

## Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, November 20, 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 November 6th meeting approved by acclamation**

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

Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; R. Zanibbi (12:20)

The strategic framework is being shared widely on campus. It has been revised in collaboration with many stakeholders and I want to ask that you please make sure you look at the draft and share feedback. Today, I'm going to propose that we modify how we vote. There are two things I think are important that are perhaps missing in how we discuss motions. The first is nobody signifies whether they are for, against, or seeking clarification of a motion on the floor. We just take people in order and they might all be for, or all against or proposing a large series of amendments. It's important to get those clarifications and comments out early, especially if people have questions about technical aspects in a proposal or a motion that once clarified changes everyone's opinion. The second point is that Robert's Rules formally requires an alternation between arguments for and against the motion on the floor. This is to ensure there is a debate and that both sides are represented. So my idea is that rather than having us all put up our flags and just dealer's choice, we find out whether people are for, or against, or asking for amendments in real time. If people indicate what their intent is when they're putting up their hand, we can record this as we go. So the idea would be that when you want to speak to a motion, you indicate if you're for or against or if you have a question or comment. If you're in favor, please raise your open hand, like you're waving to someone, and if you are not in favor raise a gently closed hand, but not in a way that resembles a fist. If you need clarification at the beginning and it's neither for or against, a flag only, open hand if you're for, or closed hand if you're against. The ordering for the speakers will be the following: first, we'll have up to two speakers who are just raising their flag and offering a comment or asking for a clarification. Then as needed we're going to cycle between for and against. So again, open hand for, closed hand against and then flag for neither for nor against. Also, in agreement with Michael's suggestion at the beginning of the year, this is a reminder to myself as much as to anyone else, to the extent possible, members of the

Executive Committee will speak after members of the body. Are there any questions or comments on this? The main motivation is so that we actually debate motions and don't just have discussion of the motion. Are there any questions from anyone other than the executive?

S. Aldersley: Just so that the Senate is aware, this particular change in the way we should proceed was not discussed by the executive committee. It was announced by Richard in an email to the executive committee about two hours ago. I do not approve of it and I will not abide by it.

R. Zanibbi: Well I hope if you don't abide by it, the body will. But let me explain. This was proposed partly because we've had some policies where it was a little hard to get one side or the other of the discussion in previous meetings. I hope you'll agree. This was discussed in the Senate Executive multiple times. We need a procedure and the rules that we are abiding by stipulate that this should be the practice anyway. The only thing that I'm proposing doing differently is that we also have clarifications upfront. Now if people would prefer, I'm happy to move to vote whether or not to accept this procedure. I hope it seems reasonable and fair. So is there any other discussion, objections or concerns to voting in this manner.

M. Laver: I know this may sound silly, but can we practice it?

R. Zanibbi: It doesn't sound silly. When you put up your flag, it's just if you are not sure and you're going to ask for a clarification, open hand if you are going to make an argument for the motion, closed hand if you're going to make an argument against.

M. Laver:: When you say clarification, is that the equivalent to what we used to call a question?

R. Zanibbi: Exactly. What is this section? What did this mean? I don't have an opinion because I'm not sure what this is. I have an amendment, a friendly amendment or a non-friendly amendment..

C. Hull: I don't know how this might fit into the system, but I guess it's basically a question. If I want to propose an amendment to a motion, what do I do?

R. Zanibbi: I think that's treated as a question. So again, you either have, I'm going to argue for, I'm going to argue against, or I have a clarification or amendment or question in the formal sense of Robert's Rules.

C. Hull: So then in response to what you just said, I would like to second Michael's motion that we try it today without voting on it being a permanent procedure.

I. Puchades: Would it not be easier before somebody starts speaking they say whether they're for or against?

R. Zanibbi: No, because then we want to be able to call on people from the front of the room based on whether they are for or against in advance.

I. Puchades: What happens when everybody's for and there's no arguments against?

R. Zanibbi: In that case what we do is if you just don't have one of those groups, you just empty the queue according to the criteria. You just make sure that if there are people from different groups, you're alternating that order. Everybody still gets a chance to speak.

On a different matter, I'd like to constitute a task force on longer evaluation cycles. The faculty affairs committee has a charge to look into having longer three year evaluation cycles for professors and

principal lecturers. I'd like to thank Provost David for helping make this possible. Our proposed membership for the task force includes Tang and Christian, the FAC co-chairs, Corinna Schlombs, last year's FAC chair, Laverne McQuiller, Andre Hudson who will represent deans and Sharon Mason who will represent chairs. I would like to move to approve the formation of this task force as described and with that membership.

A. McLaren: Second. I know that there was a task force that already made recommendations which were considered and then there was a verdict or a response. How is this different from what those folks have been working on for a few years?

R. Zanibbi: Provost David is here, so please correct me if I'm wrong, but we've had some discussions and it seems like there may be some readiness to modify the previous proposal which was to have evaluation materials every three years. The new proposal is to have this task force look into the possibility in the off years of having faculty submit a CV and a one page summary of their work and this would reduce the reporting burden dramatically. I was pleasantly surprised that the provost and others are receptive to this and so I'm trying to move forward and reduce that reporting burden.

P. Panmanabhan: Is the provost going to be on this task force?

R. Zanibbi: He helped direct its creation but he's not going to be involved directly. However, Laverne will be a member representing Academic Affairs and she is in close communication with Prabu, who is here with us every two weeks.

