

College Senate Meeting Minutes

22 November 2021

Attendance

Senators Attending via Zoom:

L. Frisbee, R. Celli (proxy held at times by S. Shoemaker), L. Ciarfardoni (proxy held at times by C. Rossi), E. Liberatori (proxy held by A. Lang), E. Wagner, S. Shoemaker, A. Krause, C. Rossi, M. Wake, J. Cash, S. Jones, J. Fishner, L. Tessier, D. Holub (proxy held at times by L. Sloane), L. Jones, D. Cutting, A. Calabrese, D. Gashler, D. Aikens, M. House, N. Wagner (proxy held by M. Wake), A. Lang, L. Reyes, J. Brosnan, J. Fitch, A. Balcom, D. Wakin, Lindsay Walker (alt for D. Keever), Simon Purdy (alt for T. Hamblin), J. Warren

Senators Absent: None.

Guests: Lars Schweidenback, Dez Keever, Adriene Clifford, Dana Santos, Susan Deane, Lauren Sloane, Rob Piurowski, Ted Martin, Charlie Mole, Linnea Goodwin Burwood, Karen Teitelbaum, Jessica Fell, David Brower, Trish DeAngelis, Jen Aikens, Barb Sturdevant, Kelly Keck, Terry Hamblin, Michael's iPhone, Riikka Olson, Joan Erickson, Meagan Stone, Jack Tessier, Bret Meckel, Genevieve Salerno, John Padovani, Lori Tremblay, Elizabeth Sherr, Jackie Howard, John Horner, Brian Bean, Carlos Cabrera, Alyse Retallick, Benjamin VanDusen, Joe Keable.

Meeting called to order at 4:31 pm by Presider, E. Frisbee via Zoom.

Reminder: please use the "raise your hand" feature. Guests can speak, but cannot vote.

Welcome! – Liz

- Welcome! Thank you for attending!
- We have a lot of work today. Want to make sure folks feel safe, heard, and respected. Reminder of rules regarding speaking twice per amendment, trying to keep the meeting moving.
- Only Senators may vote, but guests may also speak.

Meeting Minutes

- Motion to approve: Dan G. Doug Holub seconds.
 - Y 26, 1 abstentions. Motion passes.

VONC Resolution Continued – Lisa

- Starting with Resolution 8.

- Amendment from Business & Hospitality via Shannon: “the climate” to “behavioral norms.” Cheri seconds.
 - Jason F: Explanation? What is normal to one person might not be normal to another. Shannon: That’s actually why we want to change it to that. We haven’t done a true climate study recently. “Behavioral norms” is more neutral, not associated with a specific survey. Jason: Feels subjective.
 - Lou: Similar: wanted a definition. Thanks, Shannon.
 - Josh: Point of clarification: because of the behavioral norms that there were resignations, or are the resignations separate? Shannon: Not sure about the intentions re: resignation.
 - Lisa: We had heard issues from those who resigned about the climate; that’s why this was put here.
 - Erin: “but has faced challenges including numerous resignations” as opposed to the climate issues. Amendment to the amendment. Joanna seconded.
 - Lori: Something about collegiality? There seemed to be reports of lack of collegiality and that led to the unfortunate climate on the groups that made folks resign. Friendly amendment: “in collegiality”
 - Jason: Is there documentation that it was a lack of collegiality or showing why people are resigning? Also: “numerous” – how many? And with stated reasons?
 - Liz: 5 so far off hand. Can read one that I was given permission to read here: “Due to the time commitments I am managing this semester and the current environment and behaviors throughout campus, I don't believe my time investments would be sufficient to effectively accomplish the goals of this taskforce. I wish each of you the best of luck with this endeavor, and believe if the necessary players are also willing to actively engage with the taskforce there is potential for some positive outcomes.”
 - Amanda: I resigned from the CET due to concerns about collegiality within the group.
 - Alice: Grammar concern.
 - Lisa: I also resigned from the financial CET committee and that was due to the climate and workings of the group.
 - JoAnna: Was the original content about the president? Or the CET groups?
 - Lisa: Issues regarding president’s interactions with the CET. Climate is impacting the works of those groups.

