

College Senate Meeting Minutes

1 November 2021

Attendance

Senators Attending via Zoom:

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

Senators Absent:

Guests: Kelly Keck, Lars Schweidenback, Monica Liddle, Dez Keever, Adriene Clifford, John Horner, Dana Santos, Susan Deane, Ben West, Carol Bishop, Lauren Sloane, Rob Piurowski, Doug Gulotty, Ted Martin, Charlie Mole, Linnea Goodwin Burwood, Karen Teitelbaum, Keith Landa (UFS President), Jessica Fell, David Brower, Dave Krzyston, Lori Tremblay, Steve Cembrinski, Brian Foster, Shawn Cobstill, Carlos Cabrera, Dan Davis, Amy Brown, Trish DeAngelis, Jen Aikens, Ted Sump, Katie Bucci, Peter Brusoe, Michael Sullivan, Maureen O'Connor, Linda Blocker, Barb Sturdevant, Brian Bean, Lynne Smith, Jessica Pruschki, Kathy Hibbard, Laura Raner

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!

Meeting Minutes

- Motion to postpone the meeting minutes until the next meeting due to length of meeting minutes. Jason F. Ellen seconded. 11 Yes; 12 N; 3 abstentions.
 - Minutes posted Friday, Oct 29 with the agenda for the next meeting
- Ellen – last meeting discussion of Division of the House. Done research on this. Calling for a division of the house that we deem sensitive and you all deem anonymous, that we should do a division of the house instead. Challenging the existing rule as a point of order. I cannot read people's minds ahead of time.

- Objection.
- Liz: But the vote happened. Not sure this takes precedent of the order of business for this agenda. We are not in new business yet.
- Lori: We're not in the middle of a vote.
- Liz – we have to hear each other. We can't keep talking over each other. "Division of the house" is if you doubt the result of a voice vote then you can do the division.
- Ellen – that's how I thought it was, but that's not what I was told last week. I was told we had to do it ahead of time.
- Liz – I read that it needed to happen beforehand, but I also said that once debate begins, division cannot be called. Is that correct? Heads nod.
 - In that case, discussion had already happened, so we couldn't do the division. Yes – Liz clarified this in the last meeting.
 - Ellen – If we are in doubt of the vote, then we can do division. So when can I call.
 - Liz – after the motion, but not after discussion has started.
- Keith – Reading Roberts Rules now. Division is meant merely for clarifying voice votes. To make it clear how many yeas and nays there are – not used for clarifying other kinds of ballots. From my reading it doesn't make sense to use it for a paper/poll ballot. Not relying on how many people are shouting the loudest.
 - Thank you, Keith!
 - Ellen – given that we're using anonymous voting, I wanted the division to be transparent. Trying to follow parliamentary procedures. Roberts Rules hasn't identified a structure around anonymous voting. Wanted us to be clear with regard to last time.
- Lisa: Motion to accept the meeting minutes. Second: Ericka. Discussion: JoAnna – hard time to get feedback out to folks without the reporting; minutes posted too late. Josh F. Page 8 – motion lettered into the meeting. Why aren't they in the minutes? Shelly – Liz posted them with the minutes so I thought that was sufficient.
- Donna – Last time we agreed the letter would come Took the letter into Senate record. Vote was called in the meeting. After that we had a lot of fear of retaliation about releasing the names. Trying to find a middle ground regarding releasing the information without putting folks in jeopardy.
- JoAnna – Is that the eboard who is discussing that? Yes – we've been talking because we're receiving concerns from people. Trying to figure out the best ways to work through this. Will be discussing this further in the meeting.
- Vote: 18 Y; 2 N; 5 abstention. Passed.