I. Puchades: What we learned from the previous proposal that was rejected was that the deans and department heads were against those changes. I see Andre Hudson, but I don't know if he's going to be for or against. If he is not for, then there's no use having everyone agree to doing something that's not going to move through.

R. Zanibbi: Let me provide some context. Sharon Mason is a member of the Council of Chairs. I've spoken to her, and she has agreed to be a member of this task force. She's supportive of this change. I believe Andre Hudson was on the committee that first started formulating these ideas four or five years ago. He has been contacted and has agreed to serve in this capacity. My understanding is he's not dead set against it. The provost rightly suggested that we make sure there's a dean's representative and a chair's representative, so they can go back to their bodies and make sure that there is agreement. We're trying to be careful about this. There's also a plan to make sure that we contact the president as soon as there's a sketch, rather than bring it to Senate first for the vote, and only then bring it up for a vote.

P. Panmanabhan: I want to repeat that it's important to have a dean who isn't against this so that there could be some progress and some negotiation.

R. Zanibbi: I agree. Andre is going to talk to the Council of Deans about this so they will be in the loop. We don't plan to try and advance anything through the body until we have some consensus and agreement, although we can come to this body to talk about possibilities if needed.

**Motion to approve the creation of a Task Force to examine the possibility of extended review periods for full professors and principal Lecturers.**

**Motion passes: 34/0/1**

C. Hull: The Task Force on Graduation Rates has found a number of opportunities for faculty-driven initiatives that we think will help graduation rates. Most of these will be things that will need to be

approved by the committees, but not all of them. We have reached out to various stakeholders. One person on the committee felt very strongly we should be talking to Enrollment Management. We're doing that. We have checked in with Prabu and Neeraj and discussed what we see, what they see. We seem to be on the same page. We look forward to bringing you some proposals soon. One suggestion was why don't you look at MIT and see what they do. When we did, we were really surprised. MIT has an amazing graduation rate and they do some very interesting things that we could maybe adopt here.

R. Zanibbi: The task force on graduate remission on grants that Poornima asked to have created early in the year has now been constituted and is moving forward. We look forward to updates. Lastly, the new directory that holds versions of policy drafts has a space to provide additional text comments so that we can comment on policies before they're presented at Senate. So as soon as we have changes from now on, we'll post these in this location, let you know they're available and ask you to look at them. There are two policies in particular I'm asking you to review before the next meeting: faculty employment and student academic integrity and appeals.

#### Agenda Item No. 5: Student Government Update; Igor Polotai (12:35)

I. Polotai: If anyone here needs students to be on any task force so they can give a student perspective, let us know.

S. Aldersley: Igor, I don't know whether you'll be aware of this, but somebody alerted me this morning to an effort on the part of I assume Student Affairs, to change the rules regarding space for student clubs. And I understand there's a PawPrint that's been put out by both the Model Railway club and the Anime club. I would like to say that I'm willing to talk to anybody that's interested in that because I have an interest in the Model Railway Club and sometimes standardization can be taken too far. So please relay my willingness to the chairs of those two clubs or anybody else in student government that you think would be interested.

#### Agenda Item No. 6: Policy C00.0 (Code of Ethical Conduct and Compliance) Edits; E. Duthiers (12:38)

I'm here to talk about policy C0.00, the Code of Ethical Conduct and Compliance. This is my third time before the body, so I'm not going to go in as much depth as I did before, but I'd like to recap why we're here. We have presented the information and the policy to the other governance groups and they have voted to approve it. During that time I visited with the Senate Executive Committee and had an in-depth discussion doing a deeper dive into the policy and how it works with other policies. In the last few days I've had discussions with the Executive Committee and there was a proposal made by Stephen to include additional language, a sentence regarding transparency, and I think that's going to be something that the Executive Committee is going to speak to you about after the presentation to determine whether that will be included as part of the motion for your vote.

So just to do a quick run through some of the changes that are in the policy that you have received. They are pretty standard and were made to improve the flow and did not add any substantive changes to a policy that has been in place since 2009. There was a major edit in 2000, I believe. Not much has changed, but I'll walk you through some of the changes. For example, in line 179, we've clarified the language regarding who is required to report certain things and who was simply encouraged to report them. That language was already in the policy, but we wanted to make it a little bit more explicit regarding who must and who is encouraged. Another change was we added the link to the reporting and

incident page because we want people to know how to report if we are requiring you to report. So the extensive reporting mechanisms have been linked to the policy. Another change was we strengthened the language about reporting in good faith. I know before there had been some concerns about whether anybody could just report something. We wanted to be sure that good faith language was included so we strengthened the language and clarity around what we mean by that. That starts at line 204. And then in line 269, we added information about the range of corrective actions that might ensue if there is an outcome related to an investigation and a finding of responsibility. We wanted to be clear that the range of corrective actions that could be taken as a result was made very transparent to the community. The rest of the changes were just editorial, nothing of substance.

As I mentioned, there was a question about whether we could add language regarding transparency to allay some of the concerns that had been raised in the prior discussions. We went back and forth with what we would add and where we would add it, and determined that we would add a sentence in the introduction that would include the language that the university unit responsible for overseeing and enforcing the policies will carry out their responsibilities in a manner that promotes transparency, that is, if this body is willing to add that language.