- Liz: From the start, Katie and I, as co-chairs to CET, scheduled meetings to update the president on the progress of the workgroups.
 - JoAnna: So the President was getting updates, then stopped, and is now going to Liz and Susan Deane. I also didn't join the CET because of the climate and the lack of collegiality.
- Josh: When I read through this, if this is about the president and the leadership, the CET groups having issues doesn't really reflect the president. Shouldn't we be looking into this issue unto itself? This reads like there are problems within the groups. Is it the president or is it the overall environment on campus? Looking for point of clarification.
- Lori: Speaking in favor of this. Came onto a CET where there was no faculty on there. Everything reflects back on the president, because he is the leader and we have a top-down leadership model.
- Erin: We could add something in about collegiality campus-wide as opposed to the CET. However, I will hold off because that would be a different amendment.
- Amanda: Speaking in favor. All of the other whereas clauses from last week were about the consultation report. This clause is an outgrowth of that and explains why the recommendations from the consultation report cannot go forward.
- Alice calls the question. Jim seconds.
- 25 Y, 0 N, 2 abstentions to end discussion
- All in favor of the amendment to amendment: 24 Y; 0 N; 4 abstentions
- Back to original amendment: behavioral norms.
 - Erin: Procedural question re: how to amend clause and how to proceed.
 - Liz: If we had struck part of the original amendment wording, we wouldn't have to go back to vote on original amendment.
 - Lori: Amendment to amendment: Put a period after group and strike everything in yellow. Erin seconds.
 - Vote: 26 Y, 0 N, 2 abstentions.
- Amendments to whereas 8? None.
- Motion to accept 8: JoAnna, Simon seconds. 24 Y, 3 N, 2 abstentions.
- Whereas 9: Any amendments? None.
 - Motion to accept: Jim, second: Dan G. 22 Y, 1 N, 6 abstentions
- Whereas 10: Any amendments?
 - JoAnna: Motion to strike this whereas. Feels subjective. While some evidence could be provided one way, evidence could also be provided in the opposite. Lou seconds.

- Donna: Statement in support of the amendment – some constituents felt the same way.
- Vote: 9 Y, 18 N, 2 abstentions. Motion fails.
- JoAnna: Putting in the chat: “WHEREAS 10 Some campus stakeholders feel the President has failed to communicate and act on a clear vision for SUNY Delhi; and” Second: Lou
 - Josh: Speak in favor of amendment. We have a strategic plan and that has been communicated.
 - Lori: Against this change. We could say some to all of these. Some might feel there shouldn’t have been a VONC. This dilutes this statement and is not beneficial to the context of the resolution.
 - JoAnna: Even though there are some this way and that – so at what point does one group become more significant?
 - Donna: If we vote and want everyone of these to say “some” then we should have the opportunity to do so. It is not the view of every person.
 - Alice: Object to “some” for similar reasons as Lori. This is a resolution of the College Senate. We’re a deliberative body and the majority rules.
 - Vote: Y 9, N 18, 2 abstentions. Motion fails.
- Back to the original whereas clause.
 - Josh: Motion to amend: Strike “communicate and” because the strategic plan is available and communicated to everyone. Second: JoAnna.
 - Lori: Point of clarification: we have a strategic plan, but is it the President’s responsibility or is that someone else? – On the website. Does the president have a role in communicating the strategic plan? I hear what folks are saying, but want clarification on this. Goes back to the top-down leadership.
 - Liz – President is part of the strategic plan, but in terms of communicating, it takes a number of people to get the message out there. Led by president and a number of people who were on the strategic plan committee.
 - Josh: Strategic report card that Katie presented at College Council. There are metrics about the outcomes. Available on the president’s website. Was also posted in the Delhi Today.
 - Yes – posted by Katie.
 - Vote: Y 13, 13 N, 2 abstentions. Liz is able to break ties. Votes in favor of deleting “communicate and” – 14 Y, 13 N, 2 abstentions. Motion passes.
- Lou: Thank you all for considering these amendments. I was losing hope on the collective body and congeniality in the room. I believe we will finish this today. I believe the President will do what the collective body wants him to do. There’s no reason to destroy and beat up further. As a collective body: we’re clear where

we're at and where we want to go. I saw a vision, I saw changes on this campus. Whether we agree with that or not, there were changes. There have been changes and change is uncomfortable. I appreciate that folks are thinking about things.

