

## Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, January 15, 2026

12:15 - 1:50 PM

Zoom

Attendance: See Below

Agenda Item No. 1: Call to Order; R. Zanibbi (12:16)

[Communication officer's note: meeting was moved from in person to Zoom given the inclement weather]

Meeting is called to order by senate chair R. Zanibbi at 12:16 PM.

Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; R. Zanibbi (12:16)

R. Zanibbi moves the adoption of the agenda and asks for any objections to approving the agenda as shown.

**-Motion approved by acclamation**

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

Michael Laver asks for any amendments or clarifications from the minutes of December 4.

-Motion to approve the minutes (Michael L./Amit R.)

**-Minutes of November 20th meeting approved by acclamation**

[December 4, 2025 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes](#)

Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; R. Zanibbi (12:18)

-Chair of senate includes has included a list of resources for senators in the executive committee reports that are on the shared drive.

-Policy board has been updated in the drive with most recent votes

-senate standing committee information also included

-executive committee has met with and will ask committee chairs to provide an interim report in mid-March. Final version will be due in the middle of April.

-Welcome to Michael Laver as Communication Officer.

-Survey for changes to B2 coming this week. 2 changes are: adding two student members to the AAC; add clinical and full clinical faculty to the voting ranks of faculty.

-ICC approved a proposal for a new BS in AI in GCCIS. Will come to senate on February 5, with materials shared well before that.

-active taskforces: student retention; academic freedom; longer evaluation cycles for full professors and principle lecturers; graduate tuition.

-MLK Day: Let Freedom Ring program and Expressions of King's Legacy. Please do register and attend

these programs and promote them.

[Executive Committee Report](#)

Agenda Item No. 5: Shared Governance Update; Igor Politai/Joanna Prescott (12:23)

**Student Government**

- On campus jobs opportunity fair for on-campus jobs in mid-February
- anyone interested in student workers are invited to participate.
- faculty who need research or teaching assistants, please participate

**Staff Council**

- Held votes for policy changes
- C6.1: did not endorse the policy because concerns that the policy would remove protections. Just because we haven't used it doesn't mean it is not important. Some concern that there would be little to no documentation for staff if they were to use, for example, the Ombuds office rather than HR.
- E27: appraisal policy for staff: concerns brought to HR involving clarification for self-appraisal process and who is responsible for writing reviews a snot all persons wo review staff do not have the title of manager. Section D: Reports: asked that reports be made to staff and university councils upon request and perhaps an annual presentation. Some language changes also suggested around the language of "surpassing job requirements and expectations." Some confusion about going from a 5 scale rating to a 4 scale, but we are willing to see how the new policy goes and revisit. Performance improvement documentation should be kept on file with HR. If a PIP put in place, that should talked about before the process begins so that employee can start making changes earlier. HR seems receptive to these suggestions.
- R. Zannibi: does document presented today reflect changes? Joanna: Yes, I believe so.

Agenda Item No. 6: Degree Proposal: Accelerated BS in Nursing (CHST); E. Debartolo and H. Ghazle (12:31)

Highlights of the proposal

- 1 year program as an add on to an existing bachelor's degree to achieve licensure and professional practice
- combination of coursework and practice; growing demand in the Rochester Regional system; degree will also expand collaboration with RRH; no electives-the curriculum highly prescribed; CHST is able to offer the degree in existing space on campus; demonstrated connection to strategic plan and goals (partnership with RRH; technology and innovation focus; peer reviews mostly have these programs); demonstrated employer needs now and in the future; RRH provided strong letter of support from the CEO.
- ICC asked a lot of questions, and vote was contingent on hiring a program director; vote on Nov. 24 passed ICC

## Questions

-Joe L.: Has thought been given to the current residency requirement? Hamad G.: this is a 50 credit program, so satisfies the requirement.

-Heidi N.: Is the shortage of nurses great enough to have another accelerated degree? Hamad: Almost 900 nurses needed, so while there are multiple programs, the demands go way beyond the ability to provide curriculum.

-Julius C.: Can you summarize what enrollment management feedback was? Hamad: extensive report from EM. A pressing need for this program was recognized and they gave their “blessing.” Also, resources needed was vetted with Finance and Administration. Program is also a stepping stone to create a full bachelor’s degree program. NYS law that all RNs must have a bachelor’s within ten years of getting their associate’s. This program will allow us to collect data to apply for accreditation, which will be granted before first cohort graduates. Jules: Yes, but, how enthusiastic was EM about this on a 5 point scale? Hamad: They are excited about it. PowerPoint with hundreds of slides and they believe that over 300 students will be coming into the bachelor’s program. Stephen A.: Is CHST confident that F&A will deliver the resources needed? Beth: ICC asked that question about resources and CHST answered those questions and said that they are confident that they will have the resources. F&A committed to requested resources such as the program director. Search firm will also be used for a program director. Also, the physical facilities will be ready prior to the first cohort. We also have a commitment for a new simulation center before the first cohort comes in (summer 2027 expected completion date). Clyde H.: Is a great idea and that we should not spend a lot of time on this because ICC has already vetted this.

