Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, October 2, 2025   12:15 - 1:50 PM   Slaughter Hall 2220-2240

Attendance: See Below

Agenda Item No. 1: Call to Order; R. Zanibbi (12:13)
Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; R. Zanibbi (12:13)
Approved by Acclamation

Agenda Item No. 3: Communications Officer's Report/Approval of Minutes; S. Aldersley (12:14)
Minutes of 9/25 not yet ready.

Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; R. Zanibbi (12:14)

The B2 votes for changing the names of the DEIC and RABC committees have been completed. The vote on renaming the DEIC to AESC (Access, Engagement and Success Committee) passed by 311 votes to 58, more than surpassing the necessary two thirds majority. For RABC to BPC (Budget & Planning Committee), the vote was 361 to 8. The next step is to update policies via a search and replacement process.

After today's meeting, the executive and other members of Senate are going to be participating in a meeting with the chair of the Middle States Reaccreditation team, Dr. Farvardin, who is President of Stevens Institute of Technology.

Watch for the first edition of the Senate Newsletter coming out later today. It includes resources that Blanca and others requested regarding both salary benchmarking information from the last three years and also the policy for questioning your salary as described in E.4 and elsewhere.

We have already released the hold on the October 16th meeting of Senate. Depending on whether we get through all the remaining charges today, we may also release the hold on the October meeting, freeing up time for the standing committees to meet.

S. Davis: As newly appointed Senate Nominations officer, I'd like to ask for nominations to replace Stephen as Communications Officer when he retires in December. If possible, we'd like to run an election on October 23rd.

R. Zanibbi: The Communications Officer role involves not just maintaining the minutes but other communications through the newsletter, and with different bodies on campus. The Comms Officer ends up being the voice of the executive a lot of the time.

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

Agenda Item No. 6: Student Government Update; Igor Polotai (12:20)
Nothing to report

Agenda Item No. 7: Standing Committee Charges; R. Zanibbi (12:20)
This is Part Two of our approval of the standing committee charges. We are going to try and approve charges in blocks again. We are going to make sure that everybody sees all the charges, carry-over and new, for each committee. I'd like to get through this quickly so we don't have to activate next week's meeting. To review, what we've done so far is collect charges from the standing committee reports. There were 51 of those, some were carry-over, some newly proposed. We then added charges from the Qualtrics survey from which we received 82 charges. The ExComm identified redundancies and things that we couldn't do this year and reduced that number to 37. So in total there were 88 charges and these were reviewed at this year's standing committee lunch. After further pruning there were 68 charges left to be distributed to 11 committees and subcommittees. At last week's meeting, we approved all charges for the curriculum oriented committees. Also last week, the AAC had three charges approved and one tabled, which we will return to later today. So now we'll continue to approve charges by the respective committees. The goal is to approve charges as worded wherever possible so if you don't have any objection to the substance of a charge, please don't object. First, we have six charges for the GLEC (Global Education Committee). These charges include: clarify the roles of the two co-chairs, one from the Henrietta campus and one from a global campus; seek individual endorsement from each college of a guideline document that's been created that offers degree programs at RIT global campuses (this document was presented in 24/25 but needs to be updated and resubmitted to the deans and directors); finalize and approve version one of the global campus resource guide; finalize the global campus localization report and disseminate it; hold a global convergence meeting for all the campuses to talk about shared interests and opportunities in November; survey RIT colleges to determine current compensation practices for faculty and staff who assist with study abroad program directors and from that develop best practices to be applied consistently across the university. **Motion: Approve all six charges for the GLEC** S. Johnson: Second S. Aldersley: I learned yesterday that RIT is going to open another campus in Albania. Clearly we are getting more and more involved on the international level. This committee struggles with its members all being in different time zones but I've begun to realize it's a really important committee. **Motion approved by acclamation**

Next, we have six charges for the AESC. These charges include: establish resources for faculty that foster best practices regarding content and activities in the classroom; explore the possibility of ensuring all academic units attend AES related activities in the annual review process and possibly model this after the human resources policy for staff. Some colleges do this already but they're looking for a consistent practice across the institute; identify and assess opportunities to protect the core institutional values, practices, pathways and structures used to ensure access, respect and dignity for every member of our community while mitigating risk of the university in the current climate. There are currently some local data collection practices within units and colleges that the committee is going to look into and they want to identify best practices; continue to work through Advance RIT to support initiatives to address opportunities for improvement identified in COACHE. There is a note that since Advance RIT is resource constrained, processes and data needed to clarify actions around the COACHE results have so far have been hard to find; investigate whether a policy that deaf culture training should only be led by deaf facilitators is appropriate and propose ways to implement this policy if advisable; follow up on the gender equity and teaching load work undertaken by Advance RIT and include course distributions for grad undergrad courses, see if improvements have been made and assess the current state of affairs. This has been a longstanding issue. The first report related to it goes back to 2021 and there's been no follow up to date, even though there was strong evidence that there is gender bias in who teaches graduate and advanced courses in our programs.

Motion: Approve all six charges for the AESC

P. White: Second

B. Thomas: I don't understand what charge #3 means when it says identify access opportunities to preserve the core institutional values, practices, pathways, structures.

R. Zanibbi: I've talked to Keith Jenkins about this. I think the intent here is to talk about preserving the current priorities of the committee formerly called DEIC, using very careful language to advocate for them.

B. Thomas: But what are the current practices? The leadership in some of the colleges are not following the principles. So why are we going through this whole thing over and over again when leadership follows a completely different path, not following the rules.

R. Zanibbi: That's good information, but the charge is talking about whether this committee will continue to look into ways to, for example, prevent the situation you're talking about and what the definitions for that are.