R. Zanibbi: For clarification, are you proposing the same motion you had before to make the proposed edits to C00 with the addition of this language?

E. Duthiers: As we discussed, I would include it if it does not require us to go through the governance groups again. I don't view this as a substantive change because I do believe that those principles are already embodied in the code and in the various policies that are codified in the code. But that would be for this body to discuss.

R. Zanibbi: To first address that directly, Tamaira, can you speak to this because we did communicate that we don't feel there is a problem with this change, in part because the modification will go back to University Council for final approval.

T. Brown: Speaking as the RIT policy officer, concerning this edit, if you are familiar with policy B.5, our policy on policies, there's a flow chart at the bottom that gives an overview of this process. As Erica mentioned, we're not seeing this as a substantive change. When the responsible offices visit each of the shared governance groups, it's for feedback. In practice we do have a vote and we do like it if these groups can endorse or improve the policy edits. But according to policy, it is strictly for feedback. There can be instances when a responsible office comes to a group to present edits, and the group does not approve them. In such a case, the responsible office can still proceed with the edits and bring them back to University Council for a final vote. So if we add this edit in with the others that were on the previous document, we can proceed with the motion as such. After which, the next step will be to present the updated language to the University Council Executive Committee and they can provide additional feedback if they like. As you know, all heads of the shared governance groups are a part of the UC Executive Committee. So they will have an opportunity via their chairs or presidents to receive that information. The chairs can take that back to the groups and if they want to provide feedback directly to the office, they can do so. But according to policy, we can proceed and take this policy back to University Council for final approval. Ultimately, because this is a university policy, the president has the final say.

M. Laver: Thank you Tamaira. I read through this and I appreciate you engaging with us so constructively. And it seems to me that you've answered the, maybe not objections, but certainly the feedback that we've given you. I am satisfied and I think you've done a great job.

E. Duthiers: **I move to approve the original changes to the language of policy C0.00 with the addition of the language regarding transparency.**

S. Aldersley: I second what Michael just said. And Erica, I want to thank you. I think this is an excellent example of shared governance in operation. Just to give the Senate a background on how we got here. I had said before that I thought that the policy needed a section N, which I thought ought to be called “Transparency”. We discussed some draft language in Executive Committee which I then sent to Erica as something to consider. Erica got back to me and we went back and forth a couple of times and it ended up with the new sentence that you see in the introduction. Again, Erica, I want to thank you for listening.

I. Puchades: Is the process of transparency defined somewhere? I'm a little confused as to what transparency means in this context. Is it spelled out in this document?

E. Duthiers: It is not a defined term in the policy but I would say that the definition is as in common parlance. As I mentioned, this is an overall overarching policy regarding the expectations of community members. So we talked about the fact that there are no charges that come out of this policy with the exception of a retaliation claim that could be brought under it to the extent that there is no retaliation language in any specific policy. So typically there are no charges resulting from this policy. It's really just being very clear about what the expectations are when you're conducting business for or on behalf of RIT.

S. Aldersley: Ivan, one of the points that Erica made along the way was that this is a high level policy and there are different approaches in different policies regarding what can go wrong, all of which is dealt with under individual policies. My intent in suggesting something like this be put into this overarching policy is that when those other policies come up for review by this body, this point will not be forgotten and will be added to the other policies according to what they deal with.

**Motion approved: 37/1/0**

[Policy C00.0 Presentation](#)

[Policy C00.0 Red Line Document](#)

[Policy C00.0 Additional Edit](#)

Agenda Item No. 7: Policy C06.0 (Policy Prohibiting Discrimination, Harassment and Retaliation)  
Edits; R. Pelta (12:50)

I'm the director of employee relations and HR partnerships. Our policy prohibiting discrimination, harassment and retaliation applies to all members of the RIT community. It's not intended to address complaints against students who are governed by these other policies listed here. The policy's purpose is to affirm the university's commitment to fostering a respectful and welcoming environment by prohibiting discrimination, harassment and retaliation and to outline the procedures for addressing complaints and ensuring compliance.

The last policy revisions were done in 2021 and there have been some recent legal updates which necessitate policy alignment. We've also identified a greater need for consistency with other institutional policies to more accurately reflect our current processes and practices. The proposed changes to C.6 will align policy with legal obligations under Titles VI and VII, specifically by adding shared ancestry and ethnic characteristics to the list of protected categories under the policy. They will also update the retaliation standard through the definition of adverse action based on a recent Supreme Court ruling, which lowered the threshold for what constitutes retaliation or adverse action under the law. It's no longer required to demonstrate that something significantly or materially diminished a tangible employment

