Faculty Senate Minutes of Meeting

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

Thursday, October 1, 2026 12:15 - 1:50 PM Slaughter Hall 2220-2240

Attendance: See Below

| Agenda Item No. 1: Call to Order; R. Zanibbi (12:18) |
|---|
| R. Zanibbi calls the meeting to order at 12:18 PM |
| Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of Agenda; R. Zanibbi (12:18) |
| **Motion to approve the agenda (R. Zanibbi/S. Johnson)**<br>**Motion passes without objection** |

| Agenda Item No. 3: Communications Officer's Report/Approval of Minutes; M. Laver (12:19) |
|---|
| **Motion to approve the minutes of 9/24 (R. Zanibbi/K. Barone)**<br>**Motion passes without objection**<br>INSERT APPROVED MEETING MINUTES FROM LAST MEETING |

| Agenda Item No. 4: Executive Committee Report; R. Zanibbi (12:21) |
|---|
| **Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC):**<br><br>**Upcoming Events**<br>● **3rd Regional (Western NY/NYC) Senate Leadership Summit**<br>Sat, Oct. 24 at St. John Fisher<br><br>**Senate Business**<br>1. **<u>Final Report:</u> Graduate Tuition Task Force (Chair: Poornima Padhmanabhan)** |

a. Report is provided in the Google Drive with this summary, here.
b. Authors note "World Changing Research" is a pillar in our strategic framework.
c. **Tuition remission policy recommendations (Sponsored Research Services (SRS) policy link):**
    i. Uniform tuition charge for each grant-supported student, similar to the practice at the University of Rochester.
    ii. Small grant exemption for overall funding/annual funding under some threshold(s)
    iii. Establish a PhD student safety net framework (for funding gaps), funded by a portion of the tuition remission.
    iv. Establish a PhD recruiting fund to support outreach, campus visits of accepted applicants, etc., funded by a portion of the tuition remission.
d. **Data gathering recommendation: "**the taskforce recommends that university administration (i.e. non-faculty stakeholders in this policy) prepare and share an assessment of the policy's impact on sponsored research activity, institutional finances, graduate student support, and PhD program growth. Such an assessment would increase transparency and provide evidence-based evaluation of the policy."
e. **Q. What are our next steps?**

2. **Update re: Restarting the University 'Calendar Committee'**
    a. **Reminder** from Basca Jadamba (COS) that we need to restart this committee in fall, with the goal of completing their evaluation/recommendation by December to satisfy administrative requirements (see March 19, 2026 minutes).
        i. Last calendar committee chaired by Joe Loffredo (registrar) Clyde Hull (SCB) and Scott Johnson (GCCIS).
    b. **Pertinent Administrative Policy:**
        i. Admin policy list – controlled outside senate, but modified with governance input;
        ii. Specific admin Policy (only **2 pages with tables**): "Development, Maintenance and Publication of Academic Calendars"
            - Responsible offices that 'own' the policy are the Office of the Registrar and the Provost's office.
    c. **Brief History:** University level committee, with membership of 2 co-chairs, and then 2 faculty, 2 staff, 2 student government representatives.
        i. Lots of good work the last time through; mostly 'kept' the calendar due to concerns, e.g., from students about proposed changes.

d. **Deliverable of the committee** is recommended changes to the 'calendar' policy, which stipulates requirements in concrete terms (e.g., number of classroom days, weeks of class, the same occurrences of weekday classes, etc.)
e. **Process:** To check on this, the chair spoke with the Registrar, Joe Loffredo.
    i. Joe Loffredo plans to co-chair this committee; unfortunately, there have been unexpected (valid) delays with assembling the committee.
    ii. **New timeline:** Joe will put the committee together in the coming weeks (aiming for early Nov. for 1st meeting), and deliver a final report re: changes to the calendar policy April 1. **We will need two representatives again.**

3. **University Advisory Committee on Gender-Related Experience (UACGRE)**
    a. **Anonymous form:** comments and questions for the committee: https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLScLfuEYs39XdLbRwaQv5hgX4O_RLVnBEuU10iOxeqafFm2JlA/viewform?usp=publish-editor