- Liz: It is important that we're open to changes. This is just a starting point. But if people don't agree, they have the right to vote against – that might be how their constituents feel. We need to be heard here. This is where agreements and disagreements need to happen. Please keep in mind that we're here to hear you out. Just because we disagree, doesn't mean the body isn't hearing you. I encourage that people remain open.
- Any other proposed revisions? None. Motion to accept whereas 10: Shannon. Second: Jim. Vote: 20 Y, 5 N, 3 abstentions
- Whereas 11: Any proposed amendments:
 - Erin: Wonder if it would stronger to split into two whereas clauses: one related to financial issues and one related to process. Second: Jim.
 - Shannon: Propose amendment to amendment to not split it but take out the word "oversight" and replace it with "shared governance"? Second: Cheri.
 - Mary: Speak against that because we did revise the budget and planning (B&P) process. B&P committee came to Senate and said it was not serving campus in its current structure. B&P wanted to be dissolved in order to restructure to better serve the campus in favor of another process. Reviewing unit plans didn't fit with structure of having budget director.
 - Josh: Against the amendment: I work with the budget process. Every unit's budget submission is made available on Confluence. Line item detail and aggregate info. Documentation and the website have only been looked at a few times. I was not aware of the change in the process that this clause is speaking to.
 - Lisa: In favor of the amendment. Each unit would have to give a rationale for hires and the hires were vetted. We aren't doing this anymore. Leadership team is making these decisions. This used to be part of the template submitted.
 - Cheri: Speaking in favor of the amendment: B&P was overhauled and gone for a year and now they're back. However, the absence of the committee doesn't absolve the president of shared governance. He could have found another way and communicated to the campus and participate in shared governance.
 - Lori: In favor of shared governance addition here.
 - Adriene: I asked for reporting on the budget changes. "Why would they want that? Just so they can complain more?" B&P was removed from the

process and could not receive any reports requested by the committee...I am in favor of the shared governance comment. I no longer felt like B&P had a voice in this process.

- Alice: New B&P created through bylaws committee. I worked with Adriene and Steve Cembrinski on this. Steve pushed for a shared governance model. But I also agree with Adriene. B&P didn't work with the model – originally senate was not part of this model. Senate argued and pushed for that and put it in the bylaws. Senate pushed for its own role. That was done by us, not the president or the leadership team.
- Mary: We did have representation during that year on the RATF. Whereas the president may not have initiated this, the fact that we argue as a group and present that to the leadership and they agree – that is shared governance. It wasn't an outright no.
- Lori: Point of clarification: seat for RATF being an option: when was that?
 - Liz: Feb 2020 was when we voted in new B*P. Not sure if we had a seat at RATF then. Ward and Mary started around then, but there was time when we didn't have representation. 2/10/20 voted on candidates for RATF.
- Vote on: keeping it one clause and "shared governance": 18 Y, 5 N, 2 abstentions. Motion passes.
- Back to original amendment to split whereas into 2 clauses
 - Doug: Point of clarification: wording change does not change to the splitting? Erin is okay with the "shared governance" as a friendly amendment.
 - Shannon: My amendment was to not strike – so does that negate original amendment? – Alice – yes, her amendment was to keep them as one. Because we voted in favor of Shannon – we don't have two. We voted to keep it together.
 - Lisa: Perhaps we need to just do individual amendments. Amendments to the amendments are getting confusing.
- Motion to accept whereas 11: Lori C, second: Cheri. Vote: 19 Y, 9 N, 1 abstention. Motion passes.
- Whereas 12: Proposed amendments: none. Motion to approve: Lori C, Simon seconds. Vote: 20 Y, 7 N, 2 abstentions. Motion passes.
- 5 min break: return at 6:34pm. Reminder: Guests can speak, but only Senators can vote.
- Whereas 13: Proposed amendments: none. Motion to approve: Erin, second: Rich. Vote: 21 Y, 6 N, 2 abstentions. Motion passes.
- Whereas 14: Proposed amendments:
 - JoAnna: Can the resolutions committee speak to this? What is this getting at?
 - Lisa: Academic calendar being finished last minute. Understandable during COVID. Breaks have been changed without discussion. Concerns

