Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, February 19, 2026   12:15 - 1:50 PM   Zoom

Attendance: See Below

Agenda Item No. 1: Call to Order; K. Barone (12:16)

Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; R. Zanibbi (12:17)
Motion to approve the Agenda (M. Anselm/J. Lanzafame)   **Motion Passes without objection**

Agenda Item No. 3: Communications Officer's Report/Approval of Minutes; M. Laver (12:17)
Motion to approve the Agenda (M. Laver/J. Lanzafame)   **Motion Passes without objection**   [February 5, 2026 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes](#)

Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; K. Barone (12:18)

B2 Changes were approved by the president
 	
 All senate resources are available in the shared drive, orientation, governance policies, committee assignments, etc.
    -Policy board tracker is also there as well as committees and taskforces materials
 New BS in AI was approved last meeting
    -there is a spreadsheet for electives in the BS in AI degree program
 	
 D8 is coming to senate today, and that is still open for comment in the policy board.
    -vote will happen March 5

Agenda Item No. 5: Shared Governance Update; (12:20)
No Student Government or Staff Council Report

Agenda Item No. 6: Policy E04.0 (Faculty Employment); L. Fernandes (12:21)

Changes were brought multiple times to senate

    -original charge was to do a 5 year review, completed in 2024. Updates approved by senate

    -provost and president requested changes to scholarship section of the policy

    -concern raised at senate with one part that could be in conflict with E6.

    -concerns were addressed and we are now presenting for approval.

Motion to approve the changes to this policy (C. Hull/H. Nikisher)

    B. Thomas: Can faculty take the results of their research and form a company? In other words, research is not just for teaching. I like this change.

Motion Passes (38-0-0)

Policy E04.0 Presentation

Policy E04.0 Edits

Agenda Item No. 7: GIS Tenure & Promotion Policy Updates; S. Holmes (12:29)

We have been reviewing our tenure and promotion expectations and we recognize that they need to be updated

    -15 years since we've updated them.

    -GIS has two academic unity, sustainability and architecture

    -We need to have senate vote and approve changes

Changes:

    -internally voted on these changes, so this is the last step

    -formatting is different

    -main updates are the fact that we had no reference to mid tenure review, and we had to develop those guidelines

    -we had a lot of redundant and unclear connections with what the provost puts out for tenure and promotion

    -Reference to Architecture's accreditation (Association of Collegiate School of Architecture).

      -architecture was underrepresented in our policies

    -References to advising was cleared up to make sure that PhD/Masters advising was a part of teaching as opposed to other advising which can be lumped under service

    -We created two documents: one was a procedure document and one a policy document

      -for example, the timeline of actions in in the procedure document

    -approved by Faculty on 13-January, 2026

Motion to approve GIS Tenure and Promotions Policy (J. Chiavaroli/C. Hull)

   -B. Hartpence: Page 5 has a rendering problem in the scholarship section. S. Holmes: This has been cleaned up in the new document. Also, we are on a portfolio model because scholarship and teaching requirements are different between two schools, so the new documents reflect this. B. Thomas: Are we expecting a vote today? No red line document? S. Holmes: the whole document would be redlined. No real change from RIT policy, though. J. Chiavaroli: a rebuild, so a red line document would be fruitless.

Motion Passes (39-0-1)

GIS Presentation

Expectations for Tenure

Policy on Tenure and Promotion

Tenure and Promotion Review Schedule

Agenda Item No. 8: United Way Campaign; A. Dulac (12:42)

Ashley is one of the campaign coordinators, and today she will talk about the campaign and how to be involved

   -United is the Way is this year's theme.

   -RIT has been recognized as a workplace champion

   -last year goal was surpassed with 479 donors with 294 event volunteers!

   -goal this year is 225,000 dollars. 3 events so far: golf tournament, mug-tug, and miracle minute hockey game. Almost 19,000 dollars raised

   -donor goal is 500; participant goal is 300.

   -if people can't donate money, we would like people to donate time.

   -last year, 14,726 service hours completed, with an impact of over 444,000 dollars

   -How can you be involved?

    -PB Jam is coming up! Please email me or United Way RIT email.

    -Chair-ity auction is coming up! Bidding starts March 16th and ends March 27. Last year 6000 raised

    -Day of Caring at Mt. Hope Cemetery on Thursday, May 21 with more information to follow

   -Epledge donations are welcome! Our website goes live MArch 2. Funds go to the community fund or agency of your choice.