Eboard Updates – Liz

- Apology for the delay in message last week. Reached out to President and Leadership team. At first we were told to put a message in Delhi Today as it wasn't an institutional message. Sent an additional message once we heard that press was contacting people. Dawn got special permission to send the message to just faculty and staff on campus. Clyde (VP of Student Senate) was also contacted. President followed up to our message with another message.
- Liz met with Clyde Van Dyke after multiple emails. Student Senate just elected a new President. Wanted to make sure he understood what happened. They are drafting a resolution from the student side. Resolution was delayed because students wanted more information when it came forward. They read through the consultation and shared it with the senate. They had a version of the consultation report that was not the final, correct version – unclear how that happened. They meet on Wednesday and we will hear more about that.
- President and Provost cancelled their meeting with eboard.
- President also cancelled all the CET update meetings with me. Working with new Leadership team member. I know we were supposed to have a large CET meeting in October; I've delayed that because we didn't have a good meeting time for everyone. We'll do a whenisgood for that.
- There was a D2L update in Delhi Today last week. If you have questions, reach out.
- Liz holds a seat on the College Foundation. Last week Liz was in that meeting. A bylaws proposal was made to remove the Senate Presider and Student Senate President from the foundation. That was approved. Liz spoke out and voted against it. They did say that this removal does not preclude a faculty or staff to serve on the board. There are no fac/staff on the board now. But if you are interested you can apply. They will interview you. Didn't see this coming. I think it's important that a faculty/staff member is on this board to oversee the foundation.
 - Erin: Did they give a reasoning when they presented the bylaws change?
 - Liz: Didn't have access to the shared folder that I typically would. "Due to rotating nature of the Senate's position and limitations presented by academic obligation" – but I still attended outside of obligation.
 - Encouraging folks to apply to a position. 10 voting members currently. They can have up to 33 members.
 - Michael Sullivan will put a notice in the Delhi Today – many folks don't know this is an opportunity.
 - Lisa – Are people are expected to serve on the board for longer than 2 years? Term is a rotating 3 year term.
- Questions? None.

CADI Board Vacancy – Liz

- Teaching faculty for a CADI Board vacancy. One volunteer has come forward: Peter Brusoe. Motion: Shelly. Simon: second. 1 abstention. Congrats, Peter!
- Liz will pass this info to John Padovani so he can get in touch re: next steps.

UFS Resolutions – Lisa

- Holistic Student Spaces –
 - Was voted anonymously by UFS in the April Plenary meeting
 - Physical and virtual spaces to support holistic wellbeing of students
 - Schools that have this already, students can reserve the space for a few hours
 - Online space should also be created for this purpose
 - UFS is asking Chancellor and campuses to support the creation of this kind
 - Motion: Erin; second: Ericka
 - Question: Is this a mandated thing? How would this get paid for?
 - Unclear yet. We haven't seen the Chancellor's response to this yet. If conceptually we agreed with it, we could add into the resolution "pending funding" or such.
 - Folks were in favor of the concept; unclear if this is financially feasible.
 - Josh – how does this differ from MOSAIC and other spaces that already exist?
 - Depends on what we define as a holistic space. Quiet meditation space, or religious space; space would be reserved, then returned to neutral. Some of our other spaces don't serve that purpose. MOSAIC is a highly programmed space.
 - Lori – with the online piece, there was dialog about having a dedicated zoom room for them to use for this kind of space.
 - Ericka – Were there any campuses that already had a physical space and also an online space? How were they doing that?
 - University of Buffalo, Upstate, Stony Brook – physical spaces. Can't remember if campuses had an online version – will look into this.
 - Carol – don't we have spaces like this in the library? Farrell?
 - Not designated for this purpose. Farrell has designated club space.
 - Vote: 2 abstentions. 24 Y – motion passes.
 - Lisa will follow up with folks at UFS with questions.
- Recognition of Covid-19 Response
 - Recognize the hard work of faculty/staff during the pandemic
 - Requests admin continue to support wellness, mental health support, prof. dev for faculty and staff
 - Motion: Doug H, second: Simon.
 - JoAnna – folks asking about money since the state is broke as well.

- Lisa – there are ways to recognize hard work without financial resources. But in terms of the last part, that might accrue a cost. Seems to be support to recognize the need for that. Hopefully that will continue at the State level and from SUNY.
- Ellen – second resolved: what does this mean re: archives.
 - For example the library is doing a cool project to record living through the pandemic (in the Delhi Today – today) <https://guides.delhi.edu/Fingerprints>
 - So not an organized thing? This is just to support the possible idea of that. No real program about how that will happen.
 - Liz – no, just encouraging.
- Carol: I am sure everyone is aware of EAP. There are also State resources for employees. <https://www.delhi.edu/mydelhi/hr/eap/index.php>
- Vote: Passes unanimously.