about campus safety. Academic planning committee – created to help academic-related issues or concerns during COVID. Committee faced a series of challenges.

- Dan: A lot in a few words here. Difficulties we've been having regarding program deactivation.
- Charlie: "Proactive" means going out in front of. It's difficult to criticize "proactive" – very nebulous. There's enough about shared governance in these others. This one is mushy and doesn't belong.
- Lou: Who constituted the resolution committee? Lisa: Shelly Jones, Jason Cash, Dan Gashler, Andrea Balcom, Lisa Tessier. Committee has the requisite number per our bylaws.
- Liz: It was not required that there be contingency plan for COVID; schools were allowed to make plans, but not required. Calendar wasn't finalized until end of August – disadvantages students and faculty/staff in planning. Lack of an assessment plan for President's Office and Provost's Office.
- Erin: Amendment: add "as recently demonstrated by the campus's Covid response." Second: Alice.
 - Alice: Speak in favor of the amendment. I agreed with the previous comments that this wasn't as strong. The evidence/examples could have been included in the statement. COVID is a good example here regarding the lack of planning.
 - Lou: Confused about the COVID response piece. That seems to be a place for kudos since we have had so few cases.
 - Shelly: COVID plan was sent back and the committee didn't know that. Areas don't know what they are teaching until a week before classes start, calendars being changed mid-semester.
 - Erin: Struggling to deal with it – going into large school meetings despite known COVID infections – questionable. Lots of confusion with students about testing, who is allowed to say things (e.g. can faculty talk to students about COVID); are classes going online? Clear planning involves good communication with constituents and stakeholders.
 - Lou: One may argue that the decisions had to happen quickly due to COVID. Things were changing even above the president. We created plans and understanding the intricacies of our school must have added to the layers of complexity. Need a marriage of shared governance and top-down leadership.
 - Kelly Keck: A lot could be mentioned with regard to labor management about this clause. One good example: pool testing.

Labor management asked about including CADI workers in pool testing; answer was SUNY didn't require it. During this crisis, there was a lot of pushing we had to do to get things done.

- Lisa: Thanksgiving break was changed without explanation during the middle of the semester. Fall 2020 calendar wasn't posted until late summer. Fall 2021 wasn't finalized until August 5. Last minute, not ahead of time. We wanted contingency plans regarding what to do. Some schools made contingency plans and then those were questioned when put into motion.
- Simon: Back in Summer 2020 when we hadn't finalized plans, I didn't know if we could talk to students. I reached out to communications, who bumped up to president, who was very upset that I asked questions about how to communicate with students and families. Even if we don't know yet, communicate that, let people know what's going on. Speaking in favor of the amendment.
- John Padovani: Would ask that Kelly Keck's prior comments be stricken; it is not true. CADI is its own entity. CADI worked from day one to comply with COVID pool testing.
- Vote: 19 Y, 8 N, 2 abstentions.* (Note: in the meeting Shelly said 1 abstention, but someone with a proxy voted late with an abstention via chat so Shelly is including this here as the abstention does not change the outcome of the vote.) Motion passes.
 - Motion to approve whereas 14: Lori C., second: Dan.
 - Vote: 20 Y, 8 N, 1 abstention. Motion passes.
- JoAnna: Motion to postpone discussion on resolution until Monday, November 29 at 4:30pm. Second: Mary.
 - Discussion: Erin: Appreciate the late hour and know we are working hard and not a fun way. I think the longer we draw this out, the environment will be toxic on campus. We need to finish this.
 - Jason F: Speaking in favor of postponement. Shouldn't be a rushed process. Still have a lot to do.
 - Liz: Still have other items on the agenda for the 29th as well.
 - Lori: If anything new were to happen between now and next week, that could affect people's votes. Better to wrap this up and be done with it. We signed up for this and need to plow through this. Next week we have a regular agenda. I'd rather stay now than the Monday before Christmas.
 - Lou: call the question.
 - Vote: Y 8, 18 N, 1 abstention. Motion fails.