B. Thomas: I have another question. Do we have data to back up Charge #6?

R. Zanibbi: This was in the report shared with Ellen. This is not conjecture. The Research and Scholarship Committee talked to Advance several years ago. In 20/21, they executed it and we haven't acted on it since, so some updating and follow up is needed.

P. Padmanabhan: I also want to talk about #6. I've heard from other faculty that there's inequity not only in teaching loads but also in how graduate students are distributed among faculty. I've heard stories of female faculty finding it very difficult to recruit grad students. So I wonder if the AESC could look at it.

R. Zanibbi: Let me make a note of that. I'll pass it on to the committee.

P. Padmanabhan: Grad students are a limited resource so it's important how that resource is distributed.

R. Zanibbi: If this is approved, I do think they have to execute this first though. As you can see, we have a four year lag. But I will share that with the committee.

H. Ghazle: Is it possible to add to charge #6 some language like 'including course distributions and graduate course and graduate student distribution'.

R. Zanibbi: The problem is execution. We already have something that's been looked at for four years. I would rather see this completed before broadening the mission of the charge.

P. Padmanabhan: Could they look at it and decide if they want to include it in their charge?

R. Zanibbi: No, we have to approve it. We want this to be the official charge so that this gets done. We're already seeing that we're four years on. I'll take this over nothing, which is what I think we risk if we broaden the scope.

Motion passes: 32/2/3

Next, we have six charges for the RSC. First, review and revise policy C.5 (Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research). This charge goes back to 2020; second, develop and propose a university research policy for standards for evaluating research that meet both university and college level criteria, including winning grants and publishing. The rationale is that you want to make sure all units follow existing policy language in E.5 regarding evaluation, but also to be clear how interdisciplinary scholarship is rewarded across the institute; third, investigate and report on RIT's new PhD tuition policy in comparison to similar policies at other R1 and R2 universities. Last week, we approved a task force to look into this.

Motion: Approve the three carry-over charges for RSC

D. Johnson: Second

Motion approved by acclamation

Now, new charges for RSC from the Qualtrics survey. First, clarify Policy E.18 to indicate whether a first leave can be taken after six or seven years of full-time service as a faculty member, and then whether eligible faculty members may take additional leaves after six or seven years after their first leave. The rationale here is that the current language makes it unclear exactly how much time you need to have worked before you can apply for leave in a subsequent year. Also, we want to determine whether the term 'sabbatical' as used by peer institutions, should replace 'professional development leave' in the existing policy. Second, revise the policy on RIT reimbursement for childcare. Current RIT policy will not allow faculty to reimburse childcare expenses incurred during research even though this is allowed by the NSF and other funding agencies in some circumstances, such as prolonged travel, disability of the child, etc. Funding for this would come from faculty held grants at no cost to the institution. Third, investigate and report an RIT's administrative policy on the return of indirect costs in comparison with other R1 and R2 universities. Next, explore adding faculty oversight and guidance to SRS sponsor research services similar to recent changes with the DSO office where we now have a faculty fellow. Include a faculty led board to oversee SRS and handle grievances and require that all SRS-related policies impacting faculty be approved by the faculty board. Rationale: substantial changes in overhead return and tuition amounts have been announced with little or no faculty input in the last two years. Next, increase travel budgets and support for faculty scholarship, for example, to cover business expenses for academic work. Some faculty have been covering costs for travel to academic conferences out of their

own pocket, as well as other research expenses to support their academic work and research programs, effectively reducing their salary when research is part of their expectation.

S. Aldersley: I don't think it's within the power of the RSC to increase travel budgets.

R. Zanibbi: No, but it is within their power to talk to the individuals who control such things and report facts to Senate.

S. Aldersley: I'm suggesting we make it clear.

R. Zanibbi: As long as it's interpretable I'm okay with it. Fifth, with research and scholarship added to faculty ownership in B2, explore which research-centric policies should be co-written with Senate. Examples are C.2. (Misconduct in Research and Scholarship), C.5 (Protections of Human Subjects) and C.11(Freedom of Speech and Expression), and C.22 (Records Management).

C. Hull: With respect to this particular one, I have been asked by constituents to include journal ranking as one of the things that specifically falls under this charge. I don't think it has a university policy number. It's an administratively controlled policy within the college. The ranking of journals is done by administrators rather than by faculty. So the faculty are saying it should be determined by the people who do the research rather than by the people who administrate.

Motion: Approve five new charges for the RSC

J. Cody: Second

T. Worrell: I'd like to support Stephen's point re: charge #4 telling the committee to increase the travel budget. You might understand it, but I'd love to have the language be something that anybody that sees it can understand it so that they know the charge is to explore it or whatever that charge really means.

R. Zanibbi: So here's the thing. If this goes long, I'm going to move quickly to table to do it at the end.

B. Thomas: There are members of RSC here so we know what that charge is. Does that solve the problem?

T. Worrell: No.

T. Brown: In the actual wording on the document it does say 'explore ways to increase'.

R. Zanibbi: It just didn't say that on the power point. I'm glad we have that clarification though. I agree. We can't just charge them to find money.

