

## Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, April 24, 2025

12:15 - 1:50 PM

Zoom

Attendance: See Below

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

Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; A. Newman (12:16)

R. Zanibbi: There was some discussion about the B2 motions that were voted on last week. There was apparently some confusion. I think people wanted to make sure that that was discussed today, maybe clarified and possibly revoted on. If I understand correctly, I think we accidentally split the motion incorrectly twice. If Mark is here, he can provide details. I'd be happy to have that in new business.

**Agenda approved by acclamation**

Agenda Item No. 3: Communications Officer's Report/Approval of Minutes; S. Aldersley (12:18)

S. Aldersley: Having received no suggestions for edits to the draft minutes for the April 17<sup>th</sup> meeting, I move they be accepted.

A. Ray: I didn't get a chance to look at these until last night, but I'd like to correct the last two statements in the section regarding the ICC discussion. Both of the statements from Mark Indelicato are exactly the opposite of what's listed here. It was a 2:1 vote on the third item to not move the charter policy and then in the very last part, the ICC is not in support of the first part of the motion.

S. Aldersley: I beg to differ. That is not what the transcript says.

A. Ray: I don't know what to tell you. We made our arguments pretty clear. Maybe he misspoke but it's clear that's not what our intention was. Over the course of that entire discussion we made it very clear how ICC stood on the matter of moving the subcommittees out of the charter and into policy.

S. Aldersley: That may be. I can't speak to that. The minutes reflect what happened, not what you think ought to have happened. If people don't say what they mean, what can I do about that? The minutes are the minutes.

Y. Zlochower: I asked a clarifying question during the meeting last week, specifically about that, whether it was 2:1 for or 2:1 against and the answer was 2:1 against, as Amit was saying. I agree there was

ambiguity in the statement originally. It said, the vote was 2:1.

R. Zanibbi: My recollection is the minutes are correct. But as the person who tried to split the motion, I was trying to capture the items that ICC approved in one part of the motion, so we could approve those, and then do the more contentious part separately, but I think we got the split wrong. I don't think it was anyone being disingenuous. I think it was an error, which is why I was asked by others to propose a revote. The questionnaire reflects what was done, but people got angry.

**Minutes approved by acclamation.**

[April 17, 2024 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes](#)

Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; A. Newman (12:21)

- 140 people have already voted on the amendments to B2. I request that Senators remind your constituents to look for it, because I used Qualtrics to send it out and in some cases it seems faculty have not received it.
- Please note that we have not yet released the May 8th hold, because we're wondering what sort of news we're going to hear from Dr. Munson at the May 1<sup>st</sup> meeting.
- I gave my end-of-year Senate report at University Council yesterday. Amongst other things, I talked about our interactions with DSO, the Charter vote, our involvement in the Presidential search, and the Governance Summit we organized here at RIT on April 12<sup>th</sup>. The President talked about the Executive Orders Task Force and that group's recommendation not to make any big changes. However, he said the Administration is exploring renaming options for anything that looks or sounds DEI-related, including the Division of Diversity and Inclusion. The phrase he used was 'anticipatory obedience' as they navigate the current environment.

C. Hull: The Task Force discussed extensively whether or not to propose changing names, and we originally decided not to. Then we found out that a lot of people were changing names anyway. So we are now thinking that maybe we should try to coordinate things instead of letting it happen in a haphazard sort of way. I will say that people who are concerned about freedom of speech and expression, and academic freedom seem to be well represented on the Task Force. We're not going to stop people from changing names of programs, but the Task Force has not been encouraging people to do so.

S. Aldersley: Senate recently approved a charge to the DEI Committee as to whether we should continue to require a DEI statement from applicants for faculty positions. Do you have an update on that?

C. Hull: That has not come before the Task Force.

A. Newman: The DEI committee has sent out a survey. The first link was faulty, but the second link was the correct one. I'm not sure how many people have responded, but I know that the survey is underway. I'm now told that over 300 people have responded.

C. Hull: I understand that a lot of people in my college have not been able to find the email about the Charter.

S. Johnson: I already mentioned to you that question 9 is broken.

A. Newman: Yes, we've been trying to figure that one out. In the meantime, I suggest you indicate 'Yes', 'No', or 'Abstain' in the text box.