benefit, just that it caused some harm to an identifiable term or condition of employment. The proposed changes also clarify scope and applicability specifically by calling out early on in the policy that concerns not based on a protected category are not applicable under this policy. And to clarify the intersection between C.6.0 and C.27 or Title IX policy. C.27 has a very high threshold for what constitutes sexual harassment. Under that policy, there's a very prescribed process that we're obligated by law to follow. In order to constitute sexual harassment under our Title IX policy, it needs to either involve an RIT employee conditioning the provision of an aid or benefit based on that member's participation in unwelcome sexual conduct. Or it needs to be so severe, pervasive and reasonably objective that it effectively denies someone's participation in an RIT program or benefit. It also needs to have occurred in the United States as one of the jurisdictional requirements, and it includes what's often referred to as the 'big four', sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence and stalking. So that's the very high threshold under Title IX. And then we have C.6, Sexual Harassment and Discrimination, which is a lower threshold. It follows New York State's definition, which is anything beyond petty slights and trivial inconveniences. The proposed edits more clearly delineate the differences and the jurisdictional application between the two. So for example, if you have sexual harassment that doesn't rise to the level of constituting Title IX sexual harassment, or if it doesn't meet the jurisdictional requirement, meaning it didn't happen in the US, we would adjudicate that under C.6.0. They also clarify scope and culpability by emphasizing the discretion for case resolution adjudication depending on the specific facts and circumstances of that case. The proposed changes also clarify roles and responsibilities of the various individuals and offices involved, specifically by emphasizing that Public Safety is the primary investigatory office for non-member cases, meaning someone who's not faculty staff or an RIT student. You'll see that we propose removing the investigatory procedures, and instead referring policy readers to the Office of Compliance and Ethics page, because it has a more transparent and full overview of the process, whereas what's listed in this policy is only part of it and I think it's easier to remove that from the policy so that we can focus really on the other pieces of this and instead refer the reader to the more fully expanded and transparent process. The proposed revisions also clarify reporting obligations by updating the definition of supervisor to clearly emphasize that it's not just those with direct reports who are considered a supervisor, but anyone with employment authority to make decisions about hiring, firing, promotions and performance evaluations. They also remove the definition of responsible person because that is a legal definition which applies under C. 27 but not under this policy. And then by adding a duty to report section so that it's clear who's obligated to report, specifically any employee of RIT, regardless of position or authority, is required to report allegations of sexual harassment or discrimination, whereas those in a position of authority are required to report on everything else under this policy. I move approval of these changes.

Senator ?: Second.

E. Weedon: In looking at policy C.00, the overarching policy, Section Three mentions the groups that are protected, which includes pregnancy status, yet I don't see pregnancy status mentioned in C.6. So I'm wondering if there was a reconciliation done between C.00 and C.6 in regards to protected groups?

R. Perlta: That's a good question. I'm going to have to look into that. If it's not there, it needs to be.

H. Ghazle: Along the same lines, has there been any reconciliation between C.0, C.6 and C 6.1?

R. Pelta: As Erica mentioned, C.00 is a codification of other university policies, so C6.0 isn't tied to C.00. I did see a question in the comment document about retaliation being listed under both policies. So if this helps to clarify the question, since retaliation under C.00 speaks to when another policy doesn't apply, it would apply to allegations made under this policy.

J. Lanzafame: Section IV.I mentioned in a now deleted section that the allegations would be recorded in a

central confidential employee relations file, which is separate from the personnel file. The phrase 'is separate from the personnel file' was struck. Are there two separate files? Because mention of that file is also in 6.1.

R. Pelta: I believe that at some point we had an actual file. We don't have those anymore. We use OnBase and then these cases are stored in a system called Maxient that's used by HR, Compliance and Ethics and Student Conduct. So just the way it was worded isn't really how we operate anymore.

R. Zanibbi: Is the official faculty employment file separate from this Maxient record? Are they two separate systems?

R. Pelta: Correct. These will be Workday in a couple of months.

C. Hull: Some time ago, we had a professor who is no longer here who habitually harassed lots of people and when they complained, they were told their complaint was being put in a permanent record of some sort which could be consulted the next time there was a complaint made. Several more people complained and someone asked, by the way, why is there no reference to all the previous complaints in the file? And the answer was 'what file'? There was no actual file of these complaints. This was about 20 years ago, so hopefully this is not the case anymore. I did not understand your answer, but I would hope that there is some kind of continuing record so when the 13th person complains, you would actually know about all the previous complaints. It seems to me that the main gist of the revisions is to make it easier for people to understand how to follow the procedure if they have a complaint. Is that right?

R. Pelta: Yes.

H. Ghazle: Just going back to whether there is some synergy between these policies, you indicated that you may need to go back regarding the pregnancy statement. Do you still feel it's time for us to vote on this?

R. Pelta: I still feel that it's time to ask for your feedback. These policies aren't necessarily related in a way where they need to be compared side by side. But if I'm misunderstanding the concern or the comment, let me know.

R. Zanibbi: I think the suggestion is asking whether you would be amenable to tabling your motion while you work through feedback.

R. Pelta: I'm sorry, just to confirm, what is the feedback?

R. Zanibbi: There was feedback about the pregnancy issue. And it seems that we have at least two people who have concerns around whether there are two different records. That needs to be made more explicit. Plus I have some other things.

Q. Song: I see the complainant cannot remain anonymous. How do you ensure confidentiality? Will the complainant's name be published?

R. Pelta: If a complainant wishes to remain anonymous, they would receive limited information about the outcome of the Office of Compliance and Ethics' investigation. We do maintain confidentiality to the extent possible. In other words, only those with a need to know receive specific details. If a complainant wants to remain anonymous, they're only going to get limited information about the investigation. If a complainant wishes to remain anonymous, we would not release their name. But if they want to receive information about the investigation, they would not remain anonymous.