Motion approved by acclamation

Next, we have six charges for the BPC. First, two carry-over charges: review best practices for merit pay and faculty compensation; compare and report on how RIT benchmark universities have historically allocated their budgets for academic affairs. Then four new charges from Qualtrics: consider the question of debt incurred by RIT. It seems that RIT's debt load and resulting debt and debt payments have increased in recent years. One of the members of the executive looked at the 990 tax reports and can confirm this numerically. And in informal conversations with administrators, they've told me that there is new debt because of certain buildings that were put up recently that were not fully funded. Next: investigate the feasibility of ITS developing a teaching computing resource parallel to research

computing to support computationally intensive teaching needs and related cutting edge technology developments such as AI. In my own unit we don't have for our instructional use anything that can handle a large neural network, a large language model that you would refine in any realistic way. So students literally can't play with modern models. COS and KGCoE put this charge forward. Multiple programs need more resources to teach courses in machine learning and AI and it would be nice to have a resource for that. Next, over the last several years, RIT has made a lot of decisions about pursuing cost saving activities such as enactment of the Xerox contract, the RGH Alliance Health Plan, preferred vendor channels, contractual agreements with Oracle Desire to Learn, etc.. The charge is to identify a means by which these efforts can be investigated to determine whether we got a reasonable return ROI.

L. Villasmil: When charge #4 uses the word 'parallel', is that the only option that the committee is going to study or can they make a recommendation that is within research computing? The reason I am asking is that I have worked with research computing for 19 years, all my time here, and have asked multiple times to improve the process including meeting with them this semester. What they lack is an interface with users. I don't like the word 'parallel', I don't want somebody else trying to use the same resources. I would like to have that unit within because what they lack is the people who teach the PhD and Master's students. When they move to another platform that's where we get lost. So we are asking barely smart program-oriented people to interface and act like customer service. Many faculty that use those facilities have bought their own computers because they don't want to be tied to research computing. So I think this is a very nice charge if the committee can explore.

R. Zanibbi: I think that's a good point. As the charge was proposed, they meant 'parallel' simply in that it would be whether it's within the same organization or separately. There would just be a body that's separated to deal with instruction versus research. They didn't mean exclusively apart from or directly within RSC or anything like that.

L. Villasmil: No, because we have used the word parallel, meaning I don't get the service that I need. I'm tired of waiting. Whether I am in CET or COS doing heavy computing, I want to get a grant and I'm going to develop my own network inside my college completely separate from research computing. What I dream about is a bigger research computing that can help everybody.

S. Aldersley: Can you go to the second page with the charges? As long as you're taking notes for the committees, you've listed a number of cost saving activities there. Would you add to that list RIT Certified? That really needs to be investigated.

R. Zanibbi: It was just restarted but yes, I've noted that and I will pass along the committee.

B. Thomas: I was on RABC years ago, we have been discussing Charge #1 forever. I don't see the need for this charge, especially now that you're sending out a newsletter with information about benchmarking, merit pay, how to challenge your salary, etc. BPC is not going to do anything about this, so we are just wasting time asking them to investigate.

R. Zanibbi: Over the last three years the ExComm has worked very actively to bring benchmarking into view. I don't think this is the time to stop that now. Will we finally get something done this year? I don't know. But I think it'd be a mistake with new information out and people finally being informed to take the charge off. That doesn't mean they have to make it their first priority. This is not order of priority, it's just the set.

C. Hull: There is a group of people at RIT who audit things, but when I was Senate chair, we were audited. Which is when I found out about the process. We were clean, they didn't find anything bad. My recollection is basically they get marching orders as to who to audit. So to charge #5, it strikes me that

they may have audited some of the things on that list already. It might be simply a case of saying 'have you audited this?' to see what the results are and if so, could we have the report? Secondly, maybe we want to consider asking to have their audit team aim specifically at things of interest to us. Because given what they were auditing when they came to audit us, I feel like whoever was in charge of the team was like, who shall we audit? Maybe we need to find something for them to audit?

H. Ghazle: I think you're talking about the IACA (Institute Audit, Compliance and Advisement). They report to and are charged by the Board of Trustees.

C. Hull: But we can request. It could be a really easy way of finding out a lot of what they need to do for this charge.

Motion: Approve six charges for the BPC

S. Johnson: Second.

Motion approved by acclamation

Next, we have charges for the FAC. These are in three blocks of five. Ten of them are carryover charges. They're working through continuing discussions about the clinical faculty ranks. I believe we approved all those policies you see up there on May 8th. I think we voted to approve changes in B.2, E.6, E.7 and E.10, E.20 for new clinical faculty. This is almost complete. All that's needed is for the Executive Committee to run a vote to approve having the clinical faculty added at the associate and full ranks added to voting faculty in B.2.

S. Aldersley: I was talking to somebody at NTID yesterday whose department is impacted by the clinical faculty innovation and they pointed out there's a number of people working there under different titles who are now going to be called clinical faculty. What is the process for changing their titles?

R. Zanibbi: That's a good question, but not something we can add to this charge.

B. Thomas: The provost spoke here last week about Charges #2 and #4. There is no need for this to continue because they'd just be wasting their time. The Provost has the final say, so why don't we just ask him what the next step is.

C. Hull: Having spoken to both Tang, the co-chair of the FAC, and to the Provost, I believe these charges should stay. I believe the Provost would be willing to engage in a dialogue with the committee. He's got issues with what they came forward with before, but I believe he is willing to help them come up with something that would address the underlying problem in a way that he would be willing to support.

R. Zanibbi: That was the reason I invited him back here to tell us what his objections were. It was to continue the conversation.

B. Lapizco-Encinas: Last week we all heard that full professors need to be evaluated on an annual basis and we need to have the granularity of five different ratings for measuring faculty performance. If the upper administration thinks that the evaluations are so very important, maybe they need to look at the calibration of the department heads doing them. Maybe they need to devote some resources into training and calibrating department heads, especially because sometimes we get very new department heads with no experience doing the evaluations. If that can be added to the charge, that would be fantastic.

R. Zanibbi: That particular charge has been very hard to execute. Again, I'd be hesitant.

B. Lapizco-Encinas: I know, but since they say faculty evaluations are so important, maybe they need to train the people doing them.