**Coming Up / 'On Deck'**

4. **D5.1 Academic Actions and Recognitions** (accepted motion to add additional probation after 1 year good standing in a new academic program)
5. **(Goal: Next Meeting on Oct 15)** Faculty Services Questionnaire report and presentation for results from last Spring; response very strong, nearly 500 faculty replied
6. **BS in AI Electives (link to list of proposals).** FSEC will provide a set of upper-year courses (300+) requiring at most one elective outside of the BS in AI core; it will select and share with degree program leadership (+senate) soon. Possible charge to ICC, TBD.
7. Update on charges for Executive Committee (FSEC)
    a. No new charges this year, (most charges from last year completed/stopped).
    b. Charge on computer access privileges will continue this year with additional help from Eric Wiliams (GIS),
    c. along with producing a draft revision of the Grievance Policy, to be completed in consultation with the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC).

Questions/Comments

E. Ientilucci: Whatever happened to the tuition reimbursement that comes back to the PI? We have been waiting for years for these funds.

R. Zanibbi: It is still in policy, I believe, that PIs can get around 20-30 percent returns I believe.

E. Ientilucci: So if I pay tuition and then my returns go annually back into my TFA, it's supposed

to be some percentage of tuition that I paid, but I've been waiting a long time to get those funds, and they don't materialize.
R. Zanibbi: Policy on Policies says that old versions of policies should be archived. It would be helpful in these cases to see how policy changes over the years. I have petitioned the administration to look into this repeatedly.
M. Zemcov: This year we have two examples of students being charged tuition by RIT–a bill from the registrar.
R. Zanibbi: Some of us were told different things about tuition, and so it is hard to have consistency.
C. Hull: I have also seen PhD students getting bills for tuition.
R. Zanibbi: So perhaps this is something we should explore a little bit. That's a little bit odd. So what are productive next steps that aren't just combative, but productive in terms of maybe changing the way we do these things? Any thoughts? I mean I thought Dr. David, one hope would be that maybe we'd get some clarity on how the PhD programs are funded and operated and then see whom we might talk to next about whether these are actionable or if there are concerns we might find compromises. I don't know. Dr. David, did you want to say anything to this?
P. David: The first year is funded by the university, but I need to know more before I can speak to particular cases.
R. Zanibbi: So I think what I'll do then is the executive committee will confer with Dr. David. We will come back. The idea that any student is getting a tuition bill while they're generating knowledge for us in the world is a little weird.

Faculty who volunteered to be on the calendar committee: S. Johnson; C. Hull; S.Chung; B. Jadamba; K. Leipold. We will run an election to arrive at the number of seats needed at our next meeting.

K. Barone: I just wanted to speak in my role as DSO fellow for just a minute to get something on the record and hopefully allow you to share out with your constituencies. A couple of weeks ago, there was a communication that was sent to students who were seeking note-taking services through the DAS, Department of Access Services that suggested students who were not afforded the note-taking accommodation, but did have a Cprint captionist could then run those transcripts through AI to help create the notes for them. This communication was then shared on social media, raising concerns with faculty, as you could imagine, and students alike. Students subsequently created a Paw Print petition citing their primary concern being their note-taking jobs being replaced by AI, and the Department of Access Services responded to say that this communication was actually an informal communication sent by one of their