- Another interesting thing that happened at University Council was that we learned the Administration had not followed procedure regarding the policy to remove the \$500 incentive for patents. Apparently, they did not present it to SC or SG on the assumption that it didn't affect them. So they are going to retrace their steps on that.

Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; G. Hogan (12:31)

Last week, Staff Council elected new chairs for next year: Gene Vogler will be the new chair, and Jeremy Zehr will be the new vice chair. The Staff Appreciation Picnic is on May 13<sup>th</sup>, and everyone is invited so if you're on campus, by all means come over. The BAG is scheduled to present to the Council on May 1<sup>st</sup>. We also voted on six HR Policies that Senate already voted on, so we're in sync there.

Agenda Item No. 6: Student Government Update; J. Anderson (12:33)

This past week our last PawPrint, to protect RIT students from ICE targeting, was assigned to the Student Affairs Committee. We responded to a PawPrint not to require students to pay for homework services for individual classes, also to Blue Light Kiosk along Lowenthal, and add period product disposal to male bathrooms, add more pads/tampon dispensers in women's restrooms and make period products available across campus. We appointed the KGOE and CHST Senators which actually got tabled to this next week, and then we appointed the Graduate Senator and the Women's Senator. This upcoming Senate, we have 14 appointments including cabinets, committee chairs, and senators.

Agenda Item No. 7: Update to RIT University Policy D02.0 (Admission); D. Kopperud and S. Van Horn (12:36)

S. Van Horn: I am the director of the English Language Center here with Dan Kopperud from Enrollment Management to present a proposed update to one particular paragraph in D02, RIT's Admissions Policy regarding English language exams. The two sections pertain to international undergraduate and graduate admissions and the kinds of tests applicants have to take. The long and short of it is that the current policy mentions specific exams by name and by score. However, exams come and go, and new exams come on the market that are comparable. So our aim is to change the language to get out of that trap, while maintaining all of the other standards and processes. The recommended changes have been endorsed by Kathleen Davis. VP of Admissions whose office is co-owner of the policy. Since a large number of the international students at RIT are graduate students, we talked to Graduate Council, and also with the University Writing Committee. Both groups endorsed the proposed changes.

The last time this section of the policy was reviewed was in 2013, as part of the quarter to semester conversion process. The existing language specifies four specific commercial exams, and that's the only part we're recommending to change. I should also mention that the existing language is somewhat problematic for NTID students in that it mentions speaking and listening, but the new language will avoid that problem. Our strategy is to replace the language on test scores with language on proficiency

standards and the criteria that we use to select exams. I should emphasize that we're not attempting to change any of the current standards. This is very narrowly about test scores only. Here's the current language in the policy. There's an undergraduate version and a graduate version which are nearly identical. The sentence to be removed is this one which refers to the paper-based TOEFL and Pearson's Test of English, where the concordances are no longer up to date. What is unique in the current policy for graduate students is that individual academic units may require higher standards or additional requirements.

So we're replacing test score language with proficiency standard language. These tests are not aptitude tests like the SAT or GRE. What they do is attempt to simulate academic performance. For example, you listen to a lecture, or you read something, and then respond by answering questions, writing and speaking. A perfect score is readily achievable for proficient users. RIT's old policy generated numbers from these exams which were benchmarked to something called the Common European framework of reference for languages, or CEFR. There isn't a US standard framework of reference for language proficiency, so we have been using the European one in line with the English language testing industry.

The CEFR has six tiers starting with A1 'basic' up to C2 'highly proficient'. Those scores are in the high B2 range. I don't really have time today to talk about the level descriptors, but I have links at the end of the presentation for the handbooks. But you can see what the standard RIT admission test scores are tied to. Graduate programs sometimes use C1. So we refer to a general standard, but what does that really mean? Are you just going to dump a student's paragraph into ChatGPT and tell it to rate it on the CEFR scale? Maybe that would be good enough, or maybe it wouldn't but let's stick to what we're already doing with academic English testing for now. The criteria that RIT would use to choose whether an exam is acceptable are standard test design criteria for academic English. In other words, not a conversation test or a technical occupational language test and not a passive, multiple choice test. It has to be given by somebody who's going to be able to provide reliability data so that the scores are meaningful and stable across testing. That means having your test bank doing the statistics, making sure that the score somebody might get this year means the same thing next year and along with that, that they've done the work to benchmark it to a proficiency scale. And the final thing we would put into policy is that it does need to have a test security system.