**-Beth D./Scott J. moves and seconds the motion to approve the accelerated degree proposal in Nursing.**

**-Vote Result: 42-0-1**

[Degree Proposal Presentation](#)

## Agenda Item No. 7: Policy D18.0 (Student Conduct Process) Hazing Definitions; C. Pariseau (12:54)

-C. Pariseau is associate director of student conduct and conflict resolution. President Biden signed the Stop Campus Hazing Act in December 2024. 4 things go into the law: Clearly Report; Institutions have to compile data for hazing incidents both for those alleged and for those found responsible ; statement of policy for prevention and awareness related to hazing; and campus hazing transparency report updated every 6 months.

-Had to change the definition of a student group: can be a few as two students and does not have to be recognized by the institution.

-New definition is “any organization at an institution of higher education (such as club, society, association, varsity or junior varsity athletic team, club sports team, fraternity, sorority, band, or student government) in which 2 or more members are students enrolled at the institution of higher education whether or not the organization is established or recognized by the institution.”

-the new definition of hazing: “any intentional, knowing or reckless act committed by a person (whether individually or in concert with other persons) against another person or persons regardless of the willingness of such person or persons to participate that: is committed in the course of initiation into, an affiliation with, or the maintenance of membership in a student organization; and causes or creates a risk above the reasonable risk encountered in the course of participation in the institution of higher

education or the organization (such as physical preparation necessary for participation in an athletic team), or physical or psychological injury including..." Lots of examples provided.

-By June 23<sup>rd</sup> institutional policy was supposed to be ready to go. Based on the timing, we went to the executive committee of University Council. They approved the policy provided it goes to the governing bodies to provide an opportunity to give feedback. Policy changes are already on our website.

-for other components of D18, we will still use the previous definition of hazing (group must be recognized by the institution). We kept the provision that someone can be held responsible for violation if they do not report hazing they know about.

-First report was already submitted. Students not named individually. No hazing incidents reported. Updated in December and June every year.

-This October the first annual security report will be submitted.

-Stacey D.: In October 2026 security report will be incidents of hazing submitted to the institute whether it rises to level of hazing or if there is a violation. Transparency report includes only those incidents that result in a violation.

-Bruce H: should the policy include a reference to the SCHA? C. Pariseau: Right now, other policies in D18 do not refer to laws, but we created a website within student conduct that provides guidance and support about hazing. That website has information about the SCHA.

-Poornima: If this has been presented to Student Government and was there feedback? Not yet. Staff Council had no real feedback. Will go before Student Government this semester. Also presented to UC.

-Does hazing (forced consumption) also include injections or smoking? C. Pariseau: Yes. Any form of consumption is included.

-Alyssa W.: The way policy is written says two or more people, in an organization, but what about people who have a personal relationship outside of organizational events or, for example, roommates? C. Pariseau: We are all learning together. First, is it considered a student organization and is the hazing on behalf of the organization. If it has nothing to do with the organization, they can still be in violation of other parts of D18.

-Mark R.: Is requiring a confidence course considered hazing? C. Pariseau: Will have to determine that harm has resulted from that course. We have put together a training opportunity required for student leaders. Stacey D.: Leadership required to take this training about identifying what might be hazing and recognizing that even simple things like calling the president Sir or Ma'am can cause duress. Also, if not available now, will be accessible to all faculty and staff. Athletics and Greek life have their own hazing training. Scott J.: Extreme physical activity and use of Sir and Ma'am is required for ROTC—what about that? C. Pariseau: We have not looked at ROTC. There was an accusation in athletics, but did not rise to the level of a violation.

-Richard Z.: Out of time. Should we have you come back after SG? We are not asking you to approve; it is informational since these changes are required by law.

-Clyde: We should vote; I object to the notion that just because University Council Executive Committee approved we do not have to vote.

**-Carly/Clyde moves and seconds.**

**-Vote Result: 36-0-2**

[Policy D18.0 Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 8: RIT Policies D08.0 (Student Academic Integrity Policy) and D18.2 (Student Appeals Policy) Revisions; B. Herring (1:20)

You have all been provided with the edits. Under review for about 10 years now! Lots of edits to wording, so I will not go over all changes. Red-lined document provided as well as changes we made last year.

- summary of changes:

- updated violations to include much wider range of violations. Multiple examples also included, including sabotage and duplicate submission.

