

# College Senate Meeting Minutes

## 19 April 2021

### Attendance

#### Senators Attending via Zoom:

A. Balcom, T. Hamblin, E. Liberatori, S. Shoemaker, L. Frisbee, S. Jones, D. Gashler, L. Tessier, M. Wake, R. Celli, R. Piurowski, A. Calabrese, C. Rossi, D. Krzyston, D. Aikens, D. Cutting, D. Holub, E. Ericson, E. Wagner, J. Fishner, M. Fields, A. Krause (proxy held via Lindsay Walker), L. Ciafardoni, J. Cash, W. Shaffer, L. Jones, D. Conklin, M. House, L. . Aleksa, J. Lindsay

**Senators Absent:** D. Green, J. Warren, S. Babcock,

**Guests:** Desiree Kever, Nii Teteh (Student Senate President), Bret Meckel, Carol Bishop, Susan Deane, David Brower, John Padovani, Joanna Brosnan, Thomas Jordan, Tomas Aguirre, Michael Sullivan, Michael Laliberte, Lars Schweidenback, Dana Santos, Katie Bucci,

Meeting called to order at 4:32 pm by Presider, E. Frisbee via Zoom.

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

### Meeting Minutes

- Motion to approve the 4-5-2021 meeting minutes: Ward Shaffer made the motion, Terry Hamblin seconded. Motion approved.

### Eboard Update – Liz

- We had meeting with Leadership team on April 7; discussed alternate plan due to feedback from last Senate meeting regarding leadership members being co-chairs
  - Potential alternate model – we will look at later tonight – Lisa created a model
- Liz received email from SUNY Provost to meet regarding consultation report
  - Met to discuss report and where we are now
- Scheduling meetings with the President to ask him to come to a May and June Senate meeting to be part of conversations; also schedule meetings with eboard as well; any meetings with eboard and leadership – hoping he can attend those as well

### **Curriculum Committee – Lars Schweidenback**

- CC20-66 – Applied Tech – New class: RFAC 180 Heat Pumps. Fix hole in HVAC curriculum. Motion: Jason Cash; Second: Lori C.; Motion passes
- CC20-67 and 68 – Mechatronics AOS and AAS – Either Electrical Theory 3 OR Physics 2; Motion: Doug H; Second: Erin Wagner; Motion passes.
- CC20-69 – Mechatronics BT AECT 280 and 375 replaced with CITA 235 and 335; advisory council recommendation due to increase in programming needs; Motion: Lisa T; second: Rich C; 1 abstention. Motion passes.
- CC20-70 – Change pre-req for Electrical Theory 4 be Electrical Theory 3 OR physics 2; Motion: Donna Cutting; Second: Shannon Shoemaker; 1 abstention; Motion passes
- CC20-71 – Events 215 new class; has been piloted previously. Motion: Terry Hamblin; Second: Ericka Erickson; 1 abstention; motion passes
- CC20-72 – Creates course EVT 345: Festival and Cultural Event Management; Motion: Rich Celli; second: Dennis Aikens; motion passes..
- CC20-73 – deactivation of EVNT 340 – has never run and no plan to run; future program change upcoming. Motion: Lori C; second: Ward Shaffer; motion passes.
- Future things to think about: how gen-ed changes will take place in terms of paperwork. Stay tuned.
  - Katie in chat: SUNY will be creating an Implementation Guide following campus feedback; answering the curriculum committee question.
- Thanks, Lars!

### **Resolution on Shared Governance – Administrator’s Response**

- Resolution from UFS was approved by UFS and endorsed by Chancellor Malatras; adopted this resolution for our campus
- Received administrative response from Dr. Jordan today at 4pm – will post in the Vancko Hall page for folks to look over
- Doug – Response re: communications within 48 hours; where is this coming from?
  - Dr. Jordan – above it says “timely communication” – so we made this more specific
- Liz – You mention the “consultation resolutions” but do you mean the consultation recommendations? – Yes.
- Ellen – we’re reading this now to apprise of us this? We’re not acting on this?
  - Liz – correct; these were the administration’s response; if you have questions we can discuss further.