So without any further ado, I will read the proposed language. We've tried to write it in a way that will not need to be revised every time there's a new test on the market or a test that's currently on the market changes or goes away. So the proposed language says that: "Prior to consideration for admission, students must achieve a minimum test score on an RIT-approved standardized test of English language proficiency in the high B2 range of the CEFR, equivalent to a 6.5 on the International English Language Testing System or IELTS. That test score pins the standard down to a slightly narrower range. Now for graduates, their individual academic units may require higher standards or additional requirements. English language proficiency exams used for admission purposes are approved by the Division of Enrollment Management in coordination with the RIT English Language Center and must meet the following criteria: exams must evaluate student language production; must demonstrate validity for evaluating academic English skills; and, must provide reliability data, scoring concordances and adequate test security. Are there exams in the queue for adoption? Sure, the Duolingo English test is very popular. There are also Cambridge, Oxford tests. There's a whole variety of tests that our students might be interested in taking because they might be easier to take or cheaper. We'd love to be considered for a motion to approve if we're ready for that today, but if not, we understand.

S. Aldersley: I've always wondered about the English Language Center. As I understand it, a student coming from some non English-speaking country to RIT may meet the requirements for a particular program, but not have the necessary English. My understanding is that those students get referred to the

ELC, where they have to pay extra and they're not considered bona fide RIT students because we don't know whether they're going to be able to get their English up to the required standard. Assuming that's still true, do you have a sense of how many students are referred? And how many don't make it and presumably have to go home?

S. Van Horn: There are so many things about this structure that I inherited that I'm not super crazy about, and I think would bear a very good broad discussion. In any case, students are referred during the admissions process. There are hundreds, but the number that actually end up coming through the program is more like dozens. The pass rate in our program is in the high 90%.

M. Anselm: As the former director of a graduate program here, I've reviewed hundreds of international applications. I understand the motivation to change it. I'm not an English language expert, and I relied very heavily on the admissions website that set these exam limits, so that I knew that the students coming in did have the appropriate level of English to be successful. I've seen the outcome Stephen is referring to. Sometimes the students still come in and they really struggle because they can't speak well. My question is what is Admissions going to do if this policy gets changed? Will there be a field in the admissions application that will take all these different tests, whatever they may be, and just plainly tell us where it ranks in the CEFR? I just want to make sure if this goes into place that it also comes with a clear field in the application so there's transparency there.

S. Van Horn: It's our job to help interpret those scores and provide all of that information for the grad directors. We know the grad directors have a lot to do and don't have time for training on all of this, so yes, absolutely, that's part of what we need to do.

A. Newman: I have a procedural question. Earlier in your presentation, you said that you had consulted with the Graduate Council and University Writing Committee to review the language.

S. Van Horn: We presented the language and asked whether they felt comfortable endorsing and if they wanted to offer any critical changes, and it so happened that neither group had any feedback for us, and they voted to endorse the proposed changes.

A. Newman: Just as a point of process, because these committees belong to the Senate, if you are seeking Senate approval, I'd ask that in future you request the Senate to funnel the request to the committees, because that's how we manage our committee's workloads and maintain a sense of order. Otherwise, if we're not aware of where things are, it becomes a little harder to approve something right away. I'm going to request that you come back next time we have space on the agenda, and we can talk about it more.