Q. Song: So they have a choice whether or not to be anonymous? Which part of the policy says that?

R. Pelta: Off the top of my head, I don't know.

M. Laver: Regarding protected categories, I was looking at the policy and it looks like that the protected categories that are listed are not comprehensive, but are merely examples. So for example, they say 'including the following protected categories', and the next statement is 'other protected categories as defined by federal and state law' also apply. So I would think that pregnancy status would fall in that category even if it's not explicitly stated in the policy. But it would be good to clarify that.

C. Hull: Would you object to a motion to add the word 'pregnancy.'

R. Pelta: I don't object. I do just want to go and do a little bit more research.

R. Zanibbi: I'd like to share a few things. The phrase 'rights and responsibilities of involved parties' is being proposed to be defined separately in administrative policy on the RIT Compliance and Ethics webpage. So if these are rights and responsibilities, why wouldn't they be spelled out in C6.0? It seems a little odd to be stipulating something this important and not have it spelled out. Of course, that would have to be updated as things change, but it seems to me the policy should move with that. Another thing is that there were interim and accommodative measures. I remember doing annual trainings and they would talk about mutual no-contact orders, which seemed to make sense and there was language about notice of outcome and so on. When it comes back, it might be good to understand more explicitly why those specific actions were removed.

R. Pelta: We believe it's easier to read through the policy and instead of getting into the process that the Office of Compliance and Ethics follows, to refer to their administrative policy for that. Because as it's written right now, it doesn't have all the details. I think it would be better for the reader to have all of the details rather than have a watered down version embedded within this policy.

R. Zanibbi: I'm sensitive to the fact things may change, but again, back to this idea of rights and responsibilities being so important, perhaps they should be spelled out. Some of these procedures seem protective enough that maybe they should be spelled out. Maybe we could talk about language to modify or ameliorate that based on some external policy as well. But it might be good to motivate those things because having it all defined in a policy that Senate would not have say over updating is something that at least I and some of the senators may be concerned about. So I'll ask that we table the motion and have you come back for a vote on this at a later time after you've reviewed the pregnancy issue and perhaps talked with the Executive and others about the other matters that have been raised.

[Policy C06.0 Presentation](#)

[Policy C06.0 Edits](#)

Agenda Item No. 8: Policy C06.1 (Resolution of Conflicts and Concerns Among RIT Employees); R. Pelta (1:10)

C.6.1 applies to all faculty, staff and students in their roles as employees. The purpose of the policy is to resolve conflicts and concerns between employees in the workplace that are not covered by other

university policies. It used to be part of C6.0 and it was separated out to address conflicts that didn't rise to the level of violating a policy or the law. I want to emphasize that this really is more of a process than a policy. It's been historically used to address mostly interpersonal concerns in the workplace that don't rise to the level of a policy violation, and at least within the last three years, it has not been used at all. We feel that it's prescriptive and limiting. It outlines a very rigid and formal process by which someone can resolve a workplace concern. And it's not as flexible and adaptive to the various types of conflicts and concerns that arise in the workplace. Plus we feel it's redundant with current approaches to resolve workplace conflict, for example, Human Resources, the Ombuds, or facilitated coaching. It's not intended to provide any type of protection. It doesn't guarantee a specific outcome or that a specific process should be followed. It really just outlines the resources available to those who might have a conflict or a concern. You might ask what's the harm in keeping it? There is no harm, but I think it's cleaner and more transparent if we're only including policies in our library that are actively being used. So I move that we decommission the policy and remove it from the governance library.

P. Padmanabhan: There seems to be a lot of important information in Appendix A. So if we remove it from the library, where would people find that information?

R. Pelta: Right now there is a website on the Student Affairs page. HR is working with Marketing & Communications to revamp our conflict and concerns page, and we will include that information there including where to go based on the specific type of concern that you have.

P. Padmanabhan: I would like to see the plan for that before completely getting rid of this policy.

J. Johnston: The Ombuds office has been consulted in regards to decommissioning this and we support it.

E. Weedon: I'm opposed to removing this. I'm aware of situations with some of my colleagues in other colleges where they had a conflict that didn't necessarily rise to a policy violation, but when they went to resources on campus, they were bounced around. I think this policy, even though it does prescribe other avenues or resources that are available, does give faculty a place to look. And there is also the record of allegations prescribed as part of this policy so with the example given by Clyde earlier about a previous person who had several allegations about them, this can be another way to have concerns noted. And so I would be opposed to removing this.

A. Adrion: I defer to the information you've given and I appreciate that the Ombuds office is in support of this. I think that was a good question regarding where people will be able to find some of these resources. With regard to Clyde's question, those are actual harassment issues, so they actually wouldn't be affected by this policy. I think in general, it's important to keep policies streamlined to what is actually being used.

J. Lanzafame: I could go either way on this motion. I defer to the Ombuds to the extent that it will not change the way things are going, but it's not clear to me that the process that would be undertaken under 6.1 would be the same as the alternative. In 6.1, if you want mediation, it's an official request to HR who gets a mediator from a list of mediators. Going to the Ombuds as the mediator is a different process. Now it might be better not to create a trail or maybe you want a trail.

R. Pelta: When there are concerns, we partner with the Ombuds and they're trained in facilitating and mediating those conversations. So that is the process we follow. We don't follow the more prescriptive process that's in 6.1. What we do with the Ombuds is similar but just a little bit more informal and more collaborative.