United Way Presentation

Agenda Item No. 9: New Business; K. Barone (12:52)

Motion to move new business ahead of D8 (M. Laver/J. Lanzafame)

Motion approved unanimously

_____

Senate resolves that it will not consider degree proposals unless the relevant curriculum committee has demonstrated that it has investigated and recommended potential electives for the degree from across the campus, with each college representative having solicited constituent feedback on possible electives and brought that feedback to the committee and the proposing unit (K. LeBlevec/A. Ray)

   -C. Hull: This makes sense. I have seen many times that when a degree comes to senate and people in one college or another will highlight electives that make sense, and often the proposers were not aware, but when it gets to senate, proposers don't want to make changes. It is not unreasonable to have college reps to investigate this at the committee level. Also there are issues of duplication of effort. Perhaps the proposal can be sent in advance to the colleges for consideration through committee reps. J. Chavarolli: a hypothetical. Suppose you have an elective requirement in your college, but how do you deal with the concept of an open elective, which are supposed to be designed to stretch students? Do we have to now have to have a list of electives from which students have to choose? K. LeBleve: This does not close the door for other open electives, but simply to encourage more communication among units as per courses that are relevant to the proposed degree. J. Lanzafame: I hate this motion not because there are not wonderful electives, but because the curriculum tables don't list broad electives. We have perspectives, immersions, open electives, etc. for this very reason. We don't prescribe broad lists of electives on tables. We are also telling ICC how to run their committee. A. Ross: I am concerned about the approval process timeline. How will this impact the approval process? I do think it is very important to have more communication, though. B. Hartpence: I am concerned this may be a duplication of effort since ICC is already doing this and we already have guardrails on this. Are electives part of the discussion in terms of duplication of effort? If this were to be approved, what does the phrase "can demonstrate" mean in this motion? How long do we wait for other colleges to get back to you? A. Kwasinski: I have serious concerns about this, mainly what it means to demonstrate; what is the criteria for demonstration? A. Ray: I am on the ICC. Many degrees are multidisciplinary and it is crucial that these degrees are not just technical degrees, and we should be breaking down barriers, especially as degrees are reaching into other colleges. This step can be done efficiently if the committee reps are proactive about being in touch with their constituency. H. Nickisher: Thank you for this motion. This is not about telling the ICC what to do, but about broadly educating our students, and being thorough and making sure we are offering the best educational experience for our students. In the recent AI degree, there are many courses in various colleges that should have been included. Time is always a factor, but a couple weeks would not have affected the process substantively.

Motion Passes (18-12-7)

Agenda Item No. 9: Policy D08.0 (Student Academic Integrity Policy); B. Herring (1:08)

Came to senate in January about these revisions. No major changes since then, but it is a huge policy,

so we want to have plenty of time for people to weigh in.

-in March, we will be looking for a vote, but today I will just review the major changes.

-We added several more examples of academic integrity violations

-we propose using Maxient since currently everything is done through email. This new online system makes it easier to track violations and for faculty to submit violations.

-Updated the hearing process to streamline the process and be more uniform. Previously each witness had 5 minutes, but now, each party has 20 total minutes, with 5 minutes for closing remarks.

-faster appeals process are incorporated into the new revisions. In some cases, outcomes are not arrived at until the next semester and in some cases in the next academic year. Now, the process is less prescribed and once cases go to the integrity committee, appeals end with the dean of the academic unit.

-essentially we are trying to make a split between academic issues, handled at the college level, and student behavior issues, handled at the university level through Student Affairs. D 18 will be updated to reflect this.

-Maximum penalty of a 0 for the course, so we feel we do not need to go beyond the college.

-Several groups have reviewed this, Student Government, Student Affairs, Ombuds, and now senate.

