

## Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, November 6, 2025

12:15 - 1:50 PM

Slaughter Hall 2220-2240

Attendance: See Below

Agenda Item No. 1: Call to Order; R. Zanibbi (12:17)

Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; R. Zanibbi (12:17)

**Agenda approved by acclamation**

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

**Minutes of 10/23 approved by acclamation**

S. Aldersley: With regard to college visits by members of the FSEC, yesterday we were at College of Business. There was a good discussion which ended up being some 30 minutes longer than we had been scheduled for. It was a good illustration of why these college meetings are so useful. We learned a lot and hopefully the faculty in the audience did too. A couple of weeks ago we had a similar experience at the College of Science meeting. This afternoon we'll be at the College of Art and Design.

R. Zanibbi: The topic that went so long yesterday was a discussion of how faculty scholarship should be evaluated and who owns the criteria for that evaluation.

[October 23, 2025 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes](#)

Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; R. Zanibbi (12:19)

R. Zanibbi: I'm continuing to put links to all of the main resources that pertain to Senate business, including the spreadsheet that summarizes the current state of policies, all the charges, links to minutes, links to previous minutes and so on. So if you find at any point you're wanting to find information, please use those links.

K. Barone: Just a reminder that if you or your constituents have any questions, comments or concerns regarding DSO and DAS, the Department of Access services, please bring them to the zoom meeting at 11 o'clock tomorrow. Please send questions in advance. The session will be recorded if you cannot attend or you can tell your constituents if they cannot attend. We're going to be talking about Genio, flex plans, note-taking, etc. A lot of the questions that have been coming in are about access services, captioning and interpreting support. Those do not fall under the umbrella of DSO, but we've invited Brittany Taylor, the Director of the Department of Access Services, and hopefully there will be some distinctions drawn between the DSO and DAS. I think it'll be a really helpful session. Again, please encourage everybody to

send in their questions

S. Aldersley: I was at a meeting of the NTID Faculty Congress a couple of days ago. The faculty at NTID have been wrestling with a communication strategic plan for two or three years and one of the questions that came out of the audience was what is the role going forward of the Access Services department? So if you're interested in that, not only NTID but also if you have deaf and hard of hearing students in your classes, you might want to attend the meeting that Keri just announced. It's somewhat in flux and I think the more faculty voice their interest in the issue, the better it will be for the university.

H. Ghazle: What's the difference between DSO and DAS?

J. Butler: DAS, the Department of Access Services, is just for note-taking, interpreting and captioning.

K. Barone: They operate in a completely separate universe. Part of the problem faculty are experiencing is that while theirs is a separate operation, the attestation that we sign at the beginning of the semester includes interpreting services along with all the other accommodations on the same document. And where we used to have NTID students notated on the course roster, we no longer have that. So if we as faculty have any trouble with interpreting services or captionists, we have nowhere to go to try to identify which students are supposed to be being supported and who isn't being supported who should be. Since we can't see that information, we have a difficult time trying to figure out who to contact for those issues than we do with DSO. So that's why we've invited DAS to come to this meeting tomorrow so they can hopefully distinguish the two offices and who's responsible for what.

R. Zanibbi: Just a reminder about the Senate retreat on December 11th from 12 to four. There'll be a Qualtrics survey coming out regarding attendance and food. The plan is to have lunch, and then a work meeting and discussion of Senate work. So please put that in your calendar.

Otherwise, we've had some questions about voting eligibility and eligibility for membership on senate committees and I just want to point people to B.2 where it talks specifically about who's eligible to vote and, by extension, serve on committees because if you serve on a committee, you vote for the decisions of the committee which by extension may impact decisions in Senate. What B2 says is that the voting members of the faculty at university, college and department level are tenure track, both tenured and pre-tenure, and senior and principal lecturers. And then there's some additional distinctions. There've been some concerns this year with people getting appointed to committees that don't fit that definition. We've decided to respect their election anyway, but the operations officer and Tamaira are working to try and make sure that we avoid this in the future.

H. Ghazle: Tamaira and I will be meeting with the college reps early in December at a luncheon where we can talk to them about trying to figure out how we can help them run their elections and do what they need to do to get their college reps.

R. Zanibbi: There is a link to policy updates on the policy board. Policy B2 has now been officially updated after President Sanders approved the committee renaming amendments. There is going to be another Qualtrics vote coming because there are a couple more changes to B2 that were approved by Senate last year but still have to be approved by the university faculty. These relate to adding clinical faculty to the voting ranks and adding two more students to the Academic Affairs Committee as voting members. There are some others we're considering but we're trying to just get caught up with old business at the moment.

The task force on principles of academic freedom met last week and those present voted unanimously to approve the senate recommendation we voted on which was to use the Chicago statement without introducing additional language about compliance with laws, and to remove mention of the Board of

Trustees when talking about who owns curriculum. Legal affairs had recommended adding a statement to the preamble to the statement about freedom of expression being effectively subject to federal law. And that is of course already true. There was concern that such an addition would alter the tone of the policy especially as other policies don't include such a clause. The committee reviewed this, discussed the situation and decided they agreed with last year's Senate vote. They're going to meet with Bobby Colon and possibly with the president.

Finally, policy C.00. As you know, Erika Duthiers' office has been here twice to talk about the changes they'd like to make to C00. I will be getting that email out today or tomorrow morning to start collecting comments from people in advance of her next visit. The goal here is to try and identify things that speak directly to the proposed changes and separate that from other concerns. Hopefully if the changes themselves are not objectionable, we can see them through.

B. Thomas: I'd like to comment on the email that came today from the Provost's office and perhaps he would be willing to speak to it. It confused me and it would be nice to know more so we can pass that on to our constituents in case we get questions. Should I hold it until New Business?

