

Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, April 30, 2026

12:15 - 1:50 PM

Zoom

Attendance: See Below

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

R. Zanibbi calls the meeting to order

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

Motion to approve the agenda (R. Zanibbi/S. Johnson)

Motion passes without objection

Agenda Item No. 3: Provost Updates; P. David (12:18)

Thanks to everyone for a very productive year!

-a very challenging environment for higher ed

Highlights:

- welcomes a new president
- new strategic plan
- Accreditation
- General Education revision begun
- Workday transition

Updates:

- budget. Is tied to enrollment so keeping a close eye on this (summer melt, etc.)
- summer initiative: benchmark initiative as a result of senate requests
- Dubai: some faculty are back to work in person, and a phased policy has been instituted
- Research last year, despite budgetary challenges, we are on par with grants from previous years
- If all goes well, we will graduate 70 PhD students this year, which is crucial for R1 status
- Transitions: CHST, NTID, and now SCB next year; Ass. Provost for International Education; VPFA
- Faculty Affairs committee: Plan for extended review for full professors and principle lecturers.

Questions:

- No questions

Agenda Item No. 4: Communications Officer's Report/Approval of Minutes; M. Laver (12:19)

Motion to approve minutes of 4/16 (R. Zanibbi/M. Anselm)

Motion passes without objection

[April 16, 2026 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes](#)

Agenda Item No. 5: Treasurer Report; J. Lanzafame (12:27)

Budget is \$12,500 per year

- as of last week, \$2020.42 remaining with two expenses left
- Lovin' Cup event later today and office supply order.
- final budget report will be next week

Questions:

- P. Padmanabhan: What is money used for?
- J. Lanzafame: almost all catering, but also governance retreat at Fisher, Tate Reserve rental, but most expenses tied to catering.
- R. Zanibbi: If anyone wants to see the breakdown, reach out and we will share
- J. Lanzafame: yes, we will share
- A. McGowan: Are new members also invited?
- R. Zanibbi: Yes! Invite shared widely

Agenda Item No. 6: Executive Committee Report; R. Zanibbi (12:30)

Senator Resources

1. General Information

- [\[link\]](#) **Faculty Senate home page.** List of senators, senate committee memberships, committee charges, past committee reports, etc.
- [\[link\]](#) **Slides from Senate Orientation.** RIT college representation, committees, expectations, and key policies governing work at senate:
 - [B2 \(Charter of Academic Governance\)](#)
 - [B5 \(the 'Policy on Policies'\)](#)
- [\[link\]](#) **Guidelines.** Senate elections & senator/committee chair responsibility guidelines
- [\[link\]](#) **List of Committees and Appointments.** Includes both senate-level and university-level committees and appointments.

2. Senate Meetings

- [\[link\]](#) **Minutes & Materials from Past Meetings**
 - **Note:** Scroll down to "Past Meetings"
- [\[link\]](#) **Roberts' Rules of Order: 4-page 'cheat sheet'**
 - ...which we (try our best to) follow during senate meetings

3. Policies

- [\[link\]](#) **Policy Board:** history & status for policies considered at senate
- [\[link\]](#) **COMMENTS directory for policy revisions.** Directories contain
 - (1) slides/overview where available,
 - (2) redline policy drafts that can be commented on in-place, and
 - (3) a text file for additional comments.
- [\[link\]](#) **RIT Governance Policy Library**

- d. [\[link\]](#) **Other RIT Policies** (e.g., Administrative, Student, College)
 - 4. **Senate Committees**
 - a. [\[link\]](#) **Charges Assigned to Standing Committees**
 - **Note:** **See Tab 3c (the leftmost tab)
 - b. [\[link\]](#) **Final Reports, Academic Year 2025-2026**
 - c. [\[link\]](#) **Committee Reports from Last Academic Year (2024-2025)**
 - [\[link\]](#) **Archive:** Reports from AY2019-2020 – AY2024-2025
-