R. Zanibbi: Is anybody from FAC here?

H. Nickisher: There is presently some concern in committee about the Provost's veto of this because it seems as if it's taken this away from the vote of the faculty and put it in the hands of deans and chairs and there is some pushback within committee. That is on the table right now in terms of our discussion.

R. Zanibbi: It's already been very complicated. It took some negotiating to get the Provost to come and talk to us about this. I am very hesitant to change the tone. I did speak with Tang today and the reason it's titled longer evaluation cycles is that is the main priority and they would like to at least see motion on that before thinking about different evaluation ratings. But your point's very well taken and I do think training is important. The third charge here relates to summer deadlines and ideas about preventing policy-related actions happening outside the nine month contract. The fourth concerns non-tenure track faculty title change. This is another thing I've talked to the Provost about not letting die. #5 is the E.9 visiting scholar policy. There are multiple changes suggested here by the committee and the rationale includes streamlining and clarifying the approval process for visiting scholars.

Motion: to approve these five carryover charges for FAC.

I. Puchades: Second.

Motion approved by acclamation

R. Zanibbi: Still with FAC and carryover again: policies and dismissal for cause. This is just about making administrative pieces to remove inconsistencies between the two policies. Second, faculty employment policy. There's been some recent changes proposed related to scholarship expectations. This was discussed in fall of 2024. It went to the provost who met with the committee. They agreed on some changes and three weeks ago, it went to Legal Affairs. So this is still in play. Third, follow up on the implementation of the faculty activity system. This is with the task force. They are continuing to work on it and will communicate updates to Senate. The target live date is July 1st. They're staging this after Workday, which is supposed to come live on January 1st because that's our new ERP system and there's going to be some interaction. Fourth, this is new from the FAC report last year; Provide clarification and specification for a change in a chair's term or the conditions for the removal of a chair, including the definition of 'extraordinary circumstances'.
This refers to E.8, the College Academic Administrative Positions policy. And in addition to that, they want to clarify the definition of what 'formal consultation with faculty' entails. There have been several challenges that have to be addressed by updating that policy. Fifth, and again new from the report, assess best practices and proposed policy changes to support faculty appropriately in allocating time for scholarship, teaching and or service while maintaining a healthy work and life balance. The subcommittee related to this has already examined evidence to support the significance of making a university-wide work-life balance policy. Evidence indicates a disparity between how faculty and administrators view burnout prevention as a top priority.

Motion: to approve these five carryover and new charges for FAC.

S. Aldersley: Second.

B. Thomas: Re: carryover Charge #1, E.23.0 and E.23.1, I was going to bring these changes to Senate I

think in 2017 or 2018. Overnight I received an email from Ellen that they could not be brought to Senate. So they killed the presentation. The next day the Office of Legal Affairs approved the changes. If I remember correctly, Ellen had just arrived. She said she needed to have a meeting with the FAC before she could agree. I don't know what's not been done over the last seven that we want this committee to work on now. My understanding is that E 23.0 applies to TT faculty and E 23.1 to NTT faculty, so what is it that we want to align?

R. Zanibbi: The LRPEC looked at this last year and we ended up contacting FAC, I thought because of an administrative inconsistency. We weren't charged with changing anything substantive.

H. Nickisher: To answer your question Bolaji, it's not just what Richard said but it's also aligning the language because with the exception of the two different kinds of faculty and a couple of other exceptions in the policy, it just makes sense to have the language more consistent and parallel between the two and this is almost done.

Motion approved by acclamation

The last set of charges for FAC are from Qualtrics. First, Policy E.21, Assignment and Transfer of TT faculty requires consultation by and with all effective parties regarding issues such as the best interest of students, tenure, etc. prior to any action being taken. The term 'consultation' is mentioned five times without definition. Similarly, the policy mentions the term 'recommendation' on three occasions without specifying the form of the recommendation. Both of these terms need to be defined. The rationale is a large part of a recent grievance revolved around the meaning of consultation and recommendation, with each party applying their own significantly different interpretations of those terms. Second, currently there is a gap in academic policy about faculty assessment of associate deans who hold faculty rank. Related, standardize the implementation for upward evaluation of chairs, since currently this is implemented with great variability across the campus. An associate dean's responsibilities and accountabilities are not clear in current policy and some colleges do not implement upward evaluation of chairs currently. Third is a modified new charge and we're back to E.7, Annual Review of Faculty. Faculty are not permitted to include childbirth under their life circumstances and the impact statement in their self appraisal. The rationale for reconsidering this omission is that childbirth impacts are felt way beyond the leave offered by the university. Fourth, determine appropriate policy for AI use in the tenure and promotion process. The rationale is that faculty need guidance with regard to what is appropriate use of AI in their work and in their dossier. And candidates also have the right to expect that their submitted materials don't get submitted to chatGPT, which is harvested by companies that run these models. Fifth, explore whether college promotion policies should be reviewed and approved by faculty senate. The rationale is that senate must approve each college's tenure policies but university policy is silent on expectations for how promotion is handled by the colleges. This impacts faculty success and retention, particularly with regard to things like you can get tenure but not automatically be an associate professor. That's confusing. All right, motion three for three for FAC.

Motion: to approve these new charges for FAC.

M. Reisch: Second

C. Hull: I did not actually know about the grievance that you mentioned. I'm aware of a situation where the entire department wants to move to another college and is unable to do so because there is no policy that allows that. The other college would like to have them. The current dean doesn't want them to leave. All the faculty in the department want to move. If we can bring this to the attention of the committee and ask if they might be able to address this as well that would be nice. My other point is that we did look at having Senate approve college promotion policies some years back. It was a royal pain and I didn't feel

like anybody got a lot out of it at that time. So I'm going to vote against #5 and I'd like to propose a motion that we vote on the first four first.