- Liz: Thank you for being here and staying late. We'll keep pressing on.
- Whereas 15: Proposed Amendments?
 - Simon: Add "including emergency situations" Second: Cheri
 - Simon: The communication part of this is the number one thing we've been discussing. We have a lack of emergency communications. A student was stabbed at an off-campus party; there was a delay of three days before communication was released to the campus about it. Students were worried and there were lots of rumors. Faculty and staff asked for a statement to go out; that didn't go out for three days after the incident took place. A few years ago there was a suicide on campus and there were lots of rumors. Emergency response plan on confluence is very clear about this (e.g. quelling rumors, events off-campus can be included in this). This needs to be communicated to the community. Element of urgency to this lack of communication.
 - Jason: Speaking against this. If students and faculty aren't safe, then there should be communication. Fire in Russell Hall was communicated. Off-campus incidents are not included in this. Safety of student needs to be prioritized before notifying campus.
 - Adam: March 2019 suicide – I responded to that situation. There are a lot of other priorities first (e.g. notifying family). There was a campus wide announcement four hours after this.
 - Lori: Speaking in favor of this. I receive many announcements per day from a different SUNY (updates of road closures, violence, etc.) as well as updates from that president. When we're in the classroom and we say we don't know what's happening either, that doesn't help console the students. There are people actively involved in these communications that can happen besides a Delhi Today Extra.
 - Mary: Speaking against this addition. Disheartening when students know things before we do. Campus was notified that the campus was safe. President held a forum regarding suicide. Initially a crime scene and we are not allowed to disclose information. We cannot disclose that until family allows us to. There were notifications that went out. The Halloween party was not on campus.
 - Erin: Speaking in support of amendment. Commend Adam and Jason and Mary who are working on the front line in the residence halls and health support services. A different example: alleged sexual assault on campus. Students didn't know if they were safe. No messaging about that ever.
 - Lou: I'm not in favor of the amendment. We should use best practices and use other mechanisms to communication if there's a statement like "there was an incident but everyone is safe" – I'm assuming in good faith that we are all safe otherwise. Students get information so quickly

through social media. Maybe we need a best practice of acknowledging that something happened, but reassuring that people are safe. Maybe we need campus-wide professional development about what to say. Moving forward we need to find a solution. How are we going to fix this? Many of us are in that mode. Need to be on the road to recovery and get this done together.

- Bret: Appreciate all your time. This is an important conversation. I hadn't planned on speaking up but I wanted to chime in. I've been on the campus for 16 years. I realize there are privacy issues – but emergency issues have changed on our campus. My job as a dean is much harder. I don't get any kind of notice; I don't want details about incidents or anything like that. But these communications have broken down on our campus. Rumors take over from facts. In an emergency we need facts. If I don't have enough facts to communicate to faculty/staff, rumors will surface. When a Vet Sci student committed suicide, I found out at 5pm after a Delhi Today and after I had told the faculty that it wasn't our student because I would know. That was a break down in communication. You can't tell details, but you can tell enough to shut down rumors.
- Linnea: I agree with Bret. When things like this happen, rumors fly through. We (deans) have no information to give faculty/staff. The lacrosse house is part of the SUNY campus – it was gifted to the campus by Dom Morales. The rumors went as far as SUCO - students over there were talking about dead Delhi students.
- Lori: Another example of best practices: emergency alert of suspicious individual from another college. Full description of what happened. Standard info at the bottom: policy and procedures re: NYS University Police (e.g. sharing information, availability of services). Reiterates briefly what happened and that the situation is safe/secure.
- Jason: Can you send the Communications CET that email as an example? Lacrosse House is not owned or operated by the college. It is not a campus house. Campus doesn't own/operate it. It changes hands in terms of renters.
- Cheri: Move to call the question. Shannon seconds. 24 Y, 1 N, 4 abstentions. Motion passes.
- Vote for amendment: 21 Y, 4 N, 3 abstentions
- Motion to approve whereas 15: Lori, second: Lindsay.
 - Simon: I appreciate the discussion that happened tonight and I appreciate everyone's work to keep our campus and students safe.
 - Vote: 22 Y, 4 N, 3 abstentions