Active Task Forces

1. Student Graduation and Retention (**Chair:** Clyde Hull, SCB)
2. Graduate Tuition (**Chair:** Poornima Padmanabhan, KGC OE)
3. Longer Evaluation Cycles for Senior Faculty – ***draft proposal currently under review*** (**Co-Chairs:** Zhi Tang, SCB and Christian Linte, KGC OE)
 - a. “Senior Faculty”: Full Professors and Principal Lecturers
4. Academic Freedom (**Chair:** TBD (currently: Mary Lynn Reed, COS))

Announcements for Upcoming Events

1. **REMINDER: TODAY 3-6pm: Faculty Senate end-of-year get-together at Lovin’ Cup. Food will be provided.** All members of senate and senate committees are invited!
2. **Convocation next week.** Friday/Saturday May 8/9.
 - a. Enjoy celebrating our work and the accomplishments of our students!

Senate Business

1. **A warm welcome to our new senators!** An email was sent out with some information for you to review at your leisure. We will provide updated materials in fall for our annual orientation session.
2. **Senate Committee Luncheon, last Thursday (Apr 23).** This year all of the committees had an end-of-year luncheon together. This worked well, and we will likely repeat this again next spring.

Tamaira was given flowers and a gift card in recognition of the excellent work that she does for senate, and the Provost thanked the senate committees for their good work.

There was then a wide-ranging discussion, among other topics talking about how service is considered in annual evaluations, and how to increase the appreciation for and visibility of work done for senate, possibly through email communications or even RIT News items, and communications from the administration to department chairs (some already exist, e.g., by LaVerne McQuiller Williams through the Council of Chairs). Disseminating and informing people about policy changes is an important question to address, for example.

3. Charges for next year & final standing committee reports

- Link to charges survey:
https://rit.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_4SeHTeunANS10wu
- An email has been sent with information and a link to submit charges for next year. ALL members of the RIT community (students, staff, administrators, and faculty) may propose charges; senate will then select charges and assign them to committees in fall.
- Final committee reports have been submitted ([link](#))
- Committee chairs: an email was sent – please fill in the provided spreadsheet to share whom was elected to chair your committee next year, and when the first meeting will be.

4. Related to Charges: Faculty Services Questionnaire (due May 7)

- Will be open until May 7.
- If you haven't please complete the survey when you can ([link](#)).

5. BS in AI Electives list ([link](#)). The chair met with Dean Matt Huenerfath (GCCIS) last week to discuss the courses collected from senate.

- It was agreed that FSEC will provide the set of upper-year courses (300+) that require at most one elective outside of the BS in AI core, and then share this with the faculty responsible for curriculum in the BS in AI degree.
- Planning to review and select from this list in fall (possibly with information gathering help from ICC and/or other curriculum committees); a related charge for next year will likely be proposed by FSEC.

6. Planned for New Business today (really!)

- Clyde Hull: Motion to create a task force to look into forming a stand-alone group for Emeritus Professors.

Questions/ Comments:

Bruce Hartpence: There seems to be some confusion about policy versions since there are so many places where these materials are located. There's the RIT website where published versions are found, there's the meeting materials for any given week, there's this policy repository for senate where people can make suggestions, and faculty seem to be confused where exactly to find things.

T. Brown: Policies on Google Drive are edited, redline documents, and website are policies that are currently in place, so I would need more information about source of confusion

B. Hartpence: The proliferation of senate related documents is the real issue and how best to direct people to resources that they would find useful without confusion.

R. Zanibbi: That is the reason for the shared drive so that everyone can access proposed changes to policy and they are all in one place! Because of time we have to move on.

Agenda Item No. 7: Shared Governance Update; I. Politai; Joanna Prescott (12:42)

J. Prescott:

- Chair and Vice Chair elections in meetings this afternoon
- Rest of the executive committee votes will be May 14th
- Staff picnic is May 12!

Agenda Item No. 8: Faculty Affairs Committee Policy E7.0 (Annual Review of Faculty) Revision; C. Babbitt (12:43)

Charge: "Currently for self-appraisal, faculty are not permitted to include childbirth under the life circumstances impact statement. I would like to see this policy reconsidered to allow faculty to describe the impact childbirth has had on their work."