[Policy D02.0 Presentation](#)

[Edited Policy D02.0 Document](#)

[2025 Endorsements](#)

Agenda Item No. 8: NTT Tiles Working Group; S. Malachowsky (12:57)

S. Malachowsky: I want to give you an update on what we've been doing in our working group. After the administration veto we wanted to explore with different stakeholder groups what had happened and what opinions were out there. Before the veto, the Executive Committee consistently supported the preference of Senate. We asked the Provost and other stakeholders, to approve it because Senate had spoken, and we

wanted to move forward with the Senate's agenda. When the Provost vetoed it a couple of us asked why that had happened and whether we could talk to other stakeholders with the Provost's blessing, and that included some of the deans, specifically asking what their opinion is about this whole topic. We also asked the President about it. We've actually met with the Provost three times on this issue and we met with one dean and another dean also shared their opinion. The conclusion we reached is that administrators know that the role of lecturers is something that needs to be addressed, and that there is an opportunity here where we could look at other options, or we could stay where we are and look toward the future. We decided to move forward with exploring other options. We've been speaking to stakeholders and gathering notes, and putting together some of the other options that were discussed. Two weeks ago we organized a meeting with the lecturer senators. We were looking for a group of lecturers who represented diverse opinions, and because they were senators, they already had a good amount of awareness about what had already transpired.

In that discussion we talked about two possibilities. There were a couple others that were discussed, but were not seen as viable because of feedback from stakeholders. The group decided that the first thing to do was to survey all RIT lecturers.

I want to talk to you today about the survey results and some of their implications. Since I put this presentation together about a week ago, the number of respondents has risen from 245 to 295 out of what we believe to be a population of approximately 350 lecturers at RIT. We can break it down by college and by far the most responses came from NTID. There has been some discussion about different kinds of lecturers for lack of a better way of putting it, for instance, people who come into the education space from industry, and people in different topical areas, which has been valuable in helping us look at the data. We asked people to indicate their rank. The great majority are senior lecturers, which means they've been at RIT for at least 5 years. We also asked what level of degree people have and an additional qualifier, whether their degree is considered terminal. There was a small minority of lecturers with only a bachelor's level degree. The great majority, roughly two thirds, have a master's degree and 15% of those are considered terminal. About one third have a PhD. I think that is insightful in terms of strategies and what requirements different options might have moving forward. Another thing we asked is, if there was a fourth rank, what would lecturers find most important in terms of potential benefits or changes to the current system. No surprise, people overwhelmingly said they'd like more money with increased contract lengths in second place. We did ask about the title, and you can see the responses on the slide. Service was ranked fourth. We didn't spend a lot of time defining what that could mean. Two others that have always been in question, but weren't a focus of this: scholarly activity and increased administrative roles, for example serving as an undergraduate or program coordinator. Finally we asked if we had a fourth rank, would you support that? 72% said they would. There were also some qualitative data relating to that.

I believe we're going to send out another survey. There are two main possibilities being discussed. Each one has merits, and each has different stakeholder groups who support it in different ways. And by stakeholder groups, I mean deans, Provost, outgoing President, incoming President. The one group we so far haven't really questioned much is department chairs which might be something for us to look at in the future.

What we'd like now is for senators to gather feedback from your constituents. Regarding the fourth rank, there's three things that we'd like more information on. We know that higher salary and contract length are important to people, but there are other things that come into play where we'd like to know people's opinions, for example, do people feel that this would open up more possibilities? Does it feel limited? Do people feel that it enhances their role within the mission of RIT?

The other option we're looking at is a parallel track with teaching professors. The questions are pretty much the same with a lot relating to how such a track would integrate with the existing three level track for lecturers.

D. Olles: When you bring this back to your constituents, Sam mentioned the possibility of the fourth rank being seen as a limitation. I think we need to recognize that we have some lecturers currently in their

forties and fifties and even older than that, and if this fourth rank was an option, some of them might never get to the position where they could reach the teaching professor role. That's the limitation there. Are people willing to go through four rungs of the ladder? Are they willing to go through promotion three times in their career? What does the timeframe look like in between each of those ranks? How many years would they have to wait until they can go from Principal Lecturer to Teaching Professor? That's one of the things that's really important to my constituents right now and something that I think we should be aware of.

My other comment relates to the parallel Teaching Professor track. The idea is that people would have a choice: they could stay on the lecturer track with their existing contract and responsibilities and not worry about changing any of that. Or you can choose to apply for promotion to this teaching professorship rank, and that's when your contractual responsibilities would change. So the parallel track implies a contractual change.

Right now, I feel the way the parallel track works, it's the best of both worlds. We can make both sides happy.