C. Hull: I was looking through the policies on how to get a BS degree approved and we have nine

different policies you have to follow if you want to propose one. There is no actual policy on what a BS degree looks like. We have lots and lots of policies and it seems like we hardly ever take any off the books and consolidate them. So I think as a matter of general principle, if we have a policy that we're not using, let's get it off the books, especially if by doing so we make things a little less confusing.

Y. Zlochow: Conflicts do naturally arise and having a place where we describe a procedure in an official channel might have some benefits over something like the Ombuds office, which is confidential. I also have a question as to why this policy has not been used before. Is it just because no one has brought it forward or have people who have brought it forward been encouraged to use a different approach?

R. Pelta: We have never had anyone reach out and say, I want to use C.6.1. I shouldn't say never. At least in the last three years, no one has reached out. We have people who come to us all the time with interpersonal conflicts and we work through those with them and help to resolve them. So I don't think that there's been a need or anyone's felt a need to invoke this policy.

T. Brown: Just for clarification, the page will still live on the policy website. It will say this policy has been decommissioned, so please go here instead. The page with the policy history does not go away.

R. Pelta: I didn't know that was the case, so thank you for telling me

E. Weedon: I'm still opposed to decommissioning this. It does outline, for example, for informal resolution what can or cannot be done, which I think is important. It states that for an informal resolution, no records or sanctions result. And I think that that's important for all parties to recognize and understand. If this policy were to go away and an employee were to seek an informal resolution, that aspect may not be considered and there could be a record or potentially sanctions as a result.

R. Pelta: I appreciate you sharing that thought, but again, this is not intended to provide any level of protection. So that would still be the case even without this process/policy. If someone comes to us and wants to informally resolve something, we're going to handle it in the same way as we would under this process. Meaning unless there's a policy that's been violated, if someone just wants to work through an interpersonal concern, we're going to do it in the manner in which we just outlined as prescribed under this process.

E. Weedon: With the informal resolution, the way it's phrased, if an employee takes it up with another employee, they're not involving anyone else, but the policy states that there should be no record or sanction as a result. And so if this policy goes away, then no one is aware that there should not be a record or sanction. This is employee to employee, not involving any other resources or areas on campus.

R. Pelta: Employees can't subject their peers to discipline or anything like that. So if it's just two employees resolving their interpersonal concerns directly, that would still be the case. There would not be a formal record or disciplinary measures.

E. Weedon: But it could be two employees where there is a power differential. And the employee is trying to resolve it informally with their supervisor.

R. Zanibbi: Rachel, if you're comfortable with us voting on the motion, we can proceed.

H. Ghazle: This also relates to faculty grievance. The E.24 policy has a lot to do with this policy, specifically with regard to the keeping of records. And there may be requests for records or evaluations or things like that. It may be beneficial for us to see how these policies connect.

R. Pelta: I don't see any overlap here. The faculty and staff grievance processes are designed to raise concerns when you believe that a process or policy has been misapplied or misinterpreted. This is to resolve conflicts and concerns between people that aren't related to policies.

### **Motion to decommission Policy C6.1**

**Motion passes: 19:9:6**

R. Zanibbi: Rachel, I would ask that you please work with Tamaira and the Executive to ensure that the appendices and resources in the policy and versions of the policy continue to exist in the web.

[Policy C06.1 Presentation](#)

[Policy C06.1 Edits](#)

### **Agenda Item No. 9: Policy E27.0 (Staff Performance Appraisal Policy) Edits; L. Burger (1:28)**

I'm the director of Learning and Organizational Development and I'm here to talk about the new staff performance appraisal policy. The policy is in front of you today because as a part of Workday implementation, we want to modernize the performance appraisal process for staff members.

The current process lacks consistency and clarity as well as overall alignment with institutional goals and values. Currently, there are inconsistent practices. Some people utilize a system inside Talent Roadmap with about 300 people. We have groups that use different timelines. We have groups that use different templates with the same rating scale today and there are different views on how to rate individuals. Over the past year we've been benchmarking with some of our peer institutions as well as working diligently with Staff Council representatives, other staff members and managers and asking what they are looking for, what do they need. One of the things that we are doing in order to ensure that the launch across the university goes successfully is to implement a pilot with over 475 people participating across different divisions and colleges. We've started to do road shows with these pilot groups making sure they understand what to expect. We are also looking to ensure that we have tools for both leaders and staff members to provide feedback. There's a feedback function inside of Workday that they will be able to utilize. Using the new system will mean there's no paper, which is going to be very positive.

I'd like to go through some of the key policy changes. You see a lot of red line on the document, a lot of which is changes in formatting, ensuring that it's more focused on the policy itself and less on the process. But I do want to talk about the core primary changes, what the new policy is, the update to the rating scale as well as the streamlined approval process and the standard appraisal template.

One of the things that happens now is everyone is on a different timeline. Managers and division heads are responsible for conducting staff performance appraisals. The timeline can be different months, different lengths of time. The new process offers just two different timelines, one focused on the academic or fiscal year and one on the calendar year with specific timelines.