Please see the attached report for details of the proposed language

Policy Review:

- E33 and FMLA
- impact statement is for faculty to contextualize impact of life situations during annual review, not to provide legal accommodations, workload modification, etc.
- some life circumstances may be related to approved leave but could also be used for other reasons
- no clear, rational reason for exclusion
- Related finding: friendly amendment in 2022 to include personal illness or injury, but not put into policy. Recommend to bundle this with today's recommendations.
- Feedback from provost office: add "include, but are not limited to..."

Questions:

P. Padmanabhan: I'm a little confused: Policy E33.1 has a workload modification that seems to address childbirth and adoption.

C. Babbitt: I have had discussions with HR and with Faculty affairs about this. The workload modification policy is very specific to teaching load and other aspects of workload that can be formally modified, and thus not worked into the annual review. This revision is solely for faculty to contextualize impacts of life events (health issues, children's illness, etc.). Also, consider if a faculty was on leave for childbirth in fall semester. Not expected to do work legally, but if they missed a critical conference during this time, they should be able to contextualize this impact on their career. This allows faculty to humanize their annual review and serve as the abscess for discussion with their supervisor. Provides flexibility.

P. Padmanabhan: Yes, I think I have another concern. You know, childbirth and adoption, it seems like, you know, I think the time is not very well defined. You know, you do talk about elder care and caregiver responsibilities. It says for ill or injured family members, it does not say caregiving responsibilities for children. So, I think, you know, that's... was it... is there a reason that was left out?

C. Babbitt: This is the reason for the language that highlights that the list is not exhaustive. We used an example, but it is not meant to be exhaustive.

R. Zanicchi: this issue has come up in senate each year I've served. There are a lot of people that are

concerned about not being allowed to mention life events in their annual review.

L. Villasmil: I want to emphasize that we cannot cover anything, and so we have to be flexible, just as we were during Covid. This is more than enough to indicate that many things can be included here.

C. Hull: I would like to thank all that worked on this. The language in front of us makes sense, and I plan to vote yes.

Motion to approve revisions to E7.0 (C. Hull/L. Villasmil)

Motion Passes 37-0-1

[FAC Presentation](#)

[Policy E07.0 Edits](#)

Agenda Item No. 9: GSOLS Revised MS Program and MS in Communication Networks (TCET) program; M. Fluet (12:59)

Biological Sciences MS Revisions

-4 tracks: Environmental Science, Bioinformatics, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology, and Cell & Molecular Biology

-Graduate Council voted to approve unanimously

Questions:

Motion to approve the Biological Sciences MS (R. Zanibbi/S. Johnson)

Question: Are there conversations with the provost about paring down master's programs? How does this fit with those conversations?

M. Fluet: This is a revision of the environmental science degree for NYSED, but it is really a combining of the Environmental Science and Bio-Informatics masters. Will sunset the Bioinformatics program.

Motion Passes 37-0-0

Embedded Systems MS

-Redesign of the MS in Communication Networks

-Opportunity to strengthen BS-MS pathway

Graduate Council Voted to approve unanimously

Motion to approve the MS in Embedded Systems (M. Anselm/C. Hull)

Motion Passes 38-0-0

[Biological Sciences and Embedded Systems Presentation](#)

[Supporting Materials - Embedded Systems](#)

[Supporting Materials - Bio Science](#)

Agenda Item No. 10: E18.0 Faculty Leave for Professional/Career Development; C. Foster and P. Padmanabhan (1:10)

Original charge: Clarify Policy E18, whether a candidate can apply for leave in year 6 or if they must wait until year 7 and then apply.

-in essence, is this a 6 year or a 7 year cycle?

-Proposing new language that clarifies that eligible faculty members are able to take a leave in year seven after serving six years. An example is provided.

Please see presentation for details of the revision

Questions:

B. Thomas: This is for tenured faculty, correct? So, tenured faculty will be up for tenure in Year 6.

So that means they can go up for tenure and leave immediately for a sabbatical once they get tenure.

If I understand this proposal. So they apply in fall of Year 6, that's when they apply to go up for tenure.

P. Padmanabhan: No, if I can take that, it says only tenured faculty are eligible to apply, so you need to get tenure first.

R. Zanibbi: So could I ask for a clarification on that? Because my understanding of this is, if you look at the example: the clock starts, I worked 6 years, and at the end of those 6 years, I'm eligible to have my tenure materials reviewed, and maybe get tenure at the end of year 6, and then year 7, when I have tenure, I'm eligible to go on sabbatical. Is that correct, or am I misunderstanding

P. Padmanabhan: Yes, that is correct.

M. Anselm: I thought you have to apply for sabbatical the year before, so, if you only get in your 7th, you'd have to apply in your seventh, in order to get it in your eighth year.

R. Zanibbi: But this language says apply in fall of year 6. It doesn't say apply in year 7.

P. Padmanabhan: This example is more applicable if it's not for a faculty member who joins as an assistant professor, and this is what their typical cycle would be. This example is more if a tenured professor took a sabbatical, and, you know, they're applying for a second sabbatical, so that timeline.

M. Anselm: Is there a way to apply in the fall semester for a spring sabbatical in your seventh year? I don't think so. I don't think there is a method to do that, right? It has to be a full year ahead.

P. Padmanabhan: Correct.

L. Villasmil: I just wanted to add that it's clear it says only tenured faculty are eligible at the last sentence, but in the example, what I think is a little bit confusing, it says summer year 6, probably at the end of year 6 will sound a little better, because summer is when I'm moving to RIT, of course we start in the fall when we are hired, but the word summer when you are already at RIT might be a little confusing, so, probably at the end of year 6, or something like that.

P. Padmanabhan: Yes, we can say end of year 6, and that is OK

B. Thomas: It's just a very funny question, sorry. So, if a faculty has not applied for sabbatical at all, and he comes in after 16 years, or 17 years, and says, look, I've been here this long, I want a full year, I don't want one single semester. Is that possible?

I Mardini: Yes, but you would take half salary.

B. Thomas, No, but I would want my full salary.

I Mardini: Yeah, if only. I'm about to get mine, and it took me about 2 years. There's a huge delay between when you are eligible to apply for the leave versus when you get it, so I will take my leave maybe about in a year from now, and I applied about a year ago or something like that, so It's kind of surprising how long it takes to get it.

Z. Yu: Okay, I just want to have some clarification. Based on the text, it does not say whether a faculty can apply for this, sabbatical after more than 6 years. Like, for example, if it's in the 7th year, 8th year, 9th year, like, can they apply for this, leave?

R. Zanibbi: True.

P. Padmanabhan: Yes, you can.

Z. Yu: So should it say after a minimum of six years of full time service?

Z. Yu: It looks like they can apply after 5 years if they have tenure in this example.

P. Padmanabhan: Yes, provided they have tenure.

J. Zlochower: I agree that the statement itself is legally pretty clear, but as I'm reading this it looks like it's guiding me to say, okay, I'm hired, I'm going to call that year one. Year six, I apply, and all is good. And then suddenly we say, well, only tenured are eligible, so really, either we're saying that most people who are hired, they're hired with tenure...it just seems a little misleading, because I'm hired, I apply in year 6, and then, oh, but I really can't, because I'm not tenured....

P. Padmanabhan: So I wonder, based on the questions, and I guess it's a friendly amendment, maybe we can say apply for leave if tenured? Would that help?

Josef: Yes, that would make it clearer.

R. Zanibbi: I want to raise something, because when this charge was assigned, I had actually been in communication with the person who sent it, and it was trying to clarify the idea that you could go on leave in your seventh year, after you had secured tenure. Craig, can you explain what is the point of only tenured faculty being eligible to apply for professional career development leave, because again, why wouldn't you apply for a leave in year 6 as you're going out for tenure?

C. Foster: In the example, we are using someone who is already a tenured faculty member applying.

M. Laver: Then, for people getting tenure, it doesn't quite work, because you have to remember that the review process for leave is very long. So your application would be due in September, September 1st of year 6. That's when the application is due. You get tenure in April, April 1st of year 6. You can apply for sabbatical September 1st of year 6, but the review doesn't happen until the next academic year, so you wouldn't be taking leave in year 7, you'd be taking leave in year 8.

E. Wheeden: Being a current member of our faculty grievance Committee, I could potentially see a situation where a new hire applies for leave in year 6 while they're also going up for tenure review. They don't get tenure, but then they get approved for the leave, and that could be used as an argument for an extended stay beyond the one-year terminal contract.

P. Padmanabhan: And that's why it's important to say that only tenured faculty members can be granted leave.

J. Lanzafame: I don't care what it is, but reading it as it's written, it very specifically says that an untenured faculty member could apply in the fall of their sixth year. Sentence two is the service clock for

all faculty members begins at the start of the academic year in which they are hired, and then the next sentence says an application for leave may be submitted during the sixth year of accrual, and that would be from date of hire.

I Mardini: Richard, you were mentioning why wouldn't anyone apply when they get the chance? If that was your question, during the luncheon, in the discussion, in the recent discussion, in the luncheon with other colleagues I was informed that, in some colleges, it's actually discouraged for people to apply for the sabbatical, and I was surprised, because I knew that someone had been here for, you know, for ages, and hadn't gotten his sabbatical, so...then I learned that this is a case, so I just thought, if that was the question you were bringing up, then that's something I figured I would share, for what it's worth.

B. Lapizco-Encinas : I just have a small amendment that may make it a little bit clearer, to say an application for leave can be submitted as early as the fall semester of the sixth year of accrual, just to make it a little bit clearer.

C. Hull: I'd like to move that we amend this to say that only tenured faculty are eligible to receive, rather than apply for, a professional career development leave, which would, I think, mean that if you went up for tenure at the same time you went up for the leave, you did not get tenure, you are obviously not eligible to receive the leave as well, so that should hopefully address the grievance issue. So, I move that we make that change, and I hope someone seconds.

R. Zanibbi: I second that change.

S. Chung: Yeah, as I put it in the chat, when I see this scope, section under E18, and it says, full-time tenured faculty with a minimum of 6 years of service, do we have to correct that as well?

R. Zanibbi: Well, technically, when you would take the leave, even if you were a new hire, you would have 6 years of service at the point that you're tenured, so I think that's consistent.

Revised text of the motion reads:

A faculty member is eligible to take a professional/career development leave beginning in the academic year after accruing six academic years of full-time service. The service clock for all faculty members begins at the start of the academic year in which the faculty member is hired. An application for leave may be submitted as early as the fall semester of the sixth year of accrual, so that an approved leave may be taken in the following (seventh) academic year. For subsequent leaves, the six-year accrual clock restarts at the Fall Semester immediately following the academic year in which the most recent leave was taken. Only tenured faculty are eligible to receive a professional/career development leave.

Example:

Fall Year 1 - End of Year 6: 6 years of full-time service.

Fall Year 6: apply for leave.

Year 7: take leave in one or both semesters in year 7.

Fall Year 8: first year of the next six-year clock starts.

Discussion:

Motion to approve amendments to the proposed revisions to E18.0 (C. Hull/R. Zanibbi)

Motion Passes (37-0-3)

Motion to approve the Revisions to Policy E18.0 (R. Zanibbi/P. Padmanabhan)

Motion passes (36-0-2)

P. Padmanabhan: If the president votes to approve this, can the ExCom keep this on the radar and have strong messaging about this in fall semester when everyone is back?

R. Zanibbi: Yes, we will submit for approval and then message in the fall

[Policy E18.0 Presentation](#)

[Policy E18.0 Edits](#)

Agenda Item No. 11: Faculty Service Survey Results; T. Worrell and R. Zanibbi (1:40)

Faculty services questionnaire is to give feedback on services that faculty use on campus. Thanks to Tracy and LaVerne for their work on this.

- Very preliminary survey results

- 270 responses as of 4/28; now it is over 300.

Overview:

- high awareness of services

- varied usage from 33% to 95 percent

- Sample of Ratings

- breakdown of sub-services

- Survey ends May 7

Questions:

L. Villasmil: The number in the center is the average between 0 and 5?

T. Worrell: Between 1 and 5

L. Villasmil: From these numbers, I see we have over 1000 faculty members and we have been there for a while. I would like to know how faculty members are growing compared to student and staff increases.

R. Zanibbi: The rule of thumb is 30% if you're lucky, and we're not closed yet. So I think, believe it or not, I think especially because of the time of year that I foolishly released this, I think we're doing quite well.

And the plan would be, we don't do this once, we do it annually. And the main motivation was that I remember when I joined Senate, it seemed like your interests were well-served if you had the right friends, but there were common issues that I heard about across campus that just didn't make the floor. And so part of this is that you don't have to know the right people to be able to chime in on these things. And then it also connected with a charge that we weren't able to act on, where people were interested in upward evaluation of some of these units. And so this is a compromise to make that happen. I think your point about scale and size and what's happening is good. And apparently we have 339 respondents, so thank you all of you who have filled this out. I know this is not the best time of year, but it is very useful information.

[Faculty Survey Presentation](#)

Agenda Item No. 12: New Business; R. Zanibbi (1:48)

GIS need for additional members for the tenure committee (R. Zanibbi)

GIS is a small unit and they need to make a minor deviation from tenure policy

- they are short one person, and they propose taking a member from affiliated faculty
- seemed fair to ExCom

Motion: Allow GIS to draw a member from the Affiliated Faculty for a tenure committee (R. Zanibbi/S. Johnson)

Motion Passes: 36-0-0

Emeritus Professor Council (C. Hull)

Motion:

Senate shall form a task force of current and emeritus faculty to, in consultation with the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, create and organize an RIT Emeritus Council, a self-governing optional-membership organization for emeritus faculty. The task force will review existing models, with particular attention to the organization at Columbia University and, in Academic Year 26-27, propose to Senate a structure for the Emeritus Council, including an Executive Committee, as well as proposing rights and responsibilities of members.

If passed by Faculty Senate, the proposal will then go to the Provost and President for final approval. Once (if) the proposal is approved by them, the Task Force shall run elections for the RIT Emeritus Council Executive Committee (ECEC). At this point the RIT ECEC will supersede the Task Force, which may then dissolve. The task force shall also make recommendations to Senate concerning expanding the privileges given to emeritus faculty in policy E6.1.2.B, and concerning how the emeritus distinction is bestowed.

Rationale:

- RIT has traditionally ignored its emeritus faculty. This is a waste of an excellent resource
- Finally, emeritus faculty have literally earned the right to have continued support for their affiliation with the institution that they advanced sufficiently to earn the title, if they want that.

Possible activities: See presentation for an extensive list of possible activities.

Questions:

Emmit: Two questions. One is, previously, is somebody just given emeritus status by a supporter that goes up to the provost and makes a convincing pitch, and that's how it's traditionally been done? That's the first question. And the second one, what does that mean for individuals that are already in this status: what they were able to do or not able to do, of course, that's all going to get re-dictated?

C. Hull: We are not planning on changing any Emeritus status and if Emeriti faculty don't want to be a part, they don't have to be.

R. Zanibbi: It's a good question, Emmett, and there is a sort of a convention that I myself had to be reminded of. When we change policy, it never applies retroactively to existing decisions. There's a legal

precedent for this, and so we follow that practice. You don't make a change, and all of a sudden, people have to be re-evaluated, for example, when they've already been given a title.

K. LeBlevic: Two questions: First is: a lot of the tasks are tasks that faculty get paid to do. By proposing free labor, we are taking away responsibilities from people who are paid to do these things. Second question: Emeritus faculty also have limited involvement in the affairs of RIT, and may not have the vision that current employees have.

C. Hull: First point, this is not intended to block people who are here from doing things. Example: Emeriti can cover classes when faculty have to go to conferences, etc. They might serve on thesis/dissertation committees, and in many cases, it is hard to find people to serve. Second point: Emeriti could serve in an advisory position, especially in terms of things that happened years ago.

B. Thomas: I find big problems with this. Selection of Emeritus status is through the provost's office, and faculty in a department may not want the retired faculty back!

P. Padmanabhan: Where will this organization live: under Faculty Senate? It seems self-governing, but there is confusion.

C. Hull: This is definitely not meant to be putting emeritus in charge of us again, and I would envision this largely as people who are here now can invite Emeritus so-and-so to do such and such, if it relates to us. If it's some sort of a social gathering, then that's, you know, among emeritus, that's entirely up to them, of course. I will also say that a lot of the details here are things that the task force is supposed to work out. We're not saying there'll be a council, we're saying, hey, let's have this task force to come back to us with a proposal for a council. And then, when they come back to us, hopefully, all of the comments that we've had in the minutes will be addressed by the task force, and, you know, they'll have answers to these questions at that time, and at that time, we could vote.

L. Villasmil: This is a taskforce, so we are not making our decision today!

Motion to approve the taskforce as outlined above (R. Zanibbi/L. Villasmil)

Motion is approved 32-0-1

Agenda Item No. 13: Adjournment; R. Zanibbi (2:08)

Thank you all for a very great year. I hope you all have a great summer and I hope to see you at Lovin' Cup.

Attendance 4/30/2026

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	Excused	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	X
Barone, Keri	Vice Chair/CLA Senator	X	Mardini, Ihab	CAD Senator	X
Beck, Makini	SOIS Senator	X	McCalley, Carmody	Alternate COS Senator	
Brady, Kathleen	NTID Senator	X	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	
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	X
Coppenbarger, Matthew	COS Senator	X	Perry, Andrew	Alternate SOIS Senator	
Cromer, Michael	Alternate COS Senator		Puchades, Ivan	KGCOE Senator	X
Cui, Feng	Alternate COS Senator		Ray, Amit	CLA Senator	X
DAManda, Elisabetta	Alternate CLA Senator		Reinicke, Bryan	Alternate SCB Senator	
David, Prabu	Provost	X	Reisch, Mark	CAD Senator	X
Davis, Stacey	NTID Senator	X	Rich, Lexi	Alternate CET Senator	X
De Wit Paul, Alissa	Alternate GIS Senator		Ross, Annemarie	NTID Senator	X
DiRisio, Keli	CAD Senator	X	Sanders, Cynthia	NTID Senator	X
Eirikur Hull, Clyde	SCB Senator	X	Shaaban, Muhammad	Alternate KGCOE Senator	
Ghazle, Hamad	Operations Officer/CHST Senator		Song, Qian	SCB Senator	
Ghoneim, Hany	Alternate KGCOE Senator		Staff Council Rep	Joanna Prescott	X
Hardin, Jessica	CLA Senator	X	Student Government Rep	Igor Polotai	
Hartpence, Bruce	Alternate GCCIS Senator	X	Sweeney, Kevin	Alternate SCB Senator	
Hoople, Jason	Alternate KGCOE Senator		Thomas, Bolaji	CHST Senator	X
Jadamba, Basca	COS Senator	X	Tsouri, Gill	KGCOE Senator	X
Johnson, Dan	CET Senator	X	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	
Kuhl, Michael	KGCOE Senator	X	Wiandt, Tamas	Alternate COS Senator	X
Kwasinski, Andres	Alternate KGCOE Senator		Zanibbi, Richard	Chair/GCCIS Senator	X
Lanzafame, Joseph	Treasurer/COS Senator	X	Zlochower, Yosef	COS Senator	X

Interpreters: Bea Hogan and Samantha Pryne

Student Assistant: Ella Kolodziej

Presenters: Callie Babbitt, Matthew Fluet, Craig Foster, Poornima Padmanabhan and Tracy Worrell