### **Bylaws Committee Update – Ward Shaffer**

- Liz met with bylaws committee to discuss bylaws recommendations that came from the consultation report

- Don't have resolutions yet, but have started working on the "low-hanging fruit" – bylaws changes that are easy to make and clean up language to make things easier
- Anticipate we will have resolutions ready for the first May meeting
- Email conversations with Steve Cembrinski; recognizing that budget and planning committee hasn't been functioning
  - Last year Mary Wake and Ward were assigned to RATF; they've attended those meetings
  - Steve wants to have a discussion re: B&P and bylaws governing it to make things smoother. No timeline yet.
  - Concerned that if we wait until other shared gov recommendations are done, we will wait too long;
  - How should we deal with B&P? In the bylaws – but no one's on it; do we populate it and then fix it; vice versa? Wait on other recommendations done first? Senate should be represented in the budget process.
- Liz – Steve's email to you is timely; trying to finalize the plan of work groups including the financial sustainability workgroup, which would include the B&P recommendation
- Carol Bishop – thank you, Ward, for bringing that up; budget process is going to continue, so it would be advantageous to start that process sooner than later; can't wait till Fall;
- Ward – just want a sense of how we do this; there's senate representation on the RATF, but we've never populated the committee we agreed to make a year ago. Obviously the budget process doesn't stop
- Lisa – Confused. Thought we revised our bylaws to have a committee in place. I think we should start with what we have in the bylaws right now and then revisit. Am I missing something?
- Laurie Jones – Motion to move forward with the process we have in our bylaws regarding the Budget and Planning committee. If the consultation process changes the bylaws, then we can address it then. Second: Ericka. Vote: 2 abstentions; motion passes.

### **Statement from College Senate on Workplace Violence and Prohibited Behaviors – Liz**

- Any feedback or suggestions on this statement?
- Ellen – At the previous meeting, I stated when Senate puts out information, it provide a supportive clause, but not a resolution or statement. Canvassed the at large group and have a statement to make. Workplace violence is an over-arching term but is usually related to physical violence or monetary exchange. No formal complaints filed. People must make formal complaints and allow the college to act as regulated. I have previously experienced harassment at other institutions and have formally reported these issues. What we have here aren't formal complaints. Instead they are near slanderous accusations with no substantiation. We cannot allow these untruths to

become facts. Trying to act in a fair, reasonable, and supportive manner. Reflect on the following: what are we doing here in the Senate body? How do these allegations serve us?

- Liz – thank you for sharing your story. I don't think this statement is intended to call on an investigation, but rather about awareness: if folks are experiencing these issues, they should report it, as you say. If the Senate does not want this, even though this was brought up a few meetings ago, then we need to make changes and/or vote on it.
- Lori C. – I see people not feeling empowered to come and speak. I don't think people who gave information to the consultation regarding this issue, they did that to share their own lived experiences rather than malicious intent. We don't get to say that those are disingenuous. If it wasn't your story, we don't get to say whether it's true or false. We make a lot of collective statements about social justice issues at SUNY. We are making a statement supporting anti-violence workplace. How can you say that nothing has been filed? That's an anonymous, confidential process federally protected. If there's a way that people are knowing that things are filed, we have a larger problem here as well.
- Carol: SUNY Delhi has an existing policy that complies with applicable laws and regulations. Help me understand why Senate feels the need to have a separate statement? Wouldn't we be better served for Senate to say they support and encourage use of the existing policies and processes.
- Katie: I'm not a Senator, but my two cents: a statement regarding workplace violence should likely be just that; alluding to the consultation doesn't stand up to the test of time. Further, we have an existing policy already that should be used.
- Liz – because these things came out through the consultation report and matched the existing workplace violence policy, and because people are coming to us, by making a statement that we acknowledge that these things are coming forward and we need to make people aware of the policy; in the positive change section, it emphasizes the existing process (e.g. reporting to HR); this is really more of statement to use the existing policy that's in place. If we need to change the language, then that's what we're here to do today.
- Ellen – Would volunteer to be on a working group to wordsmith this statement. Need to find the support to make these kinds of reports. That is available by the institution. Reach out and talk to people. We continue to swirl around anonymity and thus don't get to a resolution and help the greater good.
- Lisa – In support of a statement; I have witnessed people behaving unprofessionally. Have been yelled at over the phone. PhDs have been made fun of at public forums on campus. This statement is a step to move forward to make this a better workplace climate.
- Terry: One cannot force someone to make a complaint if they are not comfortable,. Just because a complaint is not made does not mean that a problem does not exist.