I. Puchades: We had a discussion with our dean and department heads about this, and our dean was saying we might need to consider the legal ramifications of introducing these new titles because of having people with similar titles doing different work and getting paid different salaries. I think we should include HR in this discussion too as well as other administrative roles, so we don't propose a solution that, when it gets to Legal, they say it's not possible.

S. Malachowsky: I agree. We believe that benchmarking definitely has to be a part of this, looking at other institutions, for example, and we've already done some of that.

I. Puchades: And in the context of legality within New York State.

S. Johnson: My concern is who decides if I can go on this parallel track? Is it me or my department, or my college? Because it changes my teaching load. So instead of teaching eight classes, I'm teaching maybe five or six, and that puts a burden on my department. Does my department get to decide if I can go down this track or do I get to choose and negotiate with my department?

S. Malachowsky: One of the things we're looking at is the process for nomination and promotion. The majority of promotion processes within RIT require endorsement from someone like a department chair, and ultimately a dean. So we do need to explore that.

C. Hull: If there is this Teaching Professor track, I'm wondering whether you've considered the possibility that people currently on the tenure track might want to migrate to it?

S. Malachowsky: We did think about that and we actually asked the Provost. I agree it's possible that a teaching scholar could fit into something like this, but as of right now, we've narrowed the scope to the NTT side of things.

[NTT Titles Working Group Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 9: College Governance Presentations; Q. Bui, SCB (1:19)

Our committee members are Qian Song, Sandy Rothenberg, Rick Lagiewski, and Zhi Tang. I want to give some background context to what has been driving governance activity in SCOB. In AY2023 we

discovered we were out of compliance with RIT's Charter of Academic Governance, which requires that each college should have a faculty governance body. We scheduled a faculty meeting to establish a formal governance structure and associated governance policies, and as a result, we established a faculty governance committee to formulate governance policy and committee structure. At the same time, there were ongoing discussions about a workload model that had been proposed by the Dean's office. This meant that faculty had increased interest in governance as a venue to discuss the workload model.

This year, the governance committee has been working on two items. We have reviewed various policies to identify areas where faculty governance is lacking in our college and where we may need additional governance in light of institutional policies. Based on this review, we created a governance policy in the fall of 2024 that specified the purpose and function of a governance structure in the college, the process of electing governance committee members, and the rules and norms that we want to follow. This allowed us to address the first challenge mentioned earlier, the absence of a faculty governance committee in the college. To address item #2, we created a short term task force to evaluate faculty performance, evaluation standards, and how these relate to both annual evaluation and workload. All of this was voted on and approved by the Saunders faculty in the fall.

This spring, the task force has been working on the annual evaluations process in the college. They collected input from all of the different groups of stakeholders and proposed five recommendations for discussion in faculty meetings. After these recommendations were approved by the faculty, they were forwarded to the Dean's office. The next step is for us to meet with the Dean in May, and discuss the recommendations and how to move the process forward.

Throughout this process we learned a couple of lessons that may be useful for other colleges as they look into establishing their own faculty governance structures. First, any actions and proposals regarding faculty governance have to be grounded firmly in institutional and college policies. Support from the Senate and the FAC are essential. Without a legitimate rationale, it's very difficult to justify committee actions. Second, input should always be collected from diverse stakeholders. We understand that this can slow down the process, but it's essential to get buy-in and come to an understanding of issues from multiple different perspectives. Third, there needs to be a collaborative partnership with the Administration which stresses the common goal of creating strong academic programs, a supportive work environment and student success. We are very fortunate that our Dean has been collaborative and supportive of the process and I think this is at least partly because we've tried to create clear goals around developing a collaborative partnership. Fourth, in order to drive initiatives, you have to have a passionate faculty ready to embrace cultural change. We realized very early on that a faculty governance committee has to get everything right. This is where dialogue and communication happen. But getting the real work done requires faculty engagement, and it's important to communicate that point to the faculty very early. Finally, we need to create an environment of psychological safety for all involved. Since there are diverse perspectives on controversial issues, it's necessary to have norms and rules in place that allow tenure track faculty, for example, to openly express their opinions, without fear of repercussions.