 Questions: A. Weeden: Do you have a redline document to display? Under Section 5: Academic Integrity Hearing Procedures, q: So, at the conclusion of the academic integrity hearing, the committee will determine by a simple majority if a breach of academic integrity did or did not occur. Then if you go to subsection Y: it states that if the committee agrees that a violation has occurred, and then if the student's trying to withdraw, the F would be converted to the F, but the F may not be the action that the committee determined is appropriate. Am I missing something or does that not reconcile? B. Herring: Okay, I understand what you're saying. So, this can be modified to say, "**if** the result is an F in the course…" J. Johnson: I'd like to thank the AAC for all of the hard work on this current reiteration of D.8. That being said, the Ombuds Office does see some concerns with the policy as it is currently written. Where in the policy does it share where the authority of an individual faculty member starts and stops, particularly with the new violations that occur outside the classroom? B. Herring: This is not explicitly expressed in the policy, but the faculty will initiate a violation with a recommended disciplinary action. Where it stops would be either at the academic integrity hearing. J. Johnson: Some of the violations are not specific to any homework/exam, etc. An example being "submitting false medical information". Given that the list of disciplinary actions only include a warning, an F in the course, or reduced credit/grade of 0 on the offending activity, how would such a violation be adjudicated? Is there a reason why no educational actions are listed as possible outcomes? B. Herring: We did not consider specific educational actions, they would simply be under the reduced grade policy. We could include other educational outcomes, but we do not explicitly discuss that in this policy. J. Johnson: I know that the committee is currently looking into the Maxient information system, currently used by the Center for Student Conduct and Conflict Resolution, Title IX, and Human Resources, as a method to manage the correspondence and retention of records. This will take a lot of administrative support and training for the faculty. Will the policy be on hold until that is in place? B. Herring: that is more of a senate decision and not an AAC decision. Our impression is that once it was approved, there would be a timeline to make this policy live.

Policy D08.0 Presentation

[Policy D08.0 Edits](#)

Agenda Item No. 10: Adjournment; K. Barone (1:26)

Meeting adjourned by K. Barone at 1:26.

Attendance 2/19/2026

Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended	Name	Relationship to Senate	Attended
Adrion, Amy	Alternate CAD Senator		Lapizco-Encinas, Blanca	KGCOE Senator	X
Alm, Cecilia	CLA Senator	X	Laver, Michael	Communications Officer/CLA Senator	X
Anselm, Martin	CET Senator	X	LeBlevec, Kevin	CLA Senator	X
Arena, Jason	Alternate CAD Senator		Liao, Wenjie	Alternate CLA Senator	
Barone, Keri	Vice Chair/CLA Senator	X	Mardini, Ihab	Alternate CAD Senator	X
Beck, Makini	SOIS Senator	X	McCalley, Carmody	Alternate COS Senator	
Brady, Kathleen	NTID Senator	X	McLaren, Amy	CAD Senator	
Brown, Jeremy	GCCIS Senator	X	Nickisher, Heidi	CAD Senator	X

Brown, Tamaira	Senate Coordinator	X		Officer, Cindy	Alternate NTID Senator	
Butler, Janine	NTID Senator	X		Olles, Deana	COS Senator	X
Butler, Joshua	Alternate NTID Senator			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	Excused
Coppenbarger, Matthew	COS Senator	X		Perry, Andrew	Alternate SOIS Senator	
Cromer, Michael	Alternate COS Senator			Ray, Amit	CLA Senator	X
Cui, Feng	Alternate COS Senator			Reinicke, Bryan	Alternate SCB Senator	
DAmanda, Elisabetta	Alternate CLA Senator			Reisch, Mark	CAD Senator	X
David, Prabu	Provost	Excused		Rich, Lexi	Alternate CET Senator	
Davis, Stacey	NTID Senator	X		Ross, Annemarie	NTID Senator	X
De Wit Paul, Alissa	Alternate GIS Senator	X		Sanders, Cynthia	NTID Senator	X
DiRisio, Keli	CAD Senator	X		Shaaban, Muhammad	Alternate KGCOE Senator	
Eirikur Hull, Clyde	SCB Senator	X		Song, Qian	SCB Senator	X
Ghazle, Hamad	Operations Officer/CHST Senator	X		Staff Council Rep	Amanda Hughes	X
Ghoneim, Hany	Alternate KGCOE Senator	X		Student Government Rep	Igor Polotai	
Hardin, Jessica	CLA Senator	X		Sweeney, Kevin	Alternate SCB Senator	
Hartpence, Bruce	Alternate GCCIS Senator	X		Thomas, Bolaji	CHST Senator	X
Hoople, Jason	Alternate KGCOE 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	Excused
Kwasinski, Andres	Alternate KGCOE Senator	X		Zlochower, Yosef	COS Senator	X
Lanzafame, Joseph	Treasurer/COS Senator	X				

Interpreters: Sonya Chavis and Dana Cardona

Student Assistant: Ella Kolodziej

Presenters: Leonie Fernandes, Seth Holmes, Ashley Dulac and Bruce Herring