I. Puchades: With regard to #3, is it true that childbirth cannot be included under life circumstances? Is there a list?

R. Zanibbi: It is true.

S. Aldersley: If you want to separate #1-4 and vote on #5 separately that's fine, but I very strongly believe that Senate needs to be able to approve college promotion policies. I don't know why we would approve college tenure policies but not promotion policies.

P. Padmanabhan: I want to clarify that childbirth and adoption are excluded. So it's explicitly excluded. It's not an omission.

L. Villasmil: I want to add to what Steve was saying about the college tenure policies. I was chair of the tenure committee two years ago and a member of the committee last year. The last time I read RIT policies, this body can review and provide feedback on the college policies but not approval. I just wanted to make that point.

Q. Song: I have a comment on #4. I think we should prevent the use of AI. There are people, even during the review process, they use chatGPT to look at the documentation and ideas get stolen. Particularly in some disciplines they have competing papers, so it depends on who goes faster. This is something we should be preventing.

R. Zanibbi: The first motion was not seconded. I suggest we let it die on the floor and move to Clyde's motion to vote on the first four charges.

H. Ghazle: Clyde's motion was to separate the five into four plus one. But the first motion was seconded.

J. Lanzafame: We need a second for Clyde's motion.

S. Johnson: Second.

Motion: To approve the first four FAC charges

Motion approved by acclamation

Motion: To approve the fifth FAC charge, to investigate whether college promotion policies should be approved by Senate

S. Aldersley: Second.

L. Villasmil: I want to reemphasize what I mentioned about the policy allowing us to review and provide feedback. I see it as a separate issue from actual approval.

I. Puchades: Our college is going through a revision of our promotion policy right now. It's a very complex task with a lot of moving parts and I think that if we bring each of those plans into Faculty Senate, we're going to be consumed with a lot of work reviewing some policies that we're not going to be familiar with in terms of paper rankings, journal rankings, conference group rankings, services. So I would leave it to the colleges.

C. Hull: Supplementing that, one of the main things that people said when we were discussing tenure policies amongst each other, people kept saying that the other colleges should evaluate research the way it was done in their own colleges. So Business would be telling Engineering how to do it and vice versa. Everybody seemed to want to standardize all of RIT's separate college tenure policies to the way that it is done in their own college. I share Ivan's concern that this could be a problem.

S. Aldersley: A very important and, I believe, often disregarded part of the current policy which leaves it in the hands of the colleges is that the college faculty are supposed to vote on any changes as in Ivan's case in the College of Engineering. I am very skeptical as to whether deans always follow through on the need to have the college faculty vote on whatever the administration's come up with. And that's why I think it's very important that we give the Senate a voice in this. I don't trust the deans to always do what they're supposed to do.

H. Nickisher: I am in favor of this. For one, it is about reviewing and approving, not necessarily standardizing because with my own college, very similar to perhaps what Ivan is saying, different kinds of things that artists and art historians have to go through for tenure and promotion or in this case promotion. But I think a key word for me is keeping the process 'consistent with university policy' and I have seen some of that not entirely on the college level being consistent.

P. Padmanabhan: There are other charges that keep coming up to RSC about interdisciplinary research and comments about journal ranking. Itt is a very challenging thing to resolve. There is a problem that certain faculty think all faculty should get input in but I think this is an important charge

H. Ghazle: Point of order. We have somebody who's been invited to come back and talk to us about C.00 and that's scheduled for 1:15. I really don't want to end the discussion, but just please remain cognizant of the time. I don't want to use orders of the day, but I could push for that.

J. Lanzafame: I would just like to remind the body that we are not voting on whether or not Senate should approve college promotion policies. We are voting on whether FAC should consider that. FAC can very well come back and recommend that that is not a good idea.

L. Villasmil: I don't know if it's allowed or we can table it. I'd like to rephrase the charge and make it more generic. The problem is not the process per se.The problem I have perceived is the colleges not following their own policies. So I would like to rephrase it a little bit so that they look at the whole process, not necessarily about approving.

R. Zanibbi: I will note to Joe's point that the charge does open with the word 'explore'. I don't want to spend a lot more time on this and so just informally, can we have a quick informal show of hands as to how many people would prefer to table this charge and how many people would prefer to vote on it now?

The show of hands favored proceeding with the vote.

Motion: To approve charge #5.

K. Barone: Second.

C. Hull: I move that, as a note to the committee, we exclude the specific standards of the colleges from what they're supposed to look at, like what journals are good or bad..

Motion approved: 33/4/2

R. Zanibbi: FSEC has some new charges plus carryovers that were taken on from committees that have now been removed from B2. Charge #1 is to follow up on reports that the administrative policy which allows for years of credit for prior teaching experience for lecturers to be applied at the time of hire has not been applied consistently. Charge #2 is to revise the faculty grievance policy. Originally there were three charges related to this and at the luncheon two weeks ago FAC agreed to have FSEC take this on because we have three members who are currently working on grievance and have noted a number of inconsistencies. The specific portions of the motion are to, first, explicitly designate NTT promotion decisions as non-grievable. Second, remove required training from the now defunct Center for Professional Development and third, recommend changes to both clarify the policy and bring it into better alignment with practice. Charge #3 a modified carryover charge from the ASSA to investigate and propose ways to give faculty greater agency in the administration of computer privileges. The rationale is to reduce faculty effort and time spent away from core job functions, and identify types of administrative access that should be available to faculty in all situations, and procedures for updating faculty computer access. Charge #4, also originally with the ASSA. There was a task force working to try and make it easier for students to change programs.The task now is to follow up and see if this has been paused and see what additional effort might be appropriate.
Charge #5, also a modified charge, confirm whether the restricted duration of Genio recordings provided for some students through the DSO has addressed faculty concerns or whether a longer discussion about alternative accommodations is needed. The DSO responded to this in our first official senate meeting this year, but we want to determine whether this is still an ongoing concern and address it if needed.
Charge #6 is a carryover charge from LRPC. There were 11 minor language-only edits to policies that were proposed and it's simply to take up these changes that have already been collected and pass them on.

