

S. Aldersley: So moved.

C. Hull: seconded

Motion passed 32:0:3

Agenda Item No. 13: Adjournment; A. Newman (1:53)

Attendance 4/3/2025

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	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	X	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	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	X
Cromer, Michael	ALT COS Senator		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	
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		

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	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	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 and Jennaca Saeva

Student Assistant: Ben Bui

Presenters: Cristian Linte, Heidi Nickisher, Carmody McCalley, Dwane Hannam, Ben Wolk and Scott Williams