So those are the lessons we've learned throughout this process. What we've experienced over the last year has taught us the importance of collaborative partnerships so that the faculty and the administration can work together to improve the work environment in the college.

S. Aldersley: I think you said this process started in 2023. Have you noticed an increase in interest on the part of Saunders faculty in local governance issues? Is the trajectory to involve more and more people? Or has it been a bit of a struggle to get people involved?

Q. Bui: I'm a little bit biased, but I would say there's been a positive trajectory. At the beginning of the process, we were having a difficult time finding people willing to join committees and sometimes it was difficult just to get people to vote. But in the most recent vote we had 42 faculty vote out of 55 eligible. Which I think is a very decent turnout. So I think the key is you have to address issues that are important to the faculty. If people realize we're trying to tackle something that is important to them, they will vote. One of the important drivers in our case was having the workload model proposed by the Dean office. It



created a lot of discussion among the faculty and they've realized that faculty governance can be a means of creating a safe place where we can discuss things.

A. Newman: Such a good point. It can be very easy for an individual to feel vulnerable. But as a group, you're able to deliver more complex and sometimes harsher feedback, if you need to, without being so worried about consequences. Thank you. You have done something miraculous. You have set up an entire governance group in such a short amount of time. Kudos to you for getting all of that organized.

[SCB Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 10: Benefits Advisory Group (BAG) Report; D. Olles, S. Xenias and J. Pinkham (1:30)

Jo Ellen and Stephanie are here to answer the more complex questions that are related to the HR side of things.

We started meeting at the beginning of the year and I am going to go over what has been accomplished, also give a little bit of history about some of what's been going on at RIT with regard to Benefits in the last year or so.

It's important to note that there have been a lot of faculty and staff from all different ranks, different colleges and divisions, and different demographics involved in this process. There are people with children, people of different ages, etc., etc. In addition to me representing the Senate, Noah McMullin has been representing Staff Council, so two people able to report back to those different groups. This is really important, because we were part of the decision making process. HR did not make the decisions. They asked this group what the decisions should be. Joe Lanzafame was also part of the group.

The goal is to make sure that we are providing comprehensive and competitive cost effective benefits for employees. We are self insured so RIT pays directly for employee health care.

The problem we're having right now is that, in line with national trends, RIT has been seeing huge increases in claims over the last 24 months. This increase in claims was reflected in the renewal increase which was in double digits last year. There were design changes to plans, and then there was also a bid to make changes to the medical plans themselves, which it was hoped would result in administrative savings, but we were still paying more. We anticipate an increase in 2026 as well. Prices go up, no matter what. The biggest thing is we needed to find a way to make sure that we were not going to be costing our employees more money, while at the same time making sure we are providing employees with the most effective plans possible.

We had four meetings, not so much meetings as information sessions. We were provided with so much information that every meeting was like a Benefits Tedtalk. I learned more about benefits in these four meetings than in the 20 years I've been at RIT. Each meeting, we compared different benefits plans, trying to make sure we selected the right scenario for each of our different demographics. We looked at medical and prescription plans, enrollment designs and utilization and costs. We looked at options for replacing the POS-B no drug plan, because Medicare/Medicaid no longer considers that a credible coverage plan and it will be discontinued as of January 1. Then we weighted benchmark info, and got feedback from current and prospective employees.

What some of our current employees and a lot of our prospective employees are really looking for is a high deductible health plan that also offers a health savings account, and we weighed the pros and cons of all of that. What we found is that as long as you have a health savings account that is not 'use it or lose it' that is really the best way to go.

So the decision we came up with was, we're going to continue to offer the POS-A, the POS-B and the POS-D plans with no changes to deductibles or coinsurance. The \$5 copay to RRH differential is going to

be discontinued. Out of pocket maximums are going to increase. That happens every year because of IRS limits, so is not something HR or the insurance companies can control. We're replacing the POS-B no drug option with a high deductible health plan with the HSA option not a use it or lose it, which gives people a more meaningful choice where you can do the paycheck contributions with a little bit more of an option with your plan design.

It will give new hires an option to decide on their health savings account, whether or not they're going to use that, and then offering eligible employees an additional tax savings vehicle with the rollovers from those HSA accounts. This aligns with the benefits offerings at many of our peer institutions.