#### Agenda Item No. 5: Staff Council Update; Amanda Hughes (12:30)

The only update I have to share is at our last meeting we received an update on the staff career architecture project. The project has been in the works for the past two years and essentially what has happened as a result is that over 1300 individual JDQs (job descriptions) covering all staff positions on campus have been condensed into 500 what are being called "job profiles". There are a lot of very unique roles on campus and the goal of this project is to create some consistency among roles and titles. Come January, staff are going to have new job profiles instead of their current job titles. Current staff are being grandfathered in so they can use their job titles, but if they were to move to a different position or if somebody new were to be hired, they would now assume the job profile as their job title. Supervisors will be getting a lot more information in the coming months and we'll probably have more to share come mid-December.

C. Hull: One of the things that I think is important about this project is that we have a stronger way to promote from within. So that when there's a higher level opening for staff, we don't have to bring in outside people because people internally will have had an opportunity to develop new skills and qualifications before such openings occur.

A. Hughes: That is one of the goals of this project. Supposedly, there's going to be more visibility across different ladders so you can see how you can move across different departments in a similar role to the one you're in if you are looking for some career growth. The job profiles are going to be accessible I assume on the HR website, so you'll be able to view all the different job profiles. There'll also be suggestions on jobs that are related to your job profile. So if you're looking to grow in your career at RIT, you can look outside your own department for positions that might have similar skill sets.

S. Aldersley: The word you used was that Staff Council "received" this information. I'm curious as to how it was received, and what the Council's reaction was to that reception.

A. Hughes: Staff Council has been very actively engaged in this process and Siegel, the consultation firm, has been actively seeking staff advice throughout the process. So we feel like we've been informed very well over the past couple years. I think overall it is meeting the expectation that we thought it would.

*No report from Student Government*

Agenda Item No. 6: Strategic Framework Update; E. Cardinal and F. Sklarsky (12:35)

E. Cardinal: I'm going to give a very abridged version of the slides that you saw. We have structured this so it's typically an hour, but I know you have a full schedule and we only have a short time with you so I'm going to do my best to get through everything. I will also invite you to come to one of the faculty/staff town halls if you need more time to discuss with us.

I'll begin by recapping our planning process to date, then I'll review the draft framework and talk about next steps and, hopefully, there will be enough time for discussion. You can use the QR code or the link right here if you want to provide feedback or ask questions.

We started this process with information gathering back in April/May of 2024. I've been to Senate twice, so this is my third time. We began to shape the pillars and goals in March and you can see here where we are with the feedback process.. For the rest of November we're trying to give a very quick but thorough feedback opportunity to the campus community so we can get the final product written and to the campus community for endorsement and then endorsement by the Trustees at their February meeting.

So we will be coming back at the end of January or the beginning of February to share the final product. Then comes the work of implementation.

In the interest of getting to the content, I'm going to skip through a lot of the slides since you have them. One thing I do want to call your attention to is in the past we created very robust, very detailed strategic plans. This time we are shifting towards a strategic framework. This slide outlines the differences between the two. A framework is much more of a conceptual structure. It provides guidance and the boundaries for how we're going to be making decisions and how we're going to be prioritizing things going forward. It focuses on the principles, the goals and the structure. A plan, on the other hand, is a detailed roadmap with very detailed metrics, very detailed goal statements.

We're in a time of large transition and things are moving very fast. The framework is going to guide us through the next 10 years and enable us to be nimble. The orange on this slide is how our framework will be structured and the gray is the work of implementation.

You can see that we have a set of four pillars, with each pillar having a goal and each goal having a subset of four to five strategic actions, what we're calling organizational or enabling strategies. Under implementation, we have initiatives and tactics. Some of this is already ongoing as we are moving forward. We haven't stopped the work of the university, but as we dive into advancing the framework's goals, we will be working through a number of opportunities across the university.

Now the content part. There are four pillars each with a subset of organizational strategies. Our first pillar is Transformative Student Experiences and Success. This is really a focus on education, a part of what we do here. Our second pillar is World Changing Research. Third is Culture of Wellbeing and Belonging. That's really about the people, the people that make everything happen here and finally, Global Reach and Mindset with the organizational strategies being the enablers that are going to allow us to be able to achieve success.

I'm going to focus on these high level pillar slides.. The goal statement for Transformative Student Experiences and Success talks about how we're going to enable our students to thrive in a rapidly changing world that seems to be faster and faster every day so that we create future-ready individuals thinking about careers that aren't yet known. This is broken into five elements, and again you'll find the strategic actions on the more detailed slides. #1, Enhancing our signature learning approach. This speaks to the unique elements that we bring together with technology, art and design. Also thinking about what is foundational to the core of an RIT education. We don't have a pillar about AI as AI is really becoming

something that is connecting to everything. And so it is in many of the strategic actions across all of the pillars and in fact you'll see at the end of the enhancing our signature learning approach that it says in an AI-enabled world, recognizing that our students need to understand, interact and be able to leverage AI. #2, Creating and expanding academic programs with industry and community insight. This is an acknowledgement of who we have been and who we will continue to be as a university. One that has very practical applied programs that have really grown in collaboration with industry and community, while also recognizing that the marketplace and the demand is changing. This speaks to not only undergrad and graduate degrees, but what other educational offerings we may be exploring, whether they be modular, or whether they be credential based, et cetera. #3, Increasing flexibility in academic programs. I think this is something I heard across the board in all my listening sessions, needing to find opportunities for more flexibility within existing programs and how can we collaborate better across units. This speaks to the desire to have really strong interdisciplinary programs. #4, We also heard in our listening sessions about the importance of co-op, but also recognizing that not every program requires co-op, but experiential learning is essential to our students' success. So this is really an emphasis on growing those opportunities for experiential learning, leaning into co-op where it makes sense. Also building on more research opportunities. Also recognizing that some of our students in some of their clubs, if for example they're a project manager on the snowmobile team for example, they're getting really strong applied skills that they can walk into the workforce with. #5, Ensuring student success and growth, ensuring that we're creating a space where they can be successful in their academic endeavors here and building that platform for them going forward.