Academic Policies: Alt Methods for College Credit – Jess Fell

- Policy includes a residency requirement (how much of a degree needs to be completed at SUNY Delhi). Initial language was at 50% of the degree must be completed at Delhi. Proposed changes from Academic Council was 25% requirement for all degrees.
- APC proposes that AS should be at 50% but BS at 25% and define 25% at MS degrees
- Motion to approve: Ericka; second: Alice.
- Discussion:
 - Cheri: Will lowering the residency requirement mean to lowering the entire degree or the major?
 - Jess – Half of the major has to be taken at Delhi. 25% pertains to entire degree.
 - Donna C: Dean Deane sent an email discussing the residency requirement issue. For the Nursing program for AAS degree, we do accept LA&S as appropriate, but not Nursing courses – standard for Nursing schools. For RN to BSN level, 25% would be appropriate. (Donna froze...)
 - Josh F. – Putting a pretty broad stroke here. Many specific requirements for majors. 25% and half of which needs to be in their major, that means they're only taking 5 classes in their major here. Some majors have specific classroom hours. Is that not included here?
 - Jess: It doesn't mean that we have to take 75% of their credits transferred in. There might be specific classes they have to take in certain

majors and we can require that still. Just means that the minimum to complete is 25%.

- Donna: For the Master's program, 50% residency was discussed with admissions prior.
 - Jess – we didn't write anything specific to any degree in the policy (e.g. anything specific to Nursing).
- Cheri – For BSN, 25% residency is not very different from how we're currently operating. Made us wonder if this is simply a language change for marketing purposes?
 - Jess – Not marketing. Each school is doing things differently. Overall the policy had previously said 50%, so there might be changes for some programs. Goal is to increase second degree students, transfer students, etc. Capture students who don't want to lose out on credits they took elsewhere. But this does not make us accept credits we don't want to/don't find acceptable. Just allows us to accept up to 75% of a degree.
 - Cheri – What if they took a course ten years ago and research has moved along – would we accept it? How can we justify that?
 - Jess – that would be addressed at the program level. You could deny that credit to transfer.
 - Susan – with 25% of masters, if we have the programs with only 36 credits; then possibly someone could only take 3 courses from us and get a masters. Worried about accreditation here. We do have a lot of students from other schools. 9 credits seems really low to award a degree. Perhaps masters should stay at 50%?
 - Lauren – Official wording is 50% and lower to 25%, which is what Nursing does – so we'd match Nursing. It is up to every individual program or not bring in classes. If the program doesn't want to accept the transfer credit, they don't have to.
 - Susan – dealing with this with admissions as first graduate program. Want to make sure it's policy and that we're part of this.
 - Jess – This would cover everyone and you'd still have agency to accept what you want.
 - Lori – Are there any accreditations otherwise on campus that this might affect? Jess – To my knowledge, it does not negatively impact any program's accreditation.
 - Lauren – There are other master's programs coming down the line. We need to be mindful that this is not just Nursing. CJ's Master's is coming. Respect the concerns folks have but we are growing our offerings.

- Andrea – Vet Sci discussed this. Since nothing is mandatory, we'd look at this on a case by case basis. As long as we're given the freedom to assess, this should be fine.
- Alice – There is a rep from every academic program on Academic Policy committee. I imagine all these concerns would have already come up in the committee. Jess – yes, we have a rep from each school and have discussed this.
- Josh F – Have we looked at the demand this has had on the Liberal Arts – potentially less students in math, history, etc. Potential issues in enrollment.
- Lauren – This is generally more geared toward the BS. Nothing will change at the AS level. I don't see a huge number that will affect LAS much. They will transfer in those lower classes anyway.
- Simon – In a program with both AS and BS – see this as a boost for enrollment. Students have trouble transferring credits – they sometimes go finish their degree elsewhere. I look forward to these changes, especially at the BS level where we do have a lot of transfer students.
- Lori – who decides to allow transfer credit?
 - Jess – don't expect a change in who will oversee transfer credits. Not a change in the process – just in how much we accept. Might not affect a lot of students, but hoping more students will transfer in.
- Lisa – Is there a concern that we don't want to apply this to Master's? Are we ok with that language? Susan – I understand there are other MS coming; not sure that I'm comfortable with this for our degree. Seems like a low number for accreditation purposes. I'm more comfortable with 50%. That would be my recommendation for the committee. Many students come in with 12 to 15 credits anyway.
 - Jess – You're not required to only make them take 9 credits in your program. If that's your industry standard, if they really wouldn't be able to transfer them in – then this would not really apply to you. Leaving this more broad, would allow other MS degrees to have more students transfer in.
 - Susan – if it were on our website, then students will try to argue that they can do that. This feels a bit extreme.
 - Cheri – To echo Susan, once you open the door, it exposes the institution and program to abuses of the policy. Policy

extends beyond a Dean; another Dean could do something different. If the language stays at 25% for the MS, then I would vote against it.