coordinators, which did not accurately reflect the department's intended guidance. So DAS further clarified that no student note-taking jobs would be replaced with AI. That was not at all the intent of the communication or of the DAS. So in my role as the DSO fellow though, I've still been hearing from faculty with ongoing concerns about the broader implications of the use of AI, classroom surveillance, privacy, intellectual property, and how these materials are being used. So because those questions extend beyond the clarification about note-taking, we just want to acknowledge that they are being considered. I want you to be able to share with your constituents that DSO, DAS, and leadership are all having these ongoing conversations. We want to acknowledge those concerns, and discussions are underway to reconcile the ADA obligations and compliance measures that need to be taken and the comfort and rights of faculty as they move forward. So we just want everybody to know we don't have as many answers right this moment as I think we would all love to have, but that we do want to acknowledge the concerns and let you know that the conversations are absolutely underway.
I Mardini: Can we agree that faculty can have the right to veto the use of Genio? I hear from my constituents almost daily that this is a concern.
K. Torres: So this semester, any faculty who have come forward to DSO and shared that they have different reasons why they feel as though Genio is not an appropriate fit for their class, we've been working with them to either identify whether there were other note taking mechanisms already taking place in their class. So if they had PowerPoints and slides, if they had other materials that they were able to provide to the student in advance so the student could follow along or after the fact for study purposes and thus the expectation was not individual note taking. We have been happy to say that Geneo is not necessary there in that class. Similarly, if there is a DAS note taker already in the class, we have been able to get students access through that note taker and for faculty who've identified a peer note taker that they're able to recommend to our office in lieu of Genio. So in the recruitment of the student note taker, we have onboarded those as well to hear their concerns and still meet student needs. So we still have to provide note taking accommodations, but we're willing to work with you to see which of these options will meet student needs.
I. Martini: To elaborate, if the professor has a way to provide the best education for the students, we can argue that we do not need or want Genio and can veto that for our classes. And just for context, I have surveyed my students and they get really, really concerned and really upset that they don't even know they're being recorded.
K. Torres: Again, faculty should reach out to me directly and we can discuss what the other option or strategy is. And once we agree on a note taking strategy, we're happy to implement that. I need to know so we can communicate with students who then come back and say, "Okay, my accommodation's not being implemented." We would be able to say, "Well, we've spoken to your professor and here are the ways that it is being implemented." It may not look

the same as in another class, but it does meet our standards. We want to make sure that when we're doing this, we're doing this with faculty and we're also having your back if a student comes forward and says, "This isn't what I thought." The same with when students say, "Hey, I disagree with the flex plan. We put eyes on it, we know what it says, we defend the flex plan." So we want to make sure we're putting the same intentionality around when Genio is not appropriate.

C. Hull: I was going to second this motion to have the Senate vote to veto the use of Genio and AI note takers in the class. I think that it's not just about a student's IP. If the student says something in class and the AI is recording that, that's going into its model. Anything that you say in your class is being absorbed by this AI. Your IP is going up to who knows where. Genio is not clearly advertised as an AI note taking thing. It's like a Genio thing, it helps your students. Well, that's nice. If you don't know that it's recording all of your students and you and doing whatever AI does with that, then you might not object. You should, though. I feel like we should consider the idea that maybe it should not be a first option that you can opt out of but rather it should be the last option or maybe not even an option at all to have AI in your class. So I second the motion. If it was a motion, I'm not sure it was.

I. Martini: Genio is connected to about 8000 institutes, and so I was even more concerned. And also the other problem is that many students, after discussing with them, they didn't even care to have Genio and yet they're handed the Genio options. R. Zanibbi: Do you feel that Kate's solutions are adequate?

I. Martini: Yes. It's just in the past it used to be extremely difficult to work with DSO where DSO knows you're going to have to agree to this in the way that was packaged. I had to fight tooth and nail this semester. I got to the point where no, I'm not going to allow Genio and DSO still pushes back and emails me and someone else emails me like, "Oh, you have to approve this." I already have a discussion running with someone else. So I would only say that it has been really difficult to work with this system.

. M. Reisch: I do want to say that I believe DSO did say that whatever was recorded in your class was not being used on the model, was not being then regurgitated and being part of the training model. Just as a point of information.

K. Torres: And it did go through all of ITS processes to vet the system in terms of making sure that information is not being stored long term and it's not going between other institutions. We put a very thorough process in place to ensure that we're protecting faculty engagement, faculty rights, faculty intellectual property and we've turned off most of the AI features. The only thing that is still there is the additional notes. There are a lot of other student success features in Genio that we have disabled intentionally to make sure that this platform fits our IT specifications.