The second pillar is World Changing Research. You see research in the title, but as you read the goal statement, it also talks about scholarship and creative endeavors as well. The last part of that statement is the betterment of society. What are we doing to advance society and improve the world? You see that tied in and called back within all of these pillars. So again, five actions here. #1, Advance creative and technological frontiers. We've always prided ourselves on being at the forefront of many disciplines and we want to continue that. How do we leverage new fields that are coming out? How do we create new fields with technology that is emerging and how do we create the space to enable our faculty members to do that? Attracting and retaining very talented faculty members and recruiting talented faculty members of course is essential to our work. #2, In order to enable faculty to really succeed and advance their research, we also know we need to strengthen the research ecosystem. We need to create and build the support infrastructure to enable our faculty members to do the research. #3, Cultivating the next generation of scholars. This speaks to students at all levels from undergrad to PhD, as far as creating those spaces and building research scholars in all our students. This is where you would see the growth in PhD programs as well. But also recognizing that undergraduate research is still important. #4, Amplifying research impact. I think this is a big opportunity for us as we think about growing IP opportunities, and growing new entrepreneurial activities based on faculty scholarship, just amplifying the great work that's being done, whether that's through broader communication channels or really getting more exposure for the work that all of you are doing.

Pillar Three: Culture of wellbeing and belonging. This is really foundational to the success of the university. This is about our people, faculty, staff, and students. Enhancing our connected and inclusive campus culture speaks to our community as a whole, the culture and really leaning into that culture that so many of us are proud of. Empowering all community members to thrive and grow. This is really about the ability to support all of our campus community as individuals, faculty, staff, students, alums, et cetera. You do see our alums called out here in strengthening lifelong connections to RIT, our alums and friends. Accelerating progress toward a sustainable future. If you look at the world health organization's definition of wellbeing, planetary health is essential to human health and that's why that falls into global reach and mindset. As everyone knows we have international campuses, but this goal is so much more than those international campuses. It's leveraging those opportunities but it's recognizing that we live in a global space and we need to ensure that our students are getting a globally informed education and creating opportunities for them to engage globally wherever possible. Enhancing and expanding the ability for us to connect our research opportunities globally across our campuses. But beyond that,

leveraging partnerships that we have globally and creating new opportunities. Enhancing the student experience through global experiences. The one thing I'd like you to notice is that we say global and not international. That's because global includes beyond the boundaries of RIT. There are a lot of opportunities within the US as well that expand beyond the boundaries of Rochester. And then deepening community connections. We heard a lot about the desire to be a strong community partner within the communities that our campuses operate in and that's what this space is created for.

And now our organizational strategies or enablers. What we need to do to enable success in all of those goals that I just spoke about. And I always look to Frank because I know these are his favorites and really close to his heart.

F. Sklarsky (trustee): This is something new for the strategic framework. We really haven't included these organizational strategy items in the past. We thought it was important because while we're not running a business, we're running an organization, you are all running an organization which is undergoing substantial change and the pace of that change is accelerating. The famous quote by Jack Welsh, "if the pace of change on the outside is greater than the pace of change on the inside, the end is near." RIT has always been an organization that has anticipated change and been very proactive as opposed to reactive. We want to make sure we continue to do that and to do so we have to make sure we allocate our resources in a very careful manner. While our endowment has done well, it's still relatively small for a university of our size. In recent years we have allocated our resources heavily in physical plant. I think there's a recognition by Bill and his team, as well as by the Board of Trustees that going forward what's going to enhance our reputation, cause us to be preeminent as a university and improve our rankings is academic excellence and that's driven by excellence in faculty. And so moving forward what we're going to do is place a stronger emphasis on the people side of things, which means faculty, both on the research side and on the teaching side. We want to mention that, particularly to this audience, because we understand how important it is to our future success. So allocating our resources might undergo a bit of a shift going forward, to make sure we're putting them in the right places.

The other thing we want to make sure of, and this gets to the previous comment I made, is this concept of velocity. Agility, being able to adapt to changes in the environment, is great, but we have to do that with all due urgency and speed because things are changing so fast. Our peers are having these same conversations with their faculty senates and staff councils. It's a rapidly changing world, it's a rapidly changing university and academic environment and we've got to make sure that we stay ahead of the game as we traditionally have.

E. Cardinal: We're headed to Staff Council next, right after this presentation and then tomorrow, Student Government. We also have town halls coming up for faculty and staff. So I would encourage you to attend if you're interested and encourage your constituents to do so. There are links on the website and on the events page where you can register. We're asking for registration because space is limited. One of the meetings is in here, and the other is in the SDC. So we have limited seating.

I. Puchades: I'm looking at the biggest infrastructure projects recently at RIT. We had the Shed, which I think fits really nicely in the strategic plan and we had a very good idea of how that was going to play out. I think the research building fits real well. But then we had the performing arts center and although you can see how it could fit in a lot of these pillars, I would like to have seen more of a discussion as to how it can contribute to the betterment of RIT.

B. Sanders: I don't think it is the goal of the strategic framework to answer those kinds of questions. The framework is to talk about where we want to go in the future and I think you heard Frank say we did build what I think is an incredibly beautiful and functional campus and maybe the high level thing I can say is we believe the next phase is about how do we build on that infrastructure to achieve these kinds of goals. So you asked a very specific question and its answer would be in some initiative we might create within the first pillar that looks how those kinds of things can enhance the student experience. I'm not

trying to avoid your question but I don't think that's an answer that should be owned by the strategic planning committee or the president's cabinet or the deans or something like that. I think that's an example of a question that we need to think about together and through the creation of initiatives, try to make the value that has been postulated come true. When you go down one level, you'll see in each strategic action there's a statement which tries to describe what we're trying to achieve by that action and that action is still going to be more strategic and less tactical than things you saw in past plans. In the past plan there was an action that said build the Shed. In this case we're talking about a more strategic, longer term outcome. What we believe, because we have to be more nimble, is that we will create initiatives, not all at once at the beginning, but as we go along, to try to achieve those things. But to come back to your question, that's clearly an important point. I'm a newcomer here, but I see a lot of value in not pigeonholing students just by their vocations. We let them be more of a whole person and performing arts is one example of that. The sustainability scholars is another example. If you want my personal opinion, we need to foster all of those things, not just one thing and create a value proposition for students where they can have both a vocation, their main degree, their livelihood and an application. I think what we need to do is come together and figure those things out.