Next we're changing the five point rating scale to a four point one. What this is looking to do is to be more descriptive in the ratings so that there can be more meaningful conversations. What this talks about is eliminating the middle ground. Oftentimes what happens with a five point scale is leaders will look to put people right in the middle because it's the easiest conversation to have. It will also help reduce rating inflation and it really does align with best practices. Typically what you will see is more of a four or a three point scale. In my experience, moving from a five point directly to a three point scale provides a lot of uncertainty instead of clarity for staff. Here you see the proposed rating scale definitions. Exceeds expectations would be a four, successfully meets expectations, a three, partially meets expectations a two

and does not meet expectations.

Next, streamlining the approval process. In today's policy once a performance appraisal has been written, two levels of manager are required to formally approve it. In the new policy, the manager who writes the performance appraisal will also approve it, although there will be an opportunity within the timeline for senior leadership to have access to all performance appraisals in their area. This includes being able to access individual performance appraisals directly, as well as looking at them as a group and being able to provide any feedback to leaders before any performance conversations happen.

The new process will provide a standard template. With all the different templates we have today, while some are sufficient in being able to provide feedback to employees, the inconsistency means that when people talk to a friend or a colleague, they're all having a different experience. Unfortunately we do still have times where employees do not end up receiving a review at all. The new process will provide a lot of opportunity for reporting, an opportunity for consistency, and an opportunity to have conversations throughout the entire year, thanks to check-in capabilities inside the system which we're really excited about. Those check-in options can happen during quarterly one-on-ones throughout the year where both the leader and the staff member can talk about what is going on throughout the year.

R. Zanibbi: The motion on the floor is to approve the proposed changes to E27.

S. Chung: I think this is nice because you have much clearer standards than before, but one thing about 'does not meet expectations', it says, 'receives negative feedback from peers, leaders, and students'. I think it is very unlikely that anyone would get negative feedback across the board, it's much more likely to be mixed.

R. Zanibbi: We may have talked about this before, I think the 'exceeds expectations' has something to the effect of 'consistently positive'. Is the word 'consistently' missing in front of 'negative'?

L. Berger: That may be true. Yes, we did talk about that.

S. Chung: Yes, maybe some words like that to make it clear because I don't think anybody is going to receive a hundred percent negative.

L. Berger: Okay.

C. Newman: *Inaudible*

L. Berger: I believe so, yes. I think there is some growth that we will have over time when we explain the new system a little bit more. Today, the system will require individuals to enter goals which can be completed in multiple ways. The employee enters them, the manager cascades them, etc. Once the performance appraisal process starts, all of those goals will be launched in the performance appraisal process as well as, and this is important to mention, as well as competencies that are related to job profiles in the staff career architecture. For the first year, we will not be rating those competencies. The reason is we are just throwing out the competencies, it would really not be fair to start rating someone when they don't know what those competencies are.. There is also a more standardized question that will go into the performance appraisal that will talk about the generalities of day-to-day operations outside of goals. I do feel like it hits the mark. There are a few things that I've heard from groups that I would say are a little more advanced in their process where they're focused more on detailed skills for each group. Our education on that is typically for someone to add in a general goal that will reflect that.

C. Hill: My first question is how strong is the support from Staff Council?

L. Berger: I will tell you after 2:30.

C. Hull: I would like to know if Staff Council supports this before I decide if I want to vote,

G. Vogler: What I can do is encourage everybody to remember that the policy that Tamaira outlined earlier, that you all can vote to endorse this. Even if we make a vote to not endorse this for whatever reason, when it goes back to UC, there's a final vote on this. So I would encourage everybody to remember that process. Staff Council has been included in a ton of these conversations. I will say that right now we are not in a great place with our performance appraisal process. So any improvement is welcome. That's the only level that I will commit to without having a full council in front of me. But I will also say, I don't think you all should hold on your side just to wait for us.

C. Hull: I appreciate that. But I do not want to vote for something and then find out later that Staff Council doesn't want it. Perhaps we could have a provisional vote saying if Staff Council votes for this, we vote for it. When I was on Academic Senate many years ago, evaluation issues came up a lot and it's distressing to see that it's still a problem. You feel that this policy will make it easier for us to see which managers evaluate their people. Will there be any kind of pressure on the manager who don't to actually start evaluating their people?

L. Berger: Yes, we absolutely will be able to see it. We now have reporting of where everyone is within the process. Did the staff member complete their portion of the review? Did they do their assessment? Has the manager gone? What is the next step? I really do think that it allows us the opportunity to be more specific about saying, 'Hey, you're in this space right now and we need to finalize that in order for your staff member to get a merit increase.'

E. Weedon: I agree wholeheartedly with Clyde. I'm very uncomfortable voting about this without knowing Staff Council's stance. I'm also very concerned about the reduction in the levels of performance from five down to four where there is still a middle ground 'successfully meets'. But what you don't have, and is lost, is the recognition to truly recognize outstanding performance. I don't know if all staff receive merit increases, but that could play a role and what could happen as a result is 'exceeds expectations' becomes the new 'outstanding'. And so it may be harder for staff to reach that and may result in more getting 'meets expectations'. So I just find it problematic that there's essentially two levels below 'meeting expectations' but only one level above, and the ramifications of only having one level above.