Motion: To approve these six charges for the FSEC.

H. Nickisher: I have an objection to #2. While I do think certainly the FSEC is well intentioned about this. But being on FAC, I know how much time was spent in revising the policy before, but also the FAC reps are conduits with their colleges and back and forth and I think unfortunately, if you just have the FSEC working on it, some of that voice is lost. And that for me that is a little bit of erosion of the shared governance process so I would like to strike #2.

M. Reisch: Regarding Charge #5, I have a constituent who is thinking they'd rather opt out and so I was wondering what the threshold would be for triggering the discussion for having that looked at

R. Zanibbi: Now that the FSEC has heard from you, that will be one forwarded and discussed. Regarding Charge #2, FAC agreed to have the FSEC look at this. And this would be a revision that would go to FAC first before coming back to Senate. I think the issue here is that the subcommittee members are the ones who understand it and because of confidentiality they can only indicate what maybe isn't working through suggestions for policy revisions

S. Aldersley: Heidi and I have talked about this a little bit. We certainly don't want to get involved in the back and forth and the yes and no of the lecturer title changes. So absolutely, we will be interacting with the administration and the FAC before anything would come back to the Senate.

C. Hull: Can we modify the charge to say any proposed changes should be reviewed by FAC?

R. Zanibbi: Yes, I think we can. I will modify the charge language in the spreadsheet to require consultation with FAC before bringing it back to Senate.

C. Hull: Second.

Motion approved by acclamation

R. Zanibbi: Additional FSEC charges: #1, create a safety profile for campus. There are things on campus that are out of an ill repair and I've actually already reached out to Campus Safety about this; #2, act as a liaison with the standing committees of senate to support the task force on retention and graduation rates that Clyde is leading and to assist with reaching stakeholders for the collection and analysis of data, and presentation of results; #3, investigate with SG the possibility of bike share and using the bikes that get left around on campus in the spring; #4, investigate removal of faculty access to the RIT all listserv to avoid embarrassing reply-alls; #5, investigate the new requirements for course proposal forms due to the transition to the Courseleaf curriculum management system; #6, explore mechanisms such as questionnaires for faculty to provide information and feedback on offices around campus that provide services to faculty, to include HR, the registrar, the Service Center, Sponsored Research Service and SPA, the Graduate School and others. Provide this information to the President and Provost for their information. The idea would be to collect joint information and not just operate from hearsay about how things are going with these offices, and then share that with the administration.

Motion: To approve these further six charges for the FSEC

S. Johnson: Second

Motion approved by acclamation

R. Zanibbi: That leaves us with the ACC charge about contact hours versus credit hours that was tabled last week. Here is a revised charge, proposed by Bruce Herring, the chair of the committee, to replace the original one: **A difference in course credit and contact hours can lead to student workload confusion. Determine the severity of these impacts and recommend changes to address issues.**

I. Puchades: Is the ACC also going to be looking at accreditation requirements for credit hours versus contact hours? That's a discussion we're having in our college right now. I just want to make the point that there's a lot of moving parts.

J. Lanzafame: NYSED dictates what the contact hour per credit hour should be. The question that really came up is to what extent colleges are obeying the NYSED guidelines. There's really limited ability to adjust if you follow their guidelines for course credits, but there has been at least some anecdotal evidence that it does happen and it upsets students when it does.

Motion: To approve the revised charge for the ACC

D. Johnson: Second

Motion approved by acclamation

Standing Committee Charges Presentation

Agenda Item No. 8: Policy C00.0 (Code of Ethical Conduct and Compliance); E. Duthiers (1:33)

Good afternoon. I am the AVP for Compliance and Ethics and the deputy general counsel. I am here to talk about C.00, which is the code of ethical conduct and compliance. My associate, Christine Smith, was here in May to first report on proposed changes to this policy. And much to our surprise, there was a lot of discussion. I recently met with the FSEC to try and understand what some of the concerns were, and as we were talking it seemed there was a little bit of confusion about the application and scope of the policy, and how it interacts with other policies in the policy library. So today I would like to give some background about the policy, why we have a code of ethical conduct and compliance, and try and address some of the sticking points that you might have.

Our code of ethics and compliance is a forward facing document that tells the rest of the community, both our internal and external stakeholders that when you're doing business with the university or on behalf of the university, that we have certain standards and expectations. It signals to our stakeholders that we want to do the right thing and that we expect when you're doing business for and on behalf of the university, you are going to do the right thing and it highlights some of the more important standards that the university expects from its community. And lastly, there are some legal obligations that we have and so the code complements some of our compliance programs and our legal requirements.

The code is a framework document. Nothing that you see in it should be a surprise because if you go through each of the standards, you'll see they embody some of the other policies that we already have on campus. For example, I laid out some of the ones that might be most significant to this body. When you see Standard A which says respect for others, there's an expectation that you will treat others with respect when you're doing business for or with RIT. We didn't pluck those standards out of the air. Respect for others is embodied in many of our other policies. For example, in our honor code or in our principles of academic freedom, in policy C.6, which is the policy prohibiting discrimination and harassment and retaliation. Title IX policy also has that.