- Whereas 16: Proposed Amendments: None. Motion to approve: Jim. Shelly seconds. Discussion none. Vote: 22 Y, 2 N, 5 abstentions. Motion passes.
- Whereas 17: Proposed Amendments:
 - Lou: Enough of our senators have experienced or have had constituents that have? None of my constituents have experienced this.
 - Shelly: I'm so glad to hear that some folks haven't experienced this; that is how it should be. No one should experience this kind of behavior. As a tenured, full faculty member, though I fear retribution for saying this, I have witnessed on more than one occasion inappropriate, hostile, aggressive behavior from the President. The president, in anger, pounded his fist on a table. He berated a colleague and when the colleague continued to attempt to calmly discuss the matter at hand, the president interrupted them and shouted "next agenda item!" in order to move the meeting along because he did not want to discuss the topic. This behavior is unbecoming of the office of the president. I have witnessed another colleague have a panic attack in a meeting with the president due to his hostile behavior. This person had a physical, visceral reaction to the aggressive behavior they experienced. No one should ever have to feel this way in a meeting – and certainly not due to the president's words and actions. This type of behavior by the president has been reported to HR on more than one occasion that I am aware of. People have done their due diligence to the college community to report this kind of behavior as they should for anyone who has acted unprofessionally. I personally did not report this to HR because the others who were in the meeting did report it and, at the time, I was untenured so I did not feel comfortable/safe to report such for fear of retribution.
 - Lori: I was also in the meeting when a colleague had a panic attack and they left the meeting because of that. Another leadership member made a disparaging remark about the fact that the person left. People are afraid to speak out because of retribution. There's been a lot of reported and documented evidence about this issue.
 - Lou: The previous workplace violence clause about the violations, were these some of the violations? Shelly: No those were about policy/procedure, not about individual people.
 - Motion to accept whereas 17: Jim, second: Lisa T. Vote: 22 Y, 0 N, 7 abstentions.
- Whereas 18: Proposed Amendments:
 - Jason: It was presented at Senate and put into the record, but there were not signatures included. Questions about intimidating people to sign. Move to strike whereas 18. Lou: Second.
 - Lori: This is factual, it happened. Don't know that striking it is the correct answer. I don't know the relativity of knowing who signed it. Factually speaking, whereas clauses 18 and 19 occurred.

- Erin: Proposed amendment to help ground this but don't want to do the amendments to the amendments. Mention the areas of the signers to help represent the areas and provide more clarification. List all the areas where signatures came from.
- Lisa: This is going to the Chancellor and the Chancellor has received that letter. We could re-copy the letter as part of this document that has just the areas indicated?
- Jason: Mistrust in the eboard when we were told we would get information when we asked for the signatures and didn't get them. That is FOIAble.
- Lou: Agree with Lori – these are factual. Amenable to including the document. If the President were to do something and didn't do it, it would be one of these whereas clauses. We should provide that clarity to folks. But 18 and 19 happened. Two of my constituents signed that document and signed under false pretenses.
- Josh: Point of inquiry: what groups of people have seen the letter in its entirety? We had a vote to include the letter in its entirety, but the redacted version was included.
 - Liz: By entirety you mean the names? Yes. When people signed it, they saw it. In its entirety, there may have been some that saw some of it. All of Senate saw the letter itself and the areas.
 - Josh: Monica gave you the letter and then sent it to the Chancellor's office? Liz: Yes, Monica gave me the letter. I don't know who else may have seen it. I did not send the full letter with signatures to the Eboard or anyone else on the Senate.
 - Lori: When signatures were obtained, they just saw the space they signed.
- Lisa: Jason asked because he wanted to know that different areas that were represented. Request made prior to the VONC. These are some of the things eboard discussed regarding the situation.
- Shannon put in chat different areas that were represented in the petition.
- Alice: Speaking against the amendment to strike. It's just a matter of fact. People were concerned about retaliation. The petition was not confidential; some people signed with the information they felt comfortable sharing. I do think the full information should be available. But I'm against striking this whereas clause.
- Lori: Friendly amendment to Jason's amendment: add in the departments that Shannon found. – Jason is amenable.