Furthermore, it is not our place to force people to come forward if they are not comfortable doing so.

- Carol: In response to Lori's question about confidential information. When we apply for a federal award, we have to check a box that indicates we have or have not had a federal complaint filed. Not the specific details of any individual complaint, simply if there have been any official complaints made. Yes I would know if a complaint had been filed. Not necessarily the details of the complaint. It is also possible the complaint is filed directly with federal or state agencies. Then it would likely be funneled back through SUNY to be investigated. In the end someone on campus will need to be involved to assist with investigating.
- Liz – when people have come to us, we have told them to go to HR; but this statement can be a formal way to reiterate that policy and encourage people to report their experiences. This is not saying that anyone is guilty. But we have to be aware, recognize that it's affecting our workplace, name and report the behavior, and denounce it.
- Don C. – Quick question: I'd like to know how long has it been your responsibility to report this number, Ellen? Ellen: I don't check off that box. We're under review from NYSED – under the review, it says we have not had to check that box in the last five years.
- Lisa – If we work on the beginning part of the language, it seems like some of the statement, we could agree on to improve workplace climate and how to report workplace violence properly. Maybe the initial paragraph could be revised, but the end of the statement
- Ellen – what is the point of the statement? We spend all this time, but aren't we blurring the line between support and regulatory action? Liz – would be shared with the campus and reiterates to the campus what they should do. The goal of the statement is to support the existing policies and that workplace violence have potentially occurred and to fight against it.
- Ellen – You can't say it if it's baseless. It makes it appear as though they have happened. It's slanderous.
- Terry – It is our purview to put out statements; this is not a resolution, but the senate has put out statements since its existence. After the 2016 election regarding DACA and ICE, the Senate had a very strong statement about that. SUNY couldn't actually do anything about it, but it put out a statement of support. Many of us could tell stories of witnessing this type of behavior and threats. This is not giving credence to allegations. It is merely acknowledging that there's a perception of a pattern on campus, and that the college doesn't support that. I find it very problematic when people tell others they have to come forward and face their accusers. We can't be so naive to think that retaliation doesn't happen. There is a lack of trust as we all know. It minimizes and marginalizes those who are not safe enough to be able to come forward. And, there

have been reports filed with functional supervisors which may not be "official" but they are real.

- Amanda C - I agree with Lisa that the first few paragraphs need significant edits, but I support the intent to encourage compliance with existing policies.
- Liz – In response to Ellen's request, perhaps we should create a workgroup surrounding this statement instead of hashing this out at the Senate meeting. Ellen has volunteered. Ericka, Don, Doug, Rich are willing to work on the statement.
- Ellen – does the senate seek out legal advice from SUNY? We should run this by SUNY to ensure we aren't being slanderous.
- Carol - we have campus counsel assigned. I can help you connect with her if you like.
- Dana S. - I have personally been someone who has been yelled at and I have witnessed this type of behavior aimed towards someone else. These things are happening, and people need to be believed. I have also reported this type of behavior to HR.
- Don – so there isn't a duplication of efforts, this particular issue seems to fulfill the civility workgroup coming from the resolution.
- Liz – the workgroups will be open to the campus. So if folks want to work on the workplace violence statement, they can also be on that particular workgroup.
- Dan G. – the way I read the statement is, if you experience something and say something, we support you. I really hope this doesn't get stuck and delayed indefinitely.

### **Consultation Discussion on Recommendation Plans and Meetings – Liz**

- Any feedback regarding the plan as proposed?
- Doug – Two comments: concerned about having a person that is in charge of an area also be a co-chair. Appropriate that that person be in the committee to provide info, but not necessarily being a co-chair. 2) Looked at the three slides for the counter-proposal. The intention seems to provide a period of time to consult and get feedback. Working groups would probably meet every two weeks. Shouldn't that be enough time for folks to get that feedback?
- Terry – Reiterate Doug's comments. Colleagues expressed concern that leadership co-chair the working groups. We were tasked as the Senate to do this. There may be folks uncomfortable speaking out or participating if the committee is chaired by leadership. Also problematic to have several co-chaired by the same person.
- Tomas – in the last meeting that we had, the President, Provost, and myself said we would withdraw that piece regarding the co-chair. Should we submit that officially?
- Liz – We know that that was brought up. But last time we asked for feedback from the Senate regarding the original plan/proposal. We also wanted feedback on the proposed alternate plan.