We are moving open enrollment up one month to October. We have to do this to make sure we align with the new Workday system. Everybody will be getting emails about this over the summer. Stephanie was very good about meeting with Noah and myself, to make sure communications to faculty and staff about the changes are clear. Everybody will get really detailed information via email about all of the changes being made.

HR is being very thorough in making sure they're connecting with us on what we want people to hear, and how we want people to hear it. They were very thorough in listening to the faculty and the staff throughout this entire process. It was the entire Benefits Advisory Group that ultimately made the decisions in the end.

Since I am not an HR person, I will let Stephanie and Jo Ellen answer any technical questions.

B. Thomas: Where do we find what health care plans we have?

J. E. Pinkham: The outline and the description of all of the plan offerings that the University has for employees are on our website. You can go to the HR website under Benefits and see all of the health care plans and descriptions. When we talk about POS, which means point of service, the POS-A, POS-B, the POS-B no drug, which we announced last year is not going to be continued past this year, and the POS-D plans are all outlined there. With respect to your particular enrollment, you can find that in Oracle. It is listed on My Benefits under Oracle self service and if you have any issues or questions you can contact our office or the RSC, and we can help you.

S. Malachowsky: In relation to self insurance, were you able to ascertain anything about the percentages or margins in terms of RIT's coverage versus our coverage and the financials of that? Because in previous discussions, we heard about a percentage split. Is that the same, or has it changed?

J. E. Pinkham: It's approximately 75/25. It's a weighted average based on salary tier and plan, whether an employee has a single plan, a 2 person plan, a family plan, those types of things. So it's not a straight line.

[BAG Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 11: New Business; A. Newman (1:45)

R. Zanibbi: Hamad, you said there was a procedure to revisit the vote on the B2 changes related to ICC.

H. Ghazle: There are two different ways of approaching it. You can either reconsider the motion and bring it back to reopen the debate, but in order to do that it has to be done on the same day or day after the motion passed so that avenue is closed. The other option is to move to rescind the motion, which can be done at any meeting, so there's no time limit and it can be proposed by any member. If there was a notice that this was going to be done before the meeting, it would require a simple majority, but if not it would require two-thirds of the vote to pass

S. Aldersley: I don't think a motion to rescind is on the floor yet, but assuming it was, I want to speak very strongly against it, and the reason is, as you know, the Executive Committee has been going around to all the colleges over the last two years, and it's very interesting to listen to what people think of the Senate. For example, when we visited KGCOE last year a faculty member said to us: "What do you guys do for us? What's the point of Faculty Senate?" I tried to engage this person in discussion saying why Senate is important. But he wasn't having any. Then, recently I mentioned to a colleague of mine that I thought he would make a really good senator. And his reply was "Why would I do that? What would be the point? I'm not interested in that at all." Those are only two anecdotes but Senate's reputation is what it is. If we are going to have any success at all in representing faculty interests, we need to have a better reputation among the faculty at large. And now you're saying you want to revote something that was quite clear at the time, because you, Senators, didn't understand it? The motions were put up on the screen before the vote and you saw them and you voted for them. And now you want to revote. What sort of message does that send to the rest of the faculty community about Senate's competence?

C. Hull: I'd like to propose a task force to address retention and graduation rates.

A. Newman: We can bring you back next week for either new business or put you on the agenda.

A. Ray: Stephen seems to think it was clear. It wasn't. There's widespread confusion on the matter from everyone I've talked to. As I understood it at the time we didn't vote on the very first part of the motion. We split up the other two parts, and that's what showed on screen. The very first part of the motion, and we've sent all this to Hamad, never showed up on the screen. So what we were voting on was the electoral procedure in green, and then the language about additional subcommittees.