- Vote on amendment to add the departments of the signers of the petition: 26 Y, 0 N, 3 abstentions.
 - Josh: Grammatical point to spell out the areas (not LAS but Liberal Arts and Sciences). Yes – we will do that. Thanks!
 - Motion to approve 18: Dan, second: Shannon. Vote: 26 Y, 0 N, 3 abstentions
- Whereas 19: Proposed Amendments:
 - Jason: Amendment to add the count of Y/N/Abstention (21 Y, 7 N, 1 abstention) in parentheses to the clause next to the percentages regarding the vote from Oct 18. Second: JoAnna. 25 Y, N 0, 1 abstention.
 - Motion to approve: Cheri; Second: Jim. Vote: 28 Y, 0 N, 0 abstentions.
- 5 mins break. Thank you all so much! Meet back at 8:42.
- Lori: Is the resolution clause really just procedural? As far as the steps we take? Yes.
- Any additional whereas clauses? None.
- Be it resolved 1: Proposed amendments?
 - Jason: Does the final vote get attached to the resolution? Where does it go that it shows that this resolution does not represent the entire Senate?
 - The final votes are usually posted at the top of the resolution just like UFS Resolutions and it will be recorded in our meeting minutes as well.
 - Motion to accept resolved 1: Shannon. Second: Rich. Vote: 21 Y, 1 N, 6 abstentions. Motion passes.
- Be it resolved 2: Proposed amendments
 - Josh: Should we include a timeframe in this resolved?
 - Electronically this could be sent out to the College Senate when it's complete and send it on to the others listed here. The physical copies would be sent out ASAP.
 - Josh: By December 1? Liz: Delivering a physical copy to the Chancellor might be dictated by the Chancellor's schedule. Josh: When is the next College Council meeting? December 7. Josh: Okay, or else leave it out as long as folks here know the time frame.
 - Amendment to add a date "by December 2021". JoAnna second.
 - Cheri: Speaking against the amendment. Don't mind a time being stated, but given the time of year, it might not be reasonable to get a meeting with the Chancellor. "As soon as reasonably possible" or "as schedules allow" – account for scheduling.
 - Rich: By December 2021 – sounds like November 30 is the deadline. Should be by end of December. Getting the letter physically to the Chancellor might be difficult.
 - Jason: Friendly amendment to by December 31, 2021? Accepted.
 - Adam: Two questions: is there a reason why it needs to be hand-delivered? When sending it to UFS and College Council, are we sending it in general or to