- Lisa presents the new model that will help create a space to rebuild trust.
- Liz – also said at the last leadership meeting was the recommendation that the co-chairs should be selected by the working groups themselves based on who they feel comfortable with.
- Ericka – I don't take issue regarding the first plan. This seems modeled after the middle states work groups, which are running smoothly.
- Terry – Do we have a timeframe for these working groups yet?
- Liz – we would like to get these working groups organized, populated, have a few meetings before the end of obligation. If we can get any of these done before then, that'd be great. And then we have momentum for the fall.
- Susan D. – There's concern about leadership being co-chairs, but not on the committees. What is the difference in the concern?
- Thomas J. – I'm concerned that we want to remove leadership from co-chairs but not senators from co-chairs. The lack of trust is disconcerting. How do you get to a resolution if we can't sit down and talk to someone? What do you do when someone tells you they don't feel comfortable with you in the room? Leadership doesn't have tenure. This makes me wonder if this is a good fit for me. No one's talking about how to resolve these issues.
- Doug – My suggestion was that the person responsible of that area shouldn't be in charge. There's a conflict of interest. It's like the police investigating themselves.
- Ericka - I agree with that Doug - even on a "human" level it is sometimes hard to take that hard look at yourself or a "project" or an area you manage because you are just too close to it, I believe you used the word "conflict of interest" and that makes sense to me
- Lori – The previous suggestion was that tenured faculty may be more comfortable co chairing. The goal is to have ALL representation in these workgroup. As much as we would love to see all all hold hands and kiss and make up, trust is earned and that goes both ways. I'm sure leadership feels under attack and faculty/staff have verbalized as feeling unheard etc. The workgroups are going to need to be inclusive or we may as well just do it here. Regarding Dr. Jordan's concerns: I understand where you're coming from regarding entering in turmoil and pivoting in last minute moves. There is a lot of concern regarding trust. That's on both sides. I'm sure no one in leadership wants to be in meetings with us. We do all have the best interests of the college at heart. Everyone wants a good work environment. There are a lot of concerns: does everyone have the same goal and is everyone going to be working on these goals come the fall? Sometimes things come off as aggressive and emotional – but that's because we care. While you serve at the pleasure of the president, we just serve. None of us have to be here, but we are.
- Mary Wake – Rebuilding trust comes from working together and making change. If things can't change, people have to decide if that's a relationship they want to be in. I can understand people not wanting to leadership as co-chair. But we need to work in

concert with the leadership. Someone tenured co-chairing with leadership feels more like shared governance. We don't want to get stalled in the back and forth. We want to rebuild trust. We need to commit to something and move forward.

- Jason F. - I concur with what Mary has said, and thank you for the clarification Douglas. In the consultation report is discussion about shared governance and what that is. If senate has been pushing shared governance, lets support that and have admin as co-chairs. I do agree with Douglas that it should be someone that does not oversee that area.
- Tomas – We talk about tone and perspective. Doug described this as an investigation, but I see this as a relationship that's frayed over time. We have decided to put ourselves in a vulnerable place to give us recommendations. I don't see this as something negative. Someone needs to be held accountable about making these recommendations happen. If we don't trust people, we can't give people the benefit of the doubt.
- Erin – is there a way for compromise and bring the plans together? Adopt the structure of the excel spreadsheet and have them meet in split groups (ala Lisa's plan). Liz – thank you; that was the point to have folks work among themselves as well as with the administration.
- Ward – as the guy who first raised the objection to leadership being co-chairs, I opened a can of worms that I didn't want to. In order to build trust, you need to be comfortable. The plans I saw today where faculty meet, admin meet, then we all meet and synthesize, give me hope that we can build trust. The way these were originally proposed, that's not what I saw. The plans I saw today and how the process would work, I find glimmers of hope. I'm less hung up on the co-chair and more about how the process was structured. If people were not comfortable talking, they wouldn't say anything. That isn't how we build trust.
- Don – We could have all four options posted on VH and have people vote before next week.
- Ericka – the voting area could be up by tomorrow; people could go in and have polling concluded by next week.
- Lisa – Can we narrow it down to three to avoid splitting the vote? That might be problematic.
- Liz – Ericka will put up the voting. Is everyone okay with me working with Katie Bucci as co-chairing/overseeing the entire organization of the working groups. If you have concerns about that please email me.
- It's been brought up that the Senate meetings go too long. I agree. Should we have weekly meetings where one week we just do Senate business and off weeks we do consultation update (e.g. workgroups report out)? One more meeting might be a lot, but it might help to shorten these meetings.
- Terry – I think this is good idea. We need to increase momentum and the Senate needs to do its business. I propose we have separate meetings explicit to the Consultation.