- trying to set up a university wide reporting system. The Maxient system is proposed since it is already used for reporting residential life issues. Document simply refers to online reporting system, though, because we may change systems in the future. Currently, email is used, and there are difficulties with tracking information. For example, violations are, anecdotally, not reported beyond the immediate faculty and perhaps deans' delegate. This makes it hard to track multiple violations.

- streamlining appeals process. We propose including advocate from the beginning to streamline the process. Now, 20 minutes per party whereas before each witness had 5 minutes. Proposed 5-minute closing remarks. New process says that appeals end with the dean's office whereas before there was a university appeals board for conduct and then it could be appealed to the provost. Happens very rarely. Both AAC and SAC think that academic issues should not be going to the appeals board, which is largely reserved for conduct issues. Requested by student affairs. Now D8 is only concerned with academic issues and D18 is concerned with other issues.

- D18 must be changed as well because in D18.2 mentions D8 appeals. In contact with SCO and they are working on D18.2 update. This will come forward later. A few references in other places, and these would be changed as well.

- Not requesting a vote today.

- Discussion

- Heidi N.: What is the onus on faculty for assessing cheating? Also, has this been to SG and how do they feel. B. Herring: Has been presented to student government as well as student affairs and ombuds. SG had some concerns as to who has access to documents? Concern that appeals are being limited. There was some confusion: we are not limiting appeals, just ending them with the dean's office.

- Joe J.: Have deans been asked about the new policies? Bruce H.: Not directly with deans or dean's council. Not changing any dean's level responsibility. Dean's designee has always been in the college academic misconduct committee and we did clarify that the dean's designee would be the vote to block a tie. A potential increase in volume could result.

- Not looking for a vote today. Last time there was a lot of comments about what needs to happen before voting.

- Igor P.: We would like to have this come back to SG before a faculty vote.

- Hamad: We are at 1:38, so we need to move on. Perhaps make the policy available to the faculty as a whole in the Google Drive. Bruce H. agrees to this.

[Policies D08.0 and D18.2 Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 9: FAC Policy E04.0 (Faculty Employment Policy) Updates; L. Fernandes and H. Nickisher (1:40)

Leonie: We are returning to the senate. These changes came about as a regular 5 year review of E4. Updates were made and brought to senate in April 2024. Went to provost for approval, and provost requested additional changes to another portion of the policy. Brought back to FAC, reviewed those, met with the provost, and then went back to FAC, approved unanimously in October 2025.

-Changes are to the scholarship paragraph. Joe L.: agree in principle, but the sentence that says “non-tenure track faculty may be expected to engage in scholarship depending on their contract...” E6.0 discusses scholarship expectation as depending on rank, so this would be out of synch with E6. Contract term muddies this a bit. Leonie F: There are some ranks where some in the rank may have to do scholarship and some may not, so contract takes care of this.

-Bolaji T.: Clinical faculty are required to do research, so this will have to be explicit in their contracts. Also, if non-tenure track faculty are asked to engage in scholarship, can they go back to their deans and ask to be tenure track? Leonie F.: Provost was also concerned about this; this was ambiguous in the existing language, so these changes make this clearer by using the term “contract.”

-Heidi N.: I want to reiterate that this is not about conflating E4 and E6. Lecturers do not have an expectation of scholarship, so one way to look at this is that there are occasionally exceptions, and this language says those exceptions are in their contracts.

-Clyde H.: Might be situation where an adjunct professor teaches one class, but we pay them more to do some research. I think the language of contract is a good thing. I don’t see better language for this.

-Poornima. New language is confusing. Not in favor of adding the non-tenure track faculty doing research in there because it introduces confusion.

-Richard Z.: I do see some dangers here, for example, compromising the tenure track positions as a designation of security and recognition of expertise.

**-Motion to approve proposed changes to Policy E4: Leonie/Clyde moves and seconds.**

-Bolaji: Wouldn’t it be good to address some of these questions before we vote?

-Michael L.: It is now 1:53 and asking for a vote when we are over time severely compromises faculty who feel passionate about this but also need to teach at 2, including myself!

**-Clyde: Move to adjourn: Bolaji seconds.**

**-Motion Passes without opposition.**

**-Richard Z.:** Leonie will be asked to come back. Apologies for running out of time. \

[FAC E04.0 Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 10: New Business; R. Zanibbi (N/A)

[Michael Laver’s comment: No time for this agenda item]

Agenda Item No. 11: Adjournment; R. Zanibbi (1:54)

**-Clyde: Move to adjourn: Bolaji seconds.**  
**-Motion Passes without opposition.**

Attendance 1/15/2026

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

Interpreters: Sonya Chavis and Dana Cardona

Student Assistant: Ella Kolodziej

Presenters: Elizabeth DeBartolo, Hamad Ghazle, Carly Pariseau, Bruce Herring, Leonie Fernandes and Heidi Nickisher