F. Sklarsky: Having been part of that decision process a couple of years ago, the only thing I would add is the fact that RIT, UR, Nazareth, St. John Fisher, the educational institutions in this town are becoming a larger and larger proportion of the economic and cultural ecosystem of the Rochester area and the region and the thought process was not only to enhance the performing arts on behalf of the students but as part of a linchpin in this region. That facility can become not only something that can be used by RIT internally but also as a center for the larger community.

C. Hull: I found a lot of things in your presentation I liked, but I'm going to focus on things I didn't like as much. In Pillar One about the student experience, I did not notice any mention of faculty. I'd like to think that faculty are an important part of the student's experience and that there should be something reflecting that in that pillar. With regard to Pillar Two and strategies for retaining faculty on the research side, when I got here everybody talked about teaching. I was actually instructed by a senior person to not talk about research in public 'because we don't do that here'. It feels almost like we've swung so far in the other direction that maybe we should be talking about faculty and teaching a little bit more. But wherever you want to put it, I think that should be 'develop, attract and retain faculty' because there's a feeling on the part of a lot of the faculty that we're trying to get rid of the people we have now in order to replace them with better faculty and I don't think the current faculty like that plan. I certainly don't. Pillar Three "lifelong" I think should include not just alumni but also emeritus faculty. If you look at what Columbia University does with their emeritus faculty, like wow, compared to what we do with our emeritus faculty, there's a lot of opportunity. There's a lot of people who engage with RIT their entire careers. They retire and all we say is "if you want to come on campus, that's fine as long as you buy a parking permit and then you can do whatever seems good to you, you weirdo." That is not the way we should be treating the people who spent 40 years at our institution. Finally you have all these really excellent pillars. I like them. But as regards the foundation that they should be resting on, I hear the words spoken out loud, but I do not see them written into the document. The foundation is the people who work at RIT, the faculty and the staff. I feel like overall there should be more about them. For example, actually getting paid market rate. If you're paying people a lot less than market average, telling them they're actually making more than people who work for a community college in North Dakota, is not going to persuade them they're actually making market rate. We should maybe look into ways to pay people actual market rate, both faculty and staff. Generally speaking, there are a lot of good HR practices that could be developed more. That could be a strategic plan. I'd like to see it in there somewhere. I don't see it now. I did hear it. It's very nice to hear it but I know how it is. You have a written plan, this is what we're going to do and then while we're presenting it to people, we say some stuff, it sounds good to those people but it doesn't necessarily actually happen. Having been here for over 20 years I've seen a lot of these presentations. Sometimes, almost all the time, the nice things that we hear that go along with the written stuff never

happens. So if it's written in, I think we'd appreciate it.

F. Sklarsky: We wholeheartedly agree on the faculty side of things. In fact, a few weeks ago, a subset of the trustees met and the major conclusion was exactly what you were talking about in terms of faculty excellence being one of the leading enablers for student success, our reputation and our rankings. So points well taken.

B. Sanders: All I'll say is all good points. We'll have to figure out things about each of them specifically. But please can somebody get all of that down?

S. Aldersley: It'll be in the minutes.

R. Zanibbi: Clyde, you can email that to myself or Bill directly if you want to do that.

L. Villasmil: Things are changing so rapidly. I never understood from all the emails that you have bombarded us with that this is a 'framework'. So I like the fact that it's an overview of where we are going.

B. Sanders: That change occurred in the last five or six months. It was called a plan and then we saw the light.

L. Villasmil: Clyde made a long list. I have here the list I created for the strategic plan at the end of President Munson's time. All of us collected feedback from our constituents and I think we are going to get more feedback if we do it through us. Most importantly, I worked in industry for 12 years and under the ISO 9,000 international standard organization you have to have processes, you have to have a mission, you have to have a vision. And we committed to the company in a way that I have never seen before because we were part of it. So all of us contributed. Clyde mentioned 'faculty'. If you put the word faculty in there, Clyde will say 'they listened to me, they listened to us.' That feeling of being part of it is transformative. We are here for the students, but students come and the students go. The essence is the staff and the faculty.

B. Sanders: As you heard, there'll be two more completely open sessions for faculty and staff in addition to going to the three governance groups. But you said something that I'd like. You said that maybe you will get more feedback by speaking with your departments, with your faculty. Feel free to pass on the link for providing feedback to them and encourage them to provide feedback. Of course we're going to get feedback that tells us to do different things, but we want to get as much feedback as we can.

L. Villasmil: I just want to say it may take a little longer but the advantage is I know my people and I push them to participate. I don't want to brag about it, but I got 50% of my faculty to provide feedback on the plan and I can filter it and give it to you in a way that is much easier rather than getting a hundred separate pieces.

B. Sanders: We'll be able to take feedback for the next month or so, so you have time.

B. Thomas: Being from one of the smallest and newest colleges on campus, I'm glad to see a strategy framework that has to do with university research. I raised an issue during the last presidential search during the first meeting we had with him. It has to do with diversifying leadership from the colleges. We have a leadership system in place that I do not think is meeting the standard RIT is looking for. For instance, if I set up a search committee, who are the people on the search committee? How good are they at reviewing the CVs that people submit? That affects the quality of faculty we are bringing in. It affects the quality of the research from the college, and it affects the quality of enrollment. I also came here



when teaching was emphasized, but I knew I had to do research. I knew that without research you can't get tenured, you can't get promoted.

We need to have quality leadership from the dean's office to the heads of departments, people who know what they're doing. So we are not trying to support the entrenched structure but rather to break those structures down so that we can diversify what happens in the college and in the department.

Second, on the research side, we have buildings going up. There are problems with interdisciplinary research between the colleges. When the PI is from one college, and the co-PI from another, we're always struggling with the dean's office as to how much of indirect goes back to each college. For example, the dean of the co-PI's college may say they are due 50%, but what if the faculty member from that college is doing just 20% of the work in the grant? There needs to be a structure in place that determines how much indirect goes to the co-PI's college.

Third regarding the quality of faculty, Clyde mentioned paying people enough money but let's not forget startup funds. We have faculty coming from Ivy League schools and we're offering them peanuts as startup funds. I came from the University of Pennsylvania in 2008 and they were offering a million dollars in start-up funding when I left there. If by your third year you don't have an RI that got a good score, you are out. And we don't have to tenure people who by their third or fourth year, we don't think they'll make tenure here. There's no need for us to keep them here, if they are not doing what we hired them to do. Let's have an open door policy so that we can use startup funds to hire top quality faculty.

The university needs to up its game with what we offer people when they're coming here two years, three years to get new grants from the government, for example. But the start-up fund matters a lot if we're going to bring in top quality faculty here.

S. Aldersley: Since I will shortly become an emeritus myself, I want to second Clyde's point on that. However, I would like to see not only emeritus specifically referred to, but retirees in general. A lot of people retire and they don't bother to apply for the emeritus rank because they know it's essentially meaningless. It's a title, that's it. Nothing attaches to it. So I would like to suggest that you include not only emeritus, but also faculty who have retired. It's important that people who are working here now have access to people with a good sense of organizational history. The most central issue about this place, about any organization, is its culture. And culture is slow moving. You can want to change it as rapidly as you like, but you won't succeed because culture, while not necessarily a stone that holds you back, is something you have to acknowledge and be aware of. And you can't do that if you lose track of the people who've retired and who've lived it.

K. LeBlevet: I also very much agree with Clyde. As a lecturer, I think it's important to keep in mind the importance of teaching in this institution. I think the pillar that mentions job preparedness is extremely important. But part of our job is not only to form people to be on the job market, but also to form individuals who can grow and develop as young adults. And that's not super visible to me at the moment. I think growing, improving as young adults, failing and improving is also very important. Creating people rather than a workforce is very important. I think we have to keep that in mind as well.

F. Sklarsky: With regard to that, some of the commentary that goes below the level that Enid has reviewed with us today does talk about leadership. Some RIT grads hit the ground running, they do a fantastic job, you can ask them to do anything. But we could do more to train people how to be leaders in terms of prudent risk-taking, being more innovative and creative, how to participate in a team, how to lead a team, how to motivate and inspire others and how to allocate resources, etc. That is something that got a lot of conversation in the details. Again, as Bill has pointed out to us, this is a framework. Below the framework comes the plan with a lot of details that you all are talking about of things that we are going to have to do. You don't want the trustees doing that, that's for you all. The other point I would make is that this is a living document. We may finish the strategic framework and get approval in February and so on, but it's a living document. And because the pace of change is so great this will continue to evolve and we're not afraid to say, okay, what made sense when we wrote this thing may not

make sense this year. We may have to add or deduct or tweak something in it. We have to be willing to be agile as it relates to how the framework evolves over time.

B. Sanders: Kevin, I agree with everything you just said. I can't remember if it's the first or second of the values that are on the slide deck that we had to skip because of the time constraint, but it talks about educating the whole student and about all the kind of ideas you mentioned. I'm a big believer in that.

R. Zanibbi: On the Cornell campus, embossed on the wall of the liberal arts building is a quote that says that education is not a commodity, it's an awakening of the mind. I think that sort of summarizes something that needs to be more central to our mission. Also, Frank, thank you very much for your comments about the importance of faculty and staff and the people of the institution. It's an open secret amongst the faculty that we need to have efficient, adequate resourcing in order to be effective and create a culture that will allow awakening minds. And that means we need to think not just about the exceptional but the rank and file. You need to have a strong back in order to have effective arms. An overemphasis on trying to reach just the exceptional I think has harmed us at many points over the last 20 years.

C. Sanders: Coming back to the pillar related to research within the framework, I think it's important that we think about centralized research, meaning how you streamline research support and resources in one place. For three years I had a really hard time getting help for my research, people interested in collaborating, finding resources. It's really nothing new for faculty coming here. They're also looking to expand their research opportunities. It'd be really great to have one centralized place with resources to serve faculty and support the entire campus.

E. Cardinal: A quick reminder, you have access to the slides via the QR code, and you can continue to submit comments for the next month.

H. Ghazle: I'm very happy that you mentioned alums. In a previous conversation we've talked about how important alums are to this institution. It's very important to emphasize that we care about them. They should not be hidden in a corner somewhere under an objective on page 500. Alums are where we go to ask for support. I am an alum of this institution and if you call me and say you want me to donate, would I be willing if I don't see alums mentioned prominently? Another thing I would like you to shed some light on is that RIT is trying to embark on healthcare, because that's where the growth is. Where does that fit in the strategic framework?

E. Cardinal: I think we mentioned healthcare as a strategic action both in the research and the transformative student experiences pillars.

B. Sanders: We met with the Alumni Board yesterday and had an hour-long discussion on your first point and they wouldn't disagree with you. We are listening to them. On your second point, we did not call out specific intellectual areas within the university at the highest level on purpose, because we wanted to allow innovation to come in throughout the plan. I can tell you that healthcare is one of the things we're working on this year and it will be used as an example in the plan. But just as an example, because five years from now there might be an additional thing we didn't think of and we didn't want to lock ourselves in.

F. Sklarsky: This is my student ID from 1974. I carry this with me all the time to remind myself how far this place has come. We're talking about a lot of things that we want to do and we certainly have a long way to go, but let's keep in mind how good we have become over the last 50 years and we'll make sure we keep it going.

## Strategic Framework Update Presentation

### Agenda Item No. 7: Enrollment Update; K. Davis (1:22)

This is the start of a dialogue and I'm open to fielding questions. We have a number of new faces which has not happened in a while. So I think that's an important piece. Let me give you a quick highlight on the fall 25 statistics. So it's a look back at where we're coming from into the next space, some key highlights from both the domestic and international markets and then some strategic implications. So let me define enrollment management. The godfather of enrollment management was Jack McGuire. Somewhere around 1975, he started thinking about this for Boston College. He also credits himself for recruiting Doug Flutie for those of you who are Bills fans. He was on to something. So strategic and data-driven decisions used to attract and enroll and retain students involve various groups on campus to meet the institutional goals. And this is the part where we say we can't do the work without our students, faculty and staff, without the partnerships across the institution because the goals that we work towards help us with our financial stability, the academic quality and our population size.

In enrollment management, there are key components, recruitment and enrollment, marketing, admissions, financial aid, research and reporting. We have carried this through into the leadership team in enrollment management. Colleen was in this job for a little while before I was hired. She leads the systems team. Beth leads our enrollment marketing which is different from brand marketing, which is under John Trierweiler's shop. We connect heavily with him, but we have enrollment marketing because it gets at the student detail. So if we're talking to Jimmy and he wants accounting and he wants soccer, we talk to him about that. She also is helping with our global strategy as we think about how we position ourselves in the marketplace beyond Rochester. Megan leads financial aid and scholarships, Alan's new. He leads both the undergraduate recruitment team and the graduate recruitment team. So he's doing both. We took and compressed that under one AVP and then Mike McGwin, who's been interim VP a couple of times at another school. Mike leads our operations team as well as our enrollment analytics. So when a department is thinking about a new program or wishing for an assessment of an existing one, Mike does all that work.

So some statistics, these all come out of our institutional research office. They get published to the common data set, which is nationally published as well as IPEDS. All of our locations showed us up in enrollment last year. I'm talking total enrollment here. When we take a look at just Henrietta, we had slight decreases. The global campuses though helped us. So our total of 21,4077 is up overall in part because we have this broad grouping.

Then we take a look at our budget. Our operating budget does not include NTID nor does it include our global locations, Project Lead the Way students, co-op students registered without hours or PhD students. So this is really a specific subset of how the Rochester budget gets funded. You can see the differences between Henrietta campus and then the operating budget. It's an important distinction. So in the operating budget, you then layer in freshmen, transfer, graduate and totals. Folks often ask me about PhD, so I put it in here but it would not show in that budget. Where we struggled most was in the international marketplace for our non-PhD graduate students. That's not of our own making. But we were able to make budgetary adjustments and as Dr. Watters said at his town hall, there was a balanced budget delivered. Important for all of you, so you know who you're teaching, the profile of a first year student. We have not changed our admissions requirements over time. Before I got here they were established and we have maintained that and you can see some of that here. You heard me say that international in the graduate market was a challenge. In the undergraduate market we were able to pull through. So it's important that we pulled it through because in our home location the decline in population is significant. On top of that though, there's some positive news in that we're going outside of New York state to attract students.

So what's the domestic landscape look like? And we're going to talk about that through 2041. This is some public data which is supplied by the Western States Commission on Higher Education. They look at high school graduations and birth rates, pair them up and do a fine job on projections. And you can see that the only place between now and 2041 where there is growth is in the South and that growth is only to the tune of about a hundred thousand students. So if we're looking for a panacea, it's not there. It means we need to tell our story better and put it out into the world in new markets so that we can compete with what is happening. My friends call this the ray of sunshine presentation, by the way. This is the reality of the marketplace. I think it's also important to layer in that in the United States alone there are approximately 5,978 institutions, 4,000 of them are degree-granting. John Boeckenstedt, who's a retired VP for Enrollment from Oregon State, was kind enough to create a blog with a whole bunch of IPEDS data. I have taken this off of his blog where he highlights the intense experience for students and families when selecting a college or university because of the number of choices and we all are working together to balance declining demographics in addition to the high number of schools. So it's a pretty intense competitive environment. You heard me reference a hundred thousand students from the south. You can see how many schools are in the south and with some of them, their mission is to recruit students from the south because many of them are public institutions as well.

Some things going on in higher ed. Deloitte has really interesting higher ed data right now. Everyone wants to help solve the problem and has their own consulting services. We're not partnered with them, but we do use their data and so there's declining public trust that we spend time talking about. We have to help students and families understand why they should come to college or university. Why a private institution like RIT helps the student not just with their first job but their lifelong learning. You can see what's happening with national trust around higher ed. The other component that's important to highlight is that folks are less and less willing to pay for higher education. When we look at this study, 47% say it's worth it, but only if they don't have to take a loan. 22% are saying it's worth it even with some loans. So that's a much smaller subset as you really dig into the data.

And then we talk about financial precarity. Since 2020 we've seen more than 40 colleges close. I want to highlight for you that no one's immune to the resource challenges. In 2023, four of the 14 universities in the Big 10 conference talked about large operating deficits. And so we're not alone in this challenge.

We're certainly not closing. But how do we evolve and change what we're doing, how we're doing it, and be a nimble institution as Frank and Enid we're talking about? There's a small allied health school called Russell Sage College in Albany. They just acquired Albany College of Pharmacy and when St. Rose closed, many of their students went to Russell Sage. So there was continuation. So it's how do we get creative and thoughtful as we watch the market change?

This is where our students come from for the most part, for first year students. It hasn't changed much over time, but tie that back to the declining population trends and we've got some work to do. In the international landscape, 23/24 data. We know that in January things really changed. However, the top two sending countries to the United States continue to be India and China though volumes are a bit different. Students are attracted to the STEM programs specifically. This is public data from research done by a company called Open Doors.

So what are the broad trends in the international market? NAFSA forecast a 30 to 40% decline in international student enrollment in the US for this year. That means a \$7b loss in the economy and 60,000 jobs. Consulate appointments and key countries are a challenge. And this past year we saw visa interviews and social media vetting added. And this hasn't changed as we go into next fall. So we've got global challenges and we've got domestic challenges. So what are the strategic implications? Looking at diversified enrollment pipelines, strengthening our recruitment in the domestic market even though we've got declines happening, continuing to do the global work in this space and time and supporting our students through their visa process and also aligning our academic offerings with market demand. So when you brought Allied Health up during the strategic plan conversation, that shows up here.

As for ways to help, there are a couple of opportunities here and as I said, this is a continued dialogue. There are instances with transfer students, a different market. Transfer students are a component of a diversified pipeline. So swift credit review for transfer students when, for instance, the Registrar's Office

doesn't have that class very often, the transcript goes over to a program director and the program director has to do the assessment. Doing that swiftly is really important, twofold for transfer students. How many credits do I get? How much financial aid do I get? Continuing to expedite the time it takes to make a decision on a graduate student admission, particularly a master's student. The deans and all of you were really good partners in this last year. And so there are nuances there. But continuing on that plan, many of you are participating in our admissions efforts. That includes the visits, academic one-on-one appointments, virtual events and webinars, open houses and accepted student days. But really it's how do we tell our story beyond the curriculum and showcasing the students and the work of the faculty as well in the room with students who are recruits and families so that they understand what we're offering here. It's something different and unique and we have to talk about it. We do make calls for stories as does our central marketing team. We are heavily partnered with college marketers and college recruiters because many of the colleges have college marketers and recruiters and those of you who do not, you're welcome to work with our team, Beth and Alan being the two key people. But you can send it to me and I will filter it for you and get it to the right person.

C. Newman: I'm going to put my grad program director hat on. One of the challenges I had years ago is that I didn't know to what extent I should be interacting with marketing and I didn't know how or what kind of materials I should be preparing. They did reach out to me a couple of times, but usually it was just when they needed something, so if that's the level of interaction, that's fine, but it would be nice if there was more regularity.

K. Davis: That's something we've been working on. You're wise to bring it up. The college marketers get together regularly with central marketing and with enrollment marketing. As for the recruiters, we're now folding them into the work that Alan Matthew and his team do. However, if you have ideas, we're willing to entertain them. If we're needing something from you, we will let you know. But if you have an idea, let us know and we will talk about where it fits into the cycle. You may have an idea, it may not be the right time, but we do plan a full year in advance.

[Enrollment Management Update Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 8: RIT Graduate Council Presentation of the proposed Advanced Certificate in Sustainability; G. Thurston and A. Batabyal (1:42)

G. Thurston: The Department of Sustainability brought Grad. Council an advanced certificate to consider. It's meant for mid-career professionals who can get an additional certificate that can increase their ability to help their firms with decisions that involve sustainability. It was judged to have a strong advantage in the marketplace by those who evaluated it. We looked through the proposal. There's a complete NYSED application and basically we found it to be a very well crafted proposal. GC approved it unanimously and I move that Senate approve it.

Senator ?: Second.

A. Ray: This morning, the COLA senators received an email from Christine Kiner who is professor and chair of the Science and Technology Society program which contributes to the master's program in Science Technology Policy. She wanted to point out that the department teaches a relevant graduate course but was never consulted about this proposal. That course is SDS720, Graduate Environmental Policy. She was able to look at the documents and discuss this with Dean Martin. She points out that when you include the sustainability and environmental policy, the title is misleading because there are no actual courses that include policy. She notes that in the documents, they admit that the marketing strategy

is why the policy language is intentionally added and this mimics a Johns Hopkins MS program that generates web traffic, thereby increasing search engine visibility. However, even the proposal acknowledges uncertainty about whether this tactic will work. And so she wants to request the recipients to question the program's rationale and the use of the misleading market language and to consult with the STS department.

A. Batabyal: The expanded title is a mistake. It's supposed to be 'Advanced Graduate Certificate in Sustainability' only. This was an error which I thought was corrected but apparently not. So I think part of the mis-impression is a result of the incorrect way in which this particular program was advertised. As far as not including a potential course from a faculty member in COLA, one of the purposes behind creating this program is to increase enrollment in our courses. So we have done that and this is only three courses that we're talking about. But in the future, if we expand this program, by all means we'll consult folks in other relevant colleges and departments.

R. Zanibbi: At this point I would like to pose a question regarding procedure. Hamad, is it possible to move to have the certificate formally named thus and not as shown in the slides.

A. Batabyal: I tried to get this corrected two days ago.

R. Zanibbi: That's fine. So I'm just saying, let's do it on the record and then we don't have to worry about it. So can we table the current motion and propose a second motion? I'm looking at the Operations Officer.

H. Ghazle: Let's finish the discussion.

C. Hull: I move that we change the title and leave the motion on the floor. If that passes, hopefully by acclamation then we can just keep going.

R. Zanibbi: Dr. Hull has moved to retitle the advanced certificate, the Advanced Certificate in Sustainability.

S. Johnson: Second.

A. Ray: I'd just like to point out that we've spent decades trying to break down barriers across colleges. And so we are committing to a siloed program here, when other experts exist in other colleges and could contribute to this certificate. And I would really like to see the people proposing this particular certificate take that into account.

H. Ghazle: There is a motion on the floor that was seconded to make the modification to the title first and then we'll get back to you and the original motion.

R. Zanibbi: Are there any objections to changing the title to the advanced certificate in sustainability? Can we vote by acclamation?

**Motion: To change the title to Advanced Certificate in Sustainability**

**Approved by acclamation.**

R. Zanibbi: We are now back to the initial motion with the modified title.

A. Batabyal: Some of you may not know this, but I have a joint appointment in the College of Liberal

Arts where I'm a professor of economics and, since 2022, head of the Department of Sustainability. It's a 50/50 appointment split. So I completely agree with what my colleague Amit Ray is saying as far as collegiality is concerned. In fact, since I came on board, we have 11 new CABM arrangements with four different colleges, and when I started, there were only two. We have an MS/MBA arrangement with the Saunders College of Business, which is working out quite well and we are in the process of working on four more CABM arrangements. I am all for breaking down silos and I think as I've just pointed out, I actually have a track record for doing that. So I do not agree that we are continuing to perpetuate a formerly erroneous mindset. We are in fact trying to move in another direction.

C. Hull: I second the original motion. I would like to reiterate a point I've made a few times before that we have an entire committee dedicated to dealing with whether or not the certificate should be passed. The reason why they come here is because our role is supposed to be to ask 'did they follow procedure'? It looks like they did. We shouldn't need to have to rehash. All the conversations that should have happened may have happened or should have happened at this committee. Now I'll say that in a previous year, the Saunders College of Business faculty representative on the Grad Council failed to say anything about something and people got all up in arms, but that was on the representative from the college on that committee. If there's a certificate like this and somebody thinks there should be something else considered, I agree that we should be trying to do this, but it should have already happened at this point. We should be saying 'yes, they did their job'. But I do also think that maybe Senate could say something to GC in the future to suggest they ask their college reps more explicitly to give feedback.

**Motion: To approve the Advanced Certificate in Sustainability**

**Approved: 18/3/9**

[Graduate Council Presentation](#)

[Program Research](#)

[Certificate Approval](#)

[Background](#)

**Agenda Item No. 9: New Business; R. Zanibbi (1:53)**

B. Thomas: There was an email that came this morning from the Provost's Office about a research incentive program for faculty who have grants, money to buy out time during the school year. The percentages and the numbers weren't clear to me. So those whose grants are just for summer salary alone are not affected by this, except for those who have funding within their grants to buy out time from teaching. Is that correct?

P. David: If you had time during summer, it wouldn't be to the faculty's advantage to not take the summer salary. So it's only for faculty who get all the summer salary paid for. If they have more money, then this would be to their advantage.

B. Thomas: There's a limit to how much you can take in the summer, correct? I think it's 27.5%.

P. David: Yes, the summer cap is still the same. Nothing has changed about the summer. It's for people who can build a summer salary and have additional grants.

B. Thomas: So if you had asked for money in your grant to buy out time from teaching during the academic year and you have that money, but you still have extra money.

P. David: Correct. And we can talk about the details later.

Agenda Item No. 10: Adjournment; R. Zanibbi (1:55)



# Attendance 11/6/2025

Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended	Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended
Adrion, Amy	Alternate CAD Senator		Laver, Michael	CLA Senator	XM
Aldersley, Stephen	Communications Officer/ SOIS Senator	X	LeBlevec, Kevin	CLA Senator	X
Alm, Cecilia	CLA Senator	X	Liao, Wenjie	Alternate CLA Senator	
Anselm, Martin	CET Senator	X	McCalley, Carmody	Alternate COS Senator	X
Arena, Jason	Alternate CAD Senator		McLaren, Amy	CAD Senator	
Barone, Keri	Vice Chair/CLA Senator	X	Newman, Christian	GCCIS Senator	X
Boedo, Stephen	Alternate KGCOS Senator	X	Nickisher, Heidi	CAD Senator	X
Brady, Kathleen	NTID Senator	X	Officer, Cindy	Alternate NTID Senator	X
Brown, Jeremy	GCCIS Senator	Excused	Olles, Deana	COS Senator	Excused
Brown, Tamaira	Senate Coordinator	X	Olson, Rob	Alternate GCCIS Senator	
Butler, Janine	NTID Senator	X	O'Neil, Jennifer	Alternate CET Senator	
Butler, Joshua	Alternate NTID Senator		Osgood, Robert	Alternate CHST Senator	
Chiavaroli, Julius	GIS Senator		Overby, Katrina	Alternate CLA Senator	
Chung, Sorim	SCB Senator	X	Padmanabhan, Poornima	KGCOS Senator	Excused
Cody, Jeremy	COS Senator	X	Perry, Andrew	Alternate SOIS Senator	
Coppenbarger, Matthew	COS Senator	X	Puchades, Ivan	KGCOS Senator	X
Crawford, Denton	CAD Senator	X	Ray, Amit	CLA Senator	X
Cromer, Michael	Alternate COS Senator		Reinicke, Bryan	Alternate SCB Senator	
Cui, Feng	Alternate COS Senator		Reisch, Mark	CAD Senator	X
David, Prabu	Provost	X	Rich, Lexi	Alternate CET Senator	
Davis, Stacey	NTID Senator	X	Ross, Annemarie	NTID Senator	
De Wit Paul, Alissa	Alternate GIS Senator		Sanders, Cynthia	NTID Senator	X
DiRisio, Keli	CAD Senator		Shaaban, Muhammad	Alternate tKGCOS Senator	
Eirikur Hull, Clyde	SCB Senator	X	Song, Qian	SCB Senator	
Ghazle, Hamad	Operations Officer/CHST Senator	X	Staff Council Rep	Amanda Hughes	X
Ghoneim, Hany	Alternate KGCOS Senator		Student Government Rep	Igor Polotai	
Hardin, Jessica	CLA Senator	X	Sweeney, Kevin	Alternate SCB Senator	
Hartpence, Bruce	Alternate GCCIS Senator		Thomas, Bolaji	CHST Senator	X
Jadamba, Basca	COS Senator	X	Tsouri, Gill	KGCOS Senator	X
Johnson, Dan	CET Senator		Villasmil, Larry	CET Senator	X
Johnson, Scott	GCCIS Senator	X	Warp, Melissa	Alternate CAD Senator	
Kavin, Denise	Alternate NTID Senator		Weeden, Elissa	GCCIS Senator	X
Krutz, Daniel	Alternate GCCIS Senator		White, Phil	Alternate GCCIS Senator	X
Kuhl, Michael	KGCOS Senator	X	Wiandt, Tamas	Alternate COS Senator	
Kwasinski, Andres	Alternate KGCOS Senator		Worrell, Tracy	Alternate CLA Senator	
Lanzafame, Joseph	Treasurer/COS Senator	X	Zanibbi, Richard	Chair/GCCIS Senator	X
Lapizco-Encinas, Blanca	KGCOS Senator	X	Zlochower, Yosef	COS Senator	X

Interpreters: Nicole Crouse-Dickerson and Jennaca Saeva

Student Assistant: Ella Kolodziej

Presenters: Enid Cardinal, Frank Sklarsky, George Thurston, and Amit Batabyal