- Liz – we could make another poll regarding this topic and see how people feel? Yes. Let's think about this and then vote on it via VH.
- Don – After the consultation is over, we wouldn't continue to meet every week as a Senate. We need to make sure we're keeping these things separate so we don't meet for two hours *every* week. Liz – yes, agreed. We just feel we need to provide more time for these conversations.
- Liz – We will set up these polls. Please take these polls by the end of the week. I'll meet with Katie B. to start organizing the working groups.

### **Senate Executive Session Discussion – Liz**

- We have been asked to have an executive, closed door session in the future. What is said in the Senate and what is coming to us after Senate is conflicting. If it takes an executive senate session to get at the heart of this, it might be helpful. We're in the phase of let's move forward, but after senate meetings, we have this pull back saying we can't. We need to get to the bottom of what people are saying. It's exhausting for the eboard to figure out what people want and how to move forward.
- This upcoming Monday at 4:30pm?
- Ellen – why are we hiding things?
- Liz – we aren't hiding things. We're trying to get to what people want to say but don't feel that they can't say in these open meetings. If it's the same as what is said in these open meetings, fine. But if there's something different, then we need to know before we make a commitment. After the meetings, people are still calling for a vote of no confidence, but they don't say anything in the meetings. It's really hard to move forward. We need to be clear as to what we want as a Senate body.
- Ellen – so you want to have a vote of no confidence without the transparency of the campus?
- Liz – No. That's not what I'm saying. I'm saying we need to have an open discussion of what people really want. It is unclear and it's hindering us from moving forward. We want to know what's happening in our own Senate.
- Next Monday, April 26th at 4:30pm executive session to discuss how to proceed re: vote of no confidence and how to move forward; we will record in the minutes what will happen, and that will be recorded. [Secretary Update: We have been advised by UFS that meeting minutes are not taken for Executive Sessions and that they should not be recorded.]
- Ellen – you (Liz/eboard) know what's happening behind the scenes. I'm not privy to that.
- Liz – As the eboard we hear from a lot of constituents. We are trying to bring people in the loop and where we need to go from here. If the majority are saying a vote of no confidence, then we need to talk about that openly here. Not to make a motion in an executive session. But then if we decide not to do that, then those

conversations need to stop, because we cannot move forward with these conversations happening.

- Ellen – We can't do that here? You don't know how people feel?
- Lori – The eboard get emails after every senate meetings from people in the meetings and outside of the senate. Years ago, we had an issue at Senate, regarding how could we talk openly with Kelli (former provost) at the table. There's a lot that's not being said at these meetings, but are being said on campus. Some of us that might not be sitting here in the Fall.
- Don – I'm not sure that we couldn't have a vote in executive session. I'm researching that now.
- Meeting on Monday, April 26 at 4:30pm. Motion should not be made at the executive session. We're having a conversation in this meeting. A motion should be made publically.

Circling back to Doug – Confirm that the intention is that in these work groups, the representatives will be static (e.g. faculty, staff, senator) will have representatives and they're always going to these same work groups. There's indications in the proposal that there are different leadership within the work groups (e.g. different topics in the work groups would be addressed by different leaderships?). Liz – those were the co-chairs originally set, but that doesn't seem to be the case anymore. If the group has a question for that specific leadership member, they can ask, rather than having them in the group the entire time. Groups will select their own co-chairs.

Adjourned at 6:41pm

**Next Meeting: Monday, May 3, 2021 @ 4:30pm (Zoom)**