- the leaders? Liz: To the leaders – acting chair of College Council, the President of UFS, and Chancellor. Hand-delivered to be official and receive a physical copy.
- Lou: Putting in a specific date to move this forward is important. We want to make change on this campus. Quicker we move this along, the better. President should get a letter directly as well.
 - Liz: When this goes out to all the Senators, it goes out to the President and Provost, as well as Student Senate leader. All correspondence to the Senators goes to them as well and they have access to our Vancko Hall page. Also, per our resolution process, the President receives a copy as well.
 - Erin: Could we have a date and then “as soon as schedules allow” so that there’s that awareness beyond our control (e.g. weather, Chancellor’s schedule)? Josh agrees to friendly amendment: or as schedules allow.
 - Vote: 26 Y, 3 N, 0 abstentions. Motion passes.
 - Lori: Motion for an amendment: Delivered electronically “ASAP” and physically as it is written as we just passed. That way it’s clear that we send one now and another as possible. Second: Josh. Vote: 26 Y, 0 N, 2 abstentions.
 - Motion to approve second resolved clause: Dan, second: Cheri. Vote: 24 Y, 1 N, 4 abstentions. Motion passes.
 - Be it resolved 3: proposed amendments:
 - Alice: Heard from constituents to make this less nuanced and directly calling on the President to resign. Amendment proposed. Cheri second.
 - Charlie: Word “assist” is wrong. “Proceed with” – they will assist us if there’s a change in the presidency.
 - Dan: Will make this amendment at the right time.
 - Vote: 19 Y, 8 N, 1 abstention. Motion passes.
 - Dan: Motion to replace “assist in” with “proceed with”. Second: Shannon. Vote: 21 Y, 5 N, 2 abstention. Motion passes.
 - Motion to accept the resolved 3: Lori; second: Jim Warren. Vote: 20 Y, 8 N, 1 abstention.
 - Any additional “be it resolved” clauses? No.
 - Original main motion to approve the Vote of No Confidence Resolution:
 - Jason: Motion: Asked by constituents if there were significant changes to bring this back to our areas and postpone the vote until November 29th meeting. After a five hour meeting, there have been significant changes. Second: Lou.
 - Shannon: None of the true tenets of the document have changed. We clarified some dates, changed a few words. We should finish this and get back to the regular business of the Senate.
 - Mary – We have now called for the President to resign. We are no longer just asking for the Chancellor to step in. My constituents would want to know that before I vote for them.

- Erin: Calling for a “transition in leadership” is a strong statement in line with resignation – not very different, just a more specific action.
- JoAnna: Echo Mary that VONC is not the same thing as asking for a resignation. Takes away any chance of reconciliation. For those who didn’t have these experiences, they were on board so that the campus could heal.
- Alice: Agree with Erin: “transition in leadership” was a nuanced way to ask for the President to resign or be removed. “A transition” does not mean “counseling.”
- Jason: Agree with Mary – this isn’t just nuanced language. This is a major addition. After five hours, this is not just minor language changes. People are being very hypocritical tonight.
- Vote to postpone vote: 10 Y, 18 N, 1 abstention. Motion to postpone fails.
- Concerns re: proxy votes and knowing how they would vote based on deduction. Don’t have a perfect proxy system. Making it as anonymous as possible. With current voting system, senators using proxies that are also senators know their votes won’t be anonymous because the system we use to vote has not changed yet. We are looking into a new system, however.
 - Josh: In those previous situations, we did our best – but here we’re using precedent to supersede our bylaws change. Liz: Doing the best we can using the same system as before. Didn’t want to change the system halfway through such an important vote. Not because it’s past practice, but because we don’t have another system in place yet.
 - Lou: We made changes to the document. This is not our vote, but our constituents vote. We’re going to proceed to vote now without giving this document to our constituents before we vote.
 - Liz: Postponement was attempted and voted down. We are following process.
 - Alice: Just want to be clear that we are following procedure for how we vote on resolutions. Everything has to be on the agenda for two meetings. We can discuss and make changes and still vote. We are following procedure. A postponement could be made, but that was voted down.
 - Lisa: Did amend our bylaws to say “anonymous vote” for main motion of resolution. In past we would bring it back and then come back, make amendments and vote on it. That’s what is specified in our process.
 - Liz: We are following process and parliamentary procedure. If something is voted down, we have to move on.

- Lisa: Before we vote, I just want to make sure everyone knows that there will be minor edits to the resolution (e.g. taking out the numbers of the clauses, full names of areas, add in the final vote count at top, updating the college logo at the top)
 - Vote on the Resolution for VONC: 21 Y, 7 N, 1 abstention.
 - We will proceed with the actions in the be it resolved clauses. This will be sent out to the College Senate, College Council, UFS President, and the SUNY Chancellor as soon as the final document is ready.
- Thank you all for staying on this late and getting this done. I hope you all felt safe and heard in this meeting. Thank you to the guests who stayed as well. Thank you for the consideration you've given to this topic. Have a great holiday and let us know if you have any questions.
- Adjourned: 10:00pm.