M**otion: Allow faculty to veto the use of Genio in their classes. (I. Martini/C. Hull)**
Discussion:
P. David: This is a valid concern, but you have to give us a little bit of time to process this because if all the other institutions are using it, it's a gold standard product and we say we're not going to use it, it becomes a problem. I like the case by case sort of approach. In the meantime, we'll do a little bit more research and come back to you.
R. Zanibbi: I would like to ask you if you're amenable to withdrawing the motion and then bringing it back if in fact necessary?
I. Mardini: Yes, as long as I can bring it back.
M. Osier: I really appreciate what DSO is doing to try to reach out to the students. What worries me about Genio is that their primary model is OpenAI. And I really appreciate all the screening you've done, but it's a moving target. I think that's been discussed by a number of groups. I don't know how many follow the news, but OpenAI has been called out multiple times for violating intellectual property related agreements. And so I think it's a valid thing to investigate this closely, this specific model.
R. Zanibbi: Please talk to your CAD colleagues, talk to Kate. If you can find an acceptable compromise, great, please tell us that too. If not, we'll talk about it, but we'll try to find an amicable executable solution for the situation.
**Motion to table the motion (R. Olson/K. Barone)**
**Motion passes without objection**
Resources and Information for Senators

Agenda Item No. 5: Shared Governance Update; J. Prescott (12:45)

-SG:

None

-SC:

J. Prescott: Benefits fair is happening in the Fireside Lounge. We are reminding everyone that faculty and staff have to actively enroll in a benefits package or decline benefits.

M. Laver: I just want to say something about Joanne's comment because we've been assembling a senate report for the College of Liberal Arts and I think I just want to repeat on the floor, even though probably most people here know, but you have to actively enroll in a benefit plan this year at RIT. Now I don't know what the consequences will be if you don't.

J. Prescott: You have to actively enroll or decline enrollment. You have to do something and they will be chasing people down as best as they can. Basically they want people to be aware of what they're spending for health insurance and what the university is spending for health

insurance because of the financial climate everywhere.

M. Laver: I was a little surprised that our HR person seemed to suggest that faculty would all do this without any problems, but you have experience, long experience I'm sure, with email and faculty so please make sure you're sharing with your constituents that they have to actively enroll or as you say, during this open enrollment period.

Agenda Item No. 6: Standing Committee Charges #2; R. Zanibbi (12:47)

**AESC**

- Work with the Disability Services office to review the student accommodation process; identify & address faculty and student concerns
- Work with Access Services to review practices for interpreting, captioning and other supports for NTID students; identify & address faculty and staff concerns
- Compile a summary of current initiatives supporting student graduation & retention across RIT colleges & divisions
- Compile a summary of current initiatives supporting faculty & staff retention across RIT colleges & divisions

**Motion to approve charges (R. Zanibbi/R. Olson)**

**Motion passes 36-0-0**

**Academic Affairs**

- Online courses: (1) allow colleges to require in-person examinations (2) Limit grades to Pass/Fail 2. Explore A+ grades (currently, A range is only A- or A) 3.
- Policy D13: Consider changing the requirement that students 'walk' to graduate in spring after completion or by permission of the dean/dept.|
- Policy D3.II.A: Consider adding a maximum number of graduate credits that undergraduates may take, alongside existing restrictions for double-counting courses for dual degrees.
- Exam scheduling (1) move grade submission deadlines from Friday evening to Sunday evening (2) require large sections to be scheduled earlier
- Audited Course Tuition Policy Look into discrepancy between Policy D5 and Financial Aid & Scholarships we site (re: when students are required to pay to audit a course)

**Questions and Comments:**

C. Hull: We already discussed at great length about A+ grades, and I don't know why this is coming back. If anything, the committee should look at those discussions from the past.

J. Lanzafame: There is not a lot of love among the faculty for A+, and this was brought by students. We are going to do benchmarking, and poll students. A+ is used in some Ivy League schools, but not very common in schools otherwise. It has been over ten years, and so

there's no harm in looking at it again, and just because we look at it doesn't mean there will be any action.

L. Villasmil: A couple of times I have truly exceptional students that I would like to give A+s. A good idea at least to consider it.

R. Olson: Question for C. Hull: Do you know how long ago this was?

C. Hull: At least 10 years ago.

E. Ientilucci: If colleges will require in person exams, that will severely hurt our online courses.

J. Baschnagel: Doesn't RIT have the option to require students to go to a testing center? In other words, how do we define "in person."

S. Qiang: I teach online courses. I'm afraid if we let students take the class pass and fail, students will lose the motivation to work hard. It's already very hard to get a student engaged. If we become pass and fail, which is not consistent with our college's courses, it will be very hard to get them to work.

R. Zanibbi: This would be a very good point to raise with the committee if they take the charge.

**Motion to approve charges (R. Zanibbi/S. Johnson)**

**Motion passes 35-0-1**

**Budget and Planning**

- Policy 4.1 states faculty receive additional pay for work outside their contract period (e.g., 9 month) with reference to Human Resources compensation guidelines. Locate these guidelines, and/or work with HR to clarify expectations for faculty pay outside of contract periods.

**Motion to approve charges (R. Zanibbi/R. Olson)**

**Motion passes 36-0-0**

**Research and Scholarship**

- SRS Faculty Oversight & Co-operation a. Find mechanisms and resources to make work between faculty and SRS more productive and co-operative for all involved b. Explore modification of Sponsored Research Services (SRS) practices to require consultation with faculty representatives (e.g., RSC, and by extension senate) before modifying administrative policies

**Questions and Comments:**

A Vihad: I want to clarify the first point a little bit, if it's some sort of documentation of what exactly is appropriate to expect and whatnot. Recently, for instance, I submitted a call for

proposal and I asked the representative, "Can you tell me the budget limit?" And the response was, "Here's the link to the proposal, go figure it out." So what is appropriate, what is that? I don't know if that's part of this idea.

R. Zanibbi: Yes, it is part of this. And so the question is, so the relationship is strained. Nobody will say otherwise. So the question though is, it's very easy to say, "Well, bad SRS." I think a better strategy might be to say, "Okay, we're challenged here. So let's have a conversation. What do you guys need? What do we need? How do we make this easier for everyone?" I think that would be the way to have a faculty be happier and SRS employees get the respect they deserve. Remember, they are asked, think of the advisors. The model there is not different in terms of load. And so one of the reasons I think it may seem dismissive sometimes is they're just treading water. So let's have the conversation, find out what it is, and then see if we can find a good way to work forward. The specific outcome might just be a professional agreement. I don't know. It might be documented, it might not. But I think we have to have an open conversation and try to find a way to cooperate and work more as a team so that you're not asking for things like that. And then because of structural limitations, getting the impression that they're being dismissive when they're just overwhelmed.

B. Lapizco-Encinas: I'm a member of the RSC, and just to answer this concern is that we actually plan to explore both ways. We're going to reach out to the PIs to see what are the points of friction, but we also plan to reach out to SRS to see what are the points of friction. And once we gather the information, then we can plan how we can make the situation better. And I think to echo Richard's comment for everybody involved. I think it cannot be one-sided. So we are going to reach out to both sides, find what are the challenges, and then work from there after we gather the information.

J. Baschnagel: So one question I have is, has RSC done anything where they've compared our SRS services to other universities like R1s?

R. Zanibbi: I work with R1s. We don't really want to engage in that exercise because it'll be embarrassing.

J. Baschnagel: Well, that might be the point, right?

R. Zanibbi: So let me just give you the context. So the environment I work in, I was part of an NSF AI center. I work with people at UIUC. They had 13 people devoted to grantsmanship in the department of computer science alone to try and compare that to where we are here, because the other part of that is the amount of research output is exponentially higher. So those types of comparisons are very dangerous. That is not where we are. Now, could where we are be more beneficial for everyone? Absolutely. I think that benchmarking that high is guaranteed to be disappointing and probably send the wrong message, to be honest.

M. Anselm: I want it to be on the record that when the RSC does collect information from the faculty, that it comes from all of the various different colleges on campus as well as potential units. I don't know how many will be engaged, but I think the experience in various different colleges across campuses could be different.

**Motion to approve charges (R. Zanibbi/M. Laver)**

**Motion passes 36-0-0**

**Faculty Affairs**

- Revise Policy E04.0 (Faculty Employment Policies) to indicate that faculty need to approve the standard that evaluates their scholarship; aligns w. recent changes in Policies B2, 5, and 6 (re: Academic Governance, Tenure, and Promotion)
- Explore modifying Policy E7 (Annual Review of Faculty) to address increased workloads and/or altered plans of work that may occur when faculty take approved leaves of absence or workload modifications|
- Explore reported inconsistencies between 9-month contracts and expected service work, institute business, and training that fall outside the contract year
- Clarify Professor of Practice Title usage (Policy E06 - Faculty Rank & Promotion). Proposal to expand title description in policy to clarify that the title cannot be used as an interim or transitional appointment expected to evolve into a tenure-track position
- Explore eliminating teaching effectiveness scores (e.g.,. SmartEvals) as a core consideration for faculty evaluation in tenure and promotion, and in annual merit review
- (Joe Lanzafame, COS) Add a possible extension to the midtenure evaluation review period for those who have extended their clock due to life circumstances.
- (Kelly Norris Martin, COLA Dean) Explore whether annual performance reviews belong in the evaluation process for promotion-to-full Professor or promotion to Associate Professor ranks at all.
- (Heidi Nickisher, CAD) Review Policy E6 (Faculty Rank & Promotion) II.C.1 to change from recommending to requiring that the University Promotion Review Committee be convened for disagreements in recommended outcome between a college promotion committee, the college dean, and/or the provost.
- (Sandra Rothenberg, SCB) Voting and letters for tenure a. Examine possible 'double voting' at the department & tenure committee levels b. Clarify the tenure policy (E5) on whether a mandatory department deliberation is permitted for tenure evaluation
- (Heidi Nickisher (CAD)) Review Policy E6.1 (Faculty Honorary Titles) & establish 'Distinguished Lecturer' as the highest honor bestowed NonTenure-Track Lecturers

**Questions/Comments**

K. Leipold: Isn't Number three exactly the same as what was on the budget and planning charge?

R. Zanibbi: That's a little different. The budget and planning charge was concerning rules about how much you get paid. This is when we are actually breaking the rules about requiring unpaid work. They're closely related, but they're not the same thing.

S. Qiang: So for the teaching faculty scores, that means we have a question about the overall

teaching perspective. Will you refer to that number only?

R. Zanibbi: From the proposed charge and some conversations, the problem is the way we deal with these is very different by unit. And in some units that number is used directly in determining your rate. Not the only one, but a heavily weighted one. And so particularly if you happen to be a faculty member who may get lower evaluations for reasons that have nothing to do with your academic skill, that's the concern.

H. Ghazal: Orders of the day.

S. Aldersley: FAC has a lot of charges, and they keep adding, and so some can get lost when they don't get to them. 2 years ago, the senate voted overwhelmingly to reduce appraisal categories from 5 to 3 but we are still waiting.

R. Zanibbi: This is still a live charge and is still being considered by FAC.

**Motion to approve charges (R. Zanibbi/M. Laver)**

**Motion passes 35-1-0**

Standing Committee Charges #2

Agenda Item No. 7: N. Buch, Dean Undergrad Studies & Student Success: Student Retention and Starfish (1:20)

Please see attached report

Office for undergraduate studies:

- -academic success center
- -center for teaching and learning
- -Co-op education and career services
- -Office of the Registrar
- -University Advising Office
- -Data analysis and special projects

Starfish executive Dashboard

- -as of 9/21 906 students have received alerts
- -results can be filtered by a variety of variables

Streamlined change-of-major process: charge & project goals

Historical Challenges

Policies and requirements are decentralized, inconsistent, and opaque.

No electronic form → limited ability to track change requests (e.g., application status & decisions), creating confusion for students & hampering advisors' effectiveness.

Unacceptable for internal transfer process to be more opaque / less friendly than external transfer (to a different institution).

High barrier to entry for internal transfers.

Project Goals

Streamline & centralize information, processes, and timelines to make them student-friendly.

Create on- and off-ramps for students interested in changing majors.

Stop exacerbating the perceived stigma of changing majors.

Unintended consequence of admitting new students directly into majors, and

Internal policies and practices that discourage existing students from changing majors.

Coordinated student success model

-Starting in Fall 2026… Undergraduate Studies & UAO will meet with colleges to discuss implementation of a coordinated student support model.-- Developing college-level teams-- Supporting the development of college-level strategy-- Promoting proactive outreach / support to ensure that students do not "slip through the cracks."

Revised Math Ladder: Calculus Readiness MPE

-Starting in Fall 2027, we will have a math ladder in place that provides additional instruction for incoming students who are not yet ready to succeed in Calculus. As recently as Fall 2025, these students were guaranteed MATH-171 placement, regardless of MPE score.

Revised Math Ladder: Intermediate Algebra MPE (Proposed)

-To promote success in MATH-161, we propose to have a ladder in place by Fall 2027.

**Questions/Comments**

R. Olson: Related to the change of program initiative, you mentioned a 10 day window, but that doesn't seem to align with what's on the web with programs' various deadlines, etc. Is the intent to move to a rolling window?

N. Buch: What we did was that we offered two options to colleges. One is a rolling window and one is a time specific window. Depending on what the colleges choose, we don't want to tie people's hands saying, no, you can only choose one way of doing this business. So again, we have to test this. It's only been six weeks since we've launched this. So we have to see how this

thing works. It's going to take about a year or so because the form is also not yet online, right? So right now we are still doing it the old fashioned way. So there's really no way to even track whether the 10 day window is going to be better or not because again, it's all PDFs and paper copies. The only way we can track whether the time window is being followed is once the online form comes active in January. So right now there's a lot of leeway because we're also learning just as the colleges are learning.

S. Davis: Is your change of program also going to incorporate the NTID process as well?

N. Buch: I will get you an answer to that.

M. Anselm: This looks great. I was recently at our department chair meeting and after the 21 day report, we looked at our retention numbers for first year students and a large proportion of the students that did not return in their second year had GPAs below 1.0. So we're trying to get to that 90% level. We were so close last year and then we actually took a step backwards and we're trying to brainstorm at a department level, like how can we retain more students and things of that nature. My question to you is how is this being disseminated to the students? Because in many cases, if you're a student who has less than a 1.0 GPA by the end of their first academic year, it would be nice to understand this process maybe at the end of the fall semester so that they can very quickly maybe pivot into another program, which would help all of us and various different departments achieve that 90%. We're so close. We're fighting for that one or 2%, right? Could this be a mechanism for achieving that?

N. Buch: You're absolutely right. I think if the coordinated student success model works the way I think it should work, then those conversations can start happening with students because at the end of the day on the other side of the table, there has to be a student. And if those conversations and if we are ready to, and we feel comfortable having the change of major conversation with the student, and if you've made the change of major process relatively easy, then that should work theoretically. So that's exactly the kind of thought process I have and that's the kind of thought process we'll share with the colleges when we go. I think we're meeting with CET sometime next week.

Student Retention and Starfish Presentation

Agenda Item No. 8: Emeritus Taskforce; C. Hull (1:43)

Last year this taskforce was created

-Many emeritus faculty would like to be listed on the website. But, RIT's technology does not permit us to do this.

-Parking privileges. We don't understand the rules of parking for Emeriti Faculty.

-Emeriti are interested in serving in some service opportunities.

-Adjunct teaching, dissertation committee members, etc. Policy does not currently allow them to do this.

-Please point Emeriti to the survey that we have distributed. If you need the link, we can share it.

-R. Zanibbi: Clive, thank you very much. And we will ask for you to come back and give us an update. Thank you.

**Questions/Comments**

S. Aldersley: So I just wanted to follow up. What our plan is as a task force is to come back to the Senate with some edits to E6. 01, which is the current policy, which includes emeritus. So that's what we're working on now and we hope to come back in maybe a month or six weeks or so.

Agenda Item No. 10: New Business; R. Zanibbi (1:47)

B. Lapisco-Encinas: Two constituents have said that students taking tests at the DSO complain about noise from adjacent rooms, in this case instruments.

K. Torres: Thank you. We are in the process of having our new furniture for the upstairs space delivered in November. And we are looking forward to our move to the first floor in Eastman next fall.

Agenda Item No. 11: Adjournment; R. Zanibbi (1:49)

Meeting is adjourned by R. Zanibbi.

Attendance 10/1/2026

| Name | Relationship to Senate | Attended | Name | Relationship to Senate | Attended |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Adams, Jake | Alternate GCCIS Senator | | Kwasinski, Andres | Alternate KGCOE Senator | |
| Adrion, Amy | Alternate CAD Senator | | Lanzafame, Joseph | Treasurer/COS Senator | X |
| Alm, Cecilia | CLA Senator | X | Lapizco-Encinas, Blanca | KGCOE Senator | X |
| Aloisio, Rebecca | CAD Senator | X | Laver, Michael | Communications Officer/CLA Senator | X |
| Anselm, Martin | CET Senator | X | Leipold, Kate | Alternate KGCOE Senator | X |
| Arena, Jason | Alternate CAD Senator | | Mardini, Ihab | CAD Senator | X |
| Barone, Keri | Vice Chair/CLA Senator | X | McCalley, Carmody | Alternate COS Senator | |
| Beck, Makini | SOIS Senator | | McGowan, Aaron | COS Senator | X |
| Bonzo, John | KGCOE Senator | X | McLaren, Amy | CAD Senator | |
| Boyd, Peter | Alternate SOIS Senator | | Officer, Cindy | Alternate NTID Senator | |
| Brady, Kathleen | NTID Senator | | Olson, Rob | GCCIS Senator | X |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Brown, Jeremy | GCCIS Senator | X | O'Neil, Jennifer | Alternate CET Senator | |
| Brown, Tamaira | Senate Coordinator | | Osgood, Robert | Alternate CHST Senator | |
| Burnette, Jeff | CLA Senator | X | Osier, Michael | COS Alternate Senator | X |
| Butler, Janine | NTID Senator | X | Padmanabhan, Poornima | KGCOE Senator | |
| Butler, Joshua | Alternate NTID Senator | | Reinicke, Bryan | Alternate SCB Senator | |
| Capps, John | CLA Senator | X | Reisch, Mark | CAD Senator | X |
| Chiavaroli, Julius | GIS Senator | X | Rich, Lexi | CET Senator | |
| Chung, Sorim | SCB Senator | X | Richmond, Michael | Alternate COS Senator | |
| Cody, Jeremy | COS Senator | X | Ross, Annemarie | NTID Senator | X |
| Coppenbarger, Matthew | COS Senator | X | Sanders, Cynthia | NTID Senator | X |
| David, Prabu | Provost | X | Scales, Rebecca | Alternate CLA Senator | |
| Davis, Stacey | NTID Senator | X | Song, Qian | SCB Senator | X |
| De Wit Paul, Alissa | Alternate GIS Senator | | St. Jacques, Robert | Alternate GCCIS Senator | |
| Dickens, Holly | Alternate CET Senator | | Staff Council Rep | Georgeanne Hogan | X |
| DiRisio, Keli | CAD Senator | X | Student Government Rep | Peyton Jesse | |
| Ghazle, Hamad | Operations Officer/CHST Senator | X | Sweeney, Kevin | Alternate SCB Senator | |
| Hartpence, Bruce | Alternate GCCIS Senator | | Thomas, Bolaji | CHST Senator | |
| Hoople, Jason | Alternate KGCOE Senator | | Vahid, Alireza | KGCOE Senator | X |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hull, Clyde | SCB Senator | X | Villasmil, Larry | CET Senator | X |
| Ientilucci, Emmett | COS Senator | X | Warp, Melissa | Alternate CAD Senator | |
| Jadamba, Basca | COS Senator | X | Weeden, Elissa | GCCIS Senator | |
| Johnson, Scott | GCCIS Senator | X | Wiandt, Tamas | Alternate COS Senator | |
| Kavin, Denise | Alternate NTID Senator | | Yu, Zhe | Alternate GCCIS Senator | |
| Kolodziej, Jason | KGCOE Senator | X | Zanibbi, Richard | Chair/GCCIS Senator | X |
| Krutz, Daniel | Alternate GCCIS Senator | | Zemcov, Michael | COS Senator | X |

Interpreters: Nic Crouse-Dickerson and Sonya Chavis
Student Assistant: Ella Kolodziej
Presenters: Prabu David, Elizabeth Hane, Leah Bradley, Kaitlin Stack Whitney, and Emily Sherwood