When you go through each of the standards, you'll see that these various points are already included in policy. So I like to say that the code does not really create any new duties, obligations, or rights that you might have as a member of this community. The last two standards L and M form what is known as RIT's whistleblower policy or whistleblower protection. The whistleblower protection allows you to report any kind of misconduct free from retaliation. Thinking about it from an ethical standpoint, when you see something, we want you to say something. If we don't know about it, we can't address what the concerns are and we want to continue to maintain a safe campus environment, a respectful campus environment, one where people can thrive both professionally and students can do well academically. In order for the whistleblower protection to apply, standard M talks about which specific offices you have to report to when there's something wrong. We want to encourage the general community to report, but if you are a manager, a supervisor, an officer, or any other position of leadership, you are required by law to report. The reason is because if you are in a position of leadership and you hear of wrongdoing or misconduct on campus, the knowledge you have is imputed to the entire university. For example, if a student goes to a dean and reports some sort of misconduct and the dean never reports it to one of the offices, we can't claim that we didn't know about it. Or if it's an employee who reports something, this is someone who can affect your pay, your promotion, your tenure, which classes you teach, the research you do. So you're required to tell us so that we can look into it and make a determination as to whether there is a policy violation. That's standard L. Standard M talks about retaliation. We take retaliation very, very seriously. It means that if you tell us something's wrong, we don't expect you to suffer any adverse action as a result of telling. For example, if you participate in an investigation, if you participate in an audit, if you participate in any kind of legal process or inquiry or you report something, so long as you're reporting it in good faith, you should not suffer any kind of adverse consequence as a result. So I would say that to the extent that sections L and M are not already included in other policies, we want to be sure that they are included in the code. Otherwise, the changes we made are just for flow and clarity and because the language was not following changes in practice since the last time the policy was reviewed 5 years ago.

I know that there were some questions and concerns about specific policies and the processes related to them but I would submit those are tangential to what is before the Senate today, because even if there are

concerns about those policies, they are not going to change the language of this policy. However, I'm certainly happy to answer questions because I think to the extent that I have your ear and we have some time, I want to be able to allay some of the fears and the concerns about things that my office may oversee or that I have direct responsibility for. There were questions about who is authorized to make decisions about corrective action, should there be an investigation, etc. There are so many offices involved and it really is case dependent. Sometimes it's dependent on which division you report through. So for you, it's Academic Affairs, but the policy applies to everybody on campus. In a framework policy, we cannot articulate each and every person or office that might be involved in making a decision because it's not a disciplinary policy. If you were to violate one of the standards, you would likely be charged under one of the more specific policies. The only new expectations are in standards L and M, right. So you retaliate and there's no retaliation clause in the policy that you're charged with violating, then we would use this policy because it broadens your anti-retaliation rights.

B. Thomas: I was one of those who requested that we not approve these changes when your colleague was here. Someone replied to an email to me which included a chain of emails from upper administration, which indicated that if this policy was in place, faculty could have been fired on the basis of this policy. The conversation between upper administration on the basis of this policy was wrong because literally every one of them did not know who that senior faculty member was. Someone approached me and said, what do you think about this, this information is wrong. If you consider that information that is circulating among upper administration with the faculty in the bottom who doesn't know about it, you're making a decision that will affect someone's livelihood, someone's career and someone's future. That was why I said I would vote against it. I know it's just one vote and that you can still do whatever you want to do. Second, faculty have been charged for violating some policies, and when they were investigated, HR discovered the charge was mistaken, and instead of dismissing it, decided to upgrade it to a different policy unrelated to the initial charge. I wouldn't be a part of giving the administration the power to charge somebody on one policy, only for them to discover that the charge was wrong, and upgrade it.That's why I voted against what you are introducing here and why I'm still going to vote against it.

E. Duthiers: Professor, I don't know the specific case you're talking about. When situations arise, they're so fact specific. I don't know why that would impact what this policy is intended to do, which is really to give you a clear understanding of the roadmap or the framework that the university approaches things such as other disciplinary policies. But I'm happy to come talk to you more specifically about what you might've experienced and see if there is a resolution. I don't like that you walked away from the process feeling that you weren't heard or that there was some impropriety in that.

S. Aldersley: I'm also going to vote no on this. I feel very strongly about it. When your colleague came the first time she said many times this is a high level policy and you've used that term too. I get that. However, you've added two new sections, L and M.

E. Duthiers: They're not new.They've been there.

S. Aldersley: I thought you said they were new. In any case, I'd like to ask that you be willing to add another new section, we can call it, Section N, designed to ensure protection for employees including faculty because there's an assumption in this policy that Administration always follows it. Referring to what Larry was talking about earlier, you have a policy, you're supposed to follow it. I would like standard N to include the requirement or principle of transparency. I would like faculty and staff to have the option to appeal decisions and punishments that come down from HR or wherever they come from. And as with the grievance policy, I would like N to include also the possibility of having a representative work with the person who is being charged. Because when somebody gets charged, they're on their own. Administration does this all the time. You know exactly what you're doing. The individual faculty who's being charged for something that may or may not be valid is at a loss. They have no one to turn to. And

so if this is a high level policy, you need to put in protections for RIT's employees and not just do it from the administration's point of view.

S. Johnson: We've been going round and round with this for a while and this has come back to Senate a few times and I just want to call the question at this point so that we can vote on this.

Motion: To take a vote on the proposed changes to C.00

Motion failed: 8/20/8

J. Lanzafame: This policy already exists so we're not really voting to institute a policy. I also have concerns about how the policy could be used, but I would suggest this version is preferable to the old version. Maybe should just either be done with it or table it and maybe create a task force to look at a new version of the policy that might address some of the concerns because again, their cleanup of the existing policy isn't changing the implementation of it and we can vote 'no' or table it and it still exists as it is in its uglier form and will still be used the way it's currently being used.