R. Zanibbi: I'm sharing this email I got from Mark Indelicato. What happened last time is this was the motion and he wanted to split it and I misunderstood which of the four sentences was the thing he wanted to keep. What we came away with was this 8.1 at the bottom being the thing to separate, and that was not approved. But the thing that ICC has for a very long time been against is moving the subcommittees of ICC to D.1. So, Stephen, to your point, the reason I am proposing this at all is, I didn't vote for what I thought I was voting for. I think there was miscommunication. I don't want to change policy if we misunderstood what we were doing. I certainly misunderstood what I was doing. And there were a lot of emails and email chains I was involved in, where people were quite upset. And it was all a miscommunication. I was unclear. Mark may have been a little unclear, but clearly what came out of this was not based on what I saw was intended. And so that's why I'm here today. That's why I'm suggesting it. I'm less worried about what it looks like than getting it right.

H. Ghazle: Whether a motion was unclear, a vote happened. The only option that we have now in terms of policy is to rescind the motion. If there is a motion to rescind the original vote, then we would vote on it. And since Amit only just sent me such a motion, it would need to pass with a two thirds majority. That's the procedure at this point.

J. Lanzafame: I love Robert's rules of order. God bless Robert! But it passed and it's now in the middle of a full faculty vote. Does that have any bearing on it? It already went out. It needs to be approved by the full faculty. It's not simply that it's still on the floor, or in committee or anything.

S. Aldersley: I was going to make the same point as Joe made. What message does it send about the effectiveness of Senate? If we ask the faculty at large to vote on a slew of motions that this Senate has approved over the course of the last two years, and then we say, "Oops! Sorry we didn't know what we were doing." That's what you want to say? We didn't know what we were doing?

A. Ray: I vote to rescind.

A. Newman: Do you mean move to rescind?

Y. Zlochower: This goes to the fact that this wasn't clear during the meeting. Did people know what they were voting for? I was actually quite surprised when the vote came. A lot of people were voting for the part that was controversial. It seemed very strange to me. I thought, Okay, just no one agreed with me. And then the other vote came, and it was very strange. I think there's good evidence that the Senators were confused. And it didn't help that we started off the meeting by hearing that although it wasn't wholehearted, the ICC agreed with what was going to be presented.

A. Newman: I got an email that said they wanted the vote to go forward. So I thought there was agreement. Before the vote we allowed for more conversation, and there was editing on the floor and I just followed what was happening.

J. Capps: I'd like to second that motion to rescind.

S. Aldersley: I would ask if we still have a quorum.

E. Weeden: I would like to point out where I believe the error occurred. I agree that the motion was split incorrectly. Mark had stated support for the first half which was not now known to be the correct first half. That Mark had said he was in support of the first part is why the vote passed, and the separation was supposed to be pulling out the part that the ICC did not agree with, which was then termed 8.1, and the Senators voted against that, because they believed that was the part the ICC did not agree with, which we now know is not the case. So I don't believe the vote is an accurate representation and although I respect Stephen's consideration about how this makes the Senate look, I think it's more important that we get it right than that we follow through with something that's flawed.

A. Newman: We have 30 people here. I think that counts as a quorum.

**Motion to rescind passed 21:2:4**

Agenda Item No. 12: Adjournment; A. Newman (1:58)

Attendance 4/24/2025

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	Excused	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	X	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	Excused	Reinicke, Bryan	ALT SCB Senator	
Davis, Stacey	NTID Senator	X	Ross, Annemarie	NTID Senator	X
Deese, Franklin	CAD Senator		Ruhling, Michael	CLA Senator	Excused
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	Georgeanne Hogan	X
Ghazle, Hamad	Operations Officer/CHST Senator		Student Government Rep	Joshua Anderson	X

Ghoneim, Hany	ALT KGCOE Senator	X	Sweeney, Kevin	ALT SCB Senator	
Hardin, Jessica	ALT CLA Senator	X	Thomas, Bolaji	CHST Senator	X
Hartpence, Bruce	ALT GCCIS Senator		Tobin, Karen	NTID Senator	X
Hazelwood, David	NTID Senator	X	Tsouri, Gill	KGCOE Senator	
Hull, Clyde	ALT SCB Senator	X	Van Aardt, Jan	ALT COS Senator	
Jadamba, Basca	COS Senator	X	Warp, Melissa	ALT CAD Senator	
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	X
Kuhl, Michael	KGCOE Senator	X	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: Dan Kopperud, Stanley Van Horn, Samuel Malachowsky, Quang Bui, Deana Olles, Stephanie Xenias and Jo Ellen Pinkham