- Jess – we could bring this back to the committee.
Understand that you don't want to confuse students.
- Anyone want to amend the motion to approve?
- Alice – motion to postpone this vote until the academic policies committee can bring these comments back and bring a version back to Senate. Lori C. seconds. Discussion on postponing? Motion passes unanimously.

Bylaws Change Proposal – Alice & Cheri

- Robert's Rules typically deals with in person business. Added a statement to bylaws re: in-person and online business is official.
- Voting procedures. Vote generally done by vote of hands unless proposed done otherwise. Electronic anonymous voting system for following types of motion: officers, representations, consultation, visitation, votes of no confidence, main motion for resolution. Paper ballot could be requested, but only if all senators are present. Based on recommendation from the Consultation report
- Recommended: two separate motions (i.e. actions paragraph and procedure paragraph) as they are two separate topics.
- Motion to approve the bylaw regarding conducting online business: Simon; second: Shannon.
 - Discussion: none.
 - 25 Y; 1 N; motion passes.
- Motion to approve the procedures re: voting procedures and electronic anonymous voting in certain circumstances as listed in the bylaw proposal: Erin W; second: Dennis A.
 - Discussion: JoAnna: feedback that bylaws shouldn't be changed because voting procedures are already accounted for in Robert's Rules and can be motioned for. Decisions shouldn't be made in heightened state of emotion.
 - Jason F. – Speaking against the motion. Roberts rules account for different voting methods. Bottom of agenda mentions being accountable. Anonymous voting takes away accountability. Our constituency has the right to know how we voted.
 - Ellen – My constituency and myself are against this change in the bylaws. I amplify what JoAnna and Jason have mentioned re: lack of transparency. People think they are being represented by a person, but with anonymous voting we don't know if their vote is actually the way we wanted it to go.

There could be finger pointing if folks are hidden behind a shroud of anonymity. Causes more anxiety. Same issues with accountability. A few people said: What the hell is the Senate trying to do?

- Ericka – I am in support of this (and the folks in my area). This is how resolutions are voted on at UFS. We would mirror the state process. This was also mentioned in the consultation report as a recommendation.
- Adam: Voting against this. Clarification: anonymous versus secret ballot? Are they the same or different? Alice – in Robert's rules they are synonymous. Secret ballot refers to physical paper ballot. Even when we're face to face, we still have remote folks and if we do a paper ballot, their votes aren't anonymous.
- Alice – for Liberal Arts and Science, I'm voting in support of this. When we write bylaws, it's not my opinion. Main reason to protect faculty. As a more senior faculty, I take it very seriously to protect my junior faculty and allow them to vote as they would like to to properly represent their constituency. I vote on behalf of the LAS faculty.
- Josh F. – I can motion to amend the original motion to strike the last four points (e.g. Consultation, Visitation, VONC, Main motion for resolutions).
Second: Jason F.
 - Discussion: Cheri – Need more clarification on the rationale for why to strike the last four bullets. Josh – echoes issues of transparency and accountability. Knowing that they are representing their constituency. I understand the fear of retaliation, but Senate is tasked with making tough decisions.
 - Doug H – Inappropriate to assume that if someone is voting anonymously, they are not representing their unit.
 - Josh – Not necessarily saying that's the case. But make your vote and own it. Go back to your constituency proud.
 - Simon – There's nothing in these bylaws that says you can't talk to your constituency about your vote. So it's a question of transparency for whom? If someone in a position of power over you, then that pressure is there. I see comparing us to the US House or the Senate – but we are a much smaller body. Consequences could be very dire. I've heard folks mention the fear of retaliation – but this real and palpable. I'm opposed to amending it and I think these issues need to be taken in context of who we are as a body.
 - Lisa – Speaking against these bullets. Page 28 of consultation report mentioned fear of retaliation from non-tenured faculty and staff without permanent appointment. Puts people in a dangerous position.
 - Ericka – One of the reasons stated to support knowing who votes for what in those items is so that constituents know how they vote. Would

the person have to attend as a guest to know that their area is voting? If you look back at the meeting minutes, there's not that many guests. If there is a concern that senators aren't voting in line with their constituents, they would