C. Hull: I appreciate Joe's point. I'm wondering if that counts as volunteering on the part of FSEC to create such a group. Historically when this came to us the very first time, it was explicitly not a policy that had anything like section L or M. They were understood at the time to be things where if we need a policy that says 'no retaliation', we will make that policy. So Senate can take policy M and N and put them in a separate policy.

E. Duthiers: It was in the older version, the strikeouts that you see now are just moving paragraphs to a different location. It actually included it in the 2009 version. The reason we have a whistleblower policy is it's required by law for any not-for-profit agency, like a university. There are other policies that have anti-retaliation within them. So for example in C.6, you have anti-retaliation. All this does is broaden the right, meaning that if you are charged under a policy or somebody makes a complaint about you in a policy that doesn't already include an anti-retaliation provision, you can rely on the anti-retaliation provision in C.00 because it's broader than the rights that you might have in a more specific policy. For example, if you get charged with misconduct under C.6.0, the policy for harassment and discrimination, it has to be within that context. In addition, HR already has a policy that applies to everybody that is an anti-retaliation policy. The reason it's in here is just because it's very clear in order for the whistleblower protections that you have, we have to tell you where to report.

R. Zanibbi: Erica, thank you. I think we'll invite you back as soon as possible.

[Policy C00.0 Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 9: New Business; R. Zanibbi (N/A)

There was no new business

Agenda Item No. 10: Adjournment; R. Zanibbi (1:52)

Attendance 10/2/2025

Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended	Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended
Adrion, Amy	Alternate CAD Senator		Liao, Wenjie	Alternate CLA Senator	
Aldersley, Stephen	Communications Officer/ SOIS Senator	X	McCalley, Carmody	Alternate COS Senator	X
Alm, Cecilia	CLA Senator	X	McLaren, Amy	CAD Senator	X
Anselm, Martin	CET Senator		Newman, Christian	GCCIS Senator	X
Arena, Jason	Alternate CAD Senator		Nickisher, Heidi	CAD Senator	X
Barone, Keri	Vice Chair/CLA Senator	X	Officer, Cindy	Alternate NTID Senator	
Boedo, Stephen	Alternate KGCOE Senator		Olles, Deana	COS Senator	X
Brady, Kathleen	NTID Senator	X	Olson, Rob	Alternate GCCIS Senator	
Brown, Jeremy	GCCIS Senator		O'Neil, Jennifer	Alternate CET Senator	
Brown, Tamaira	Senate Coordinator	X	Osgood, Robert	Alternate CHST Senator	X
Butler, Janine	NTID Senator	X	Overby, Katrina	Alternate CLA Senator	
Butler, Joshua	Alternate NTID Senator		Padmanabhan, Poornima	KGCOE Senator	X
Chiavaroli, Julius	GIS Senator	X	Perry, Andrew	Alternate SOIS Senator	
Chung, Sorim	SCB Senator	X	Puchades, Ivan	KGCOE Senator	X
Cody, Jeremy	COS Senator	X	Ray, Amit	CLA Senator	X
Coppenbarger, Matthew	COS Senator	X	Reinicke, Bryan	Alternate SCB Senator	
Crawford, Denton	CAD Senator	Excused	Reisch, Mark	CAD Senator	X
Cromer, Michael	Alternate COS Senator		Rich, Lexi	Alternate CET Senator	
Cui, Feng	Alternate COS Senator		Ross, Annemarie	NTID Senator	X
David, Prabu	Provost	Excused	Sanders, Cynthia	NTID Senator	X
Davis, Stacey	NTID Senator	X	Shaaban, Muhammad	Alternate tKGCOE Senator	
De Wit Paul, Alissa	Alternate GIS Senator		Song, Qian	SCB Senator	X
DiRisio, Keli	CAD Senator		Staff Council Rep	Joanna Prescott	X
Eirikur Hull, Clyde	SCB Senator	X	Student Government Rep	Igor Polotai	X
Ghazle, Hamad	Operations Officer/CHST Senator	X	Sweeney, Kevin	Alternate SCB Senator	
Ghoneim, Hany	Alternate KGCOE Senator		Thomas, Bolaji	CHST Senator	X

Hardin, Jessica	CLA Senator	X	Tsouri, Gill	KGCOE Senator	X
Hartpence, Bruce	Alternate GCCIS Senator		Villasmil, Larry	CET Senator	X
Jadamba, Basca	COS Senator	X	Warp, Melissa	Alternate CAD Senator	
Johnson, Dan	CET Senator	X	Weeden, Elissa	GCCIS Senator	X
Johnson, Scott	GCCIS Senator	X	White, Phil	Alternate GCCIS Senator	X
Kavin, Denise	Alternate NTID Senator		Wiandt, Tamas	Alternate COS Senator	X
Krutz, Daniel	Alternate GCCIS Senator		Worrell, Tracy	Alternate CLA Senator	X
Kuhl, Michael	KGCOE Senator	X	Zanibbi, Richard	Chair/GCCIS Senator	X
Kwasinski, Andres	Alternate KGCOE Senator		Zlochower, Yosef	COS Senator	
Lanzafame, Joseph	Treasurer/COS Senator	X			
Lapizco-Encinas, Blanca	KGCOE Senator	X			
Laver, Michael	CLA Senator	X			

Interpreters: Nicole Crouse-Dickerson and Sonya Chavis

Student Assistant: Ella Kolodziej

Presenters: Erika Duthiers