M. Anselm: I agree with Elissa. I would like to see the Staff Council vote.

A. Adrion: I saw your earlier presentation about this. I am in favor of simplifying the rating system. A lot of work has been done in Faculty Senate about reducing the number of rating scales. I think the system of four and the research that you've done into it makes a lot of sense. I would be in favor of it for staff and I'd be in favor of it for faculty. As I said at an earlier meeting, I think uniformity across how evaluations are done for both faculty and staff makes sense to me. I would be in support of this and I would encourage it to be implemented for faculty as well.

I. Puchades: I'm going along with the same comments. We had a big push by faculty to reduce from five to three, which was rejected by the deans and the provost on the basis that there would be no way to recognize outstanding contributors. I would like to reconcile your efforts with our efforts and whether going from five to four is the answer or it's not the answer. I would say the same argument against going from five to four still should hold true in that there's no way of recognizing outstanding performance.

S. Aldersley: Amy, I couldn't disagree with you more strongly, and that's what I'm afraid about in this. Because of the equality of the rating systems across staff and faculty and Gene, not to tread on anybody's toes, if I was a staff member, I would absolutely vote against this. You have one above 'meets' and two

below. Why any staff member would want to see that is beyond me. I'm very afraid that if this goes through, for the reasons that Amy says, because the administration will look at it that way, faculty will end up also with four ratings with two of them below meets expectations. This is an awful idea and I don't see any justification for it in what you've said in the research. I am a big proponent of going from five to three, but not this.

P. White: Can we move this vote to next time?

R. Zanibbi: **The motion is to table the vote on a new Staff Appraisal Policy (E27.0)**

**Passed by acclamation**

[Policy E27.0 Presentation](#)

[Policy E27.0 Edits](#)

Agenda Item No. 10: New Business; R. Zanibbi (1:46)

H. Ghazle: I need one Senator each to volunteer to serve on three committees: the Eisenhart, the Privacy Advisory and the Individual Conflict of Interest committees.

*Jeremy Cody volunteered for the Privacy Advisory Committee*

*Elissa Weedon volunteered for the Individual Conflict of Interest Committee*

*Carmody McCalley volunteered provisionally (pending Hamad checking on rank qualifications) for the Eisenhart Committee*

Agenda Item No. 11: Adjournment; R. Zanibbi (1:51)

Attendance 11/20/2025

Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended	Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended
Adrion, Amy	Alternate CAD Senator	X	Laver, Michael	CLA Senator	X
Aldersley, Stephen	Communications Officer/ SOIS Senator	X	LeBlevec, Kevin	CLA Senator	EXCUSED
Alm, Cecilia	CLA Senator		Liao, Wenjie	Alternate CLA Senator	X
Anselm, Martin	CET Senator	X	McCalley, Carmody	Alternate COS Senator	X
Arena, Jason	Alternate CAD Senator		McLaren, Amy	CAD Senator	X
Barone, Keri	Vice Chair/CLA Senator	X	Newman, Christian	GCCIS Senator	X
Boedo, Stephen	Alternate KGCOE Senator	X	Nickisher, Heidi	CAD Senator	EXCUSED
Brady, Kathleen	NTID Senator	X	Officer, Cindy	Alternate NTID Senator	
Brown, Jeremy	GCCIS Senator	EXCUSED	Olles, Deana	COS Senator	X
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	X	Overby, Katrina	Alternate CLA Senator	
Chung, Sorim	SCB Senator	X	Padmanabhan, Poornima	KGCOE Senator	X
Cody, Jeremy	COS Senator	X	Perry, Andrew	Alternate SOIS Senator	
Coppenbarger, Matthew	COS Senator	X	Puchades, Ivan	KGCOE Senator	X
Crawford, Denton	CAD Senator	X	Ray, Amit	CLA Senator	
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	X
Davis, Stacey	NTID Senator	X	Ross, Annemarie	NTID Senator	X
De Wit Paul, Alissa	Alternate GIS Senator		Sanders, Cynthia	NTID Senator	X
DiRisio, Keli	CAD Senator		Shaaban, Muhammad	Alternate tKGCOE Senator	
Eirikur Hull, Clyde	SCB Senator	X	Song, Qian	SCB Senator	X
Ghazle, Hamad	Operations Officer/CHST Senator	X	Staff Council Rep	Gene Vogler	X
Ghoneim, Hany	Alternate KGCOE Senator		Student Government Rep	Igor Polotai	X
Hardin, Jessica	CLA Senator	EXCUSED	Sweeney, Kevin	Alternate SCB Senator	
Hartpence, Bruce	Alternate GCCIS Senator		Thomas, Bolaji	CHST Senator	EXCUSED
Jadamba, Basca	COS Senator	X	Tsouri, Gill	KGCOE Senator	X
Johnson, Dan	CET Senator	X	Villasmil, Larry	CET Senator	EXCUSED
Johnson, Scott	GCCIS Senator		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	KGCOE Senator	X	Wiandt, Tamas	Alternate COS Senator	
Kwasinski, Andres	Alternate KGCOE Senator		Worrell, Tracy	Alternate CLA Senator	
Lanzafame, Joseph	Treasurer/COS Senator	X	Zanibbi, Richard	Chair/GCCIS Senator	X
Lapizco-Encinas, Blanca	KGCOE Senator	EXCUSED	Zlochower, Yosef	COS Senator	X



Interpreters: Nicole Crouse-Dickerson and Jennaca Saeva

Student Assistant: Ella Kolodziej

Presenters: Erika Duthiers, Rachel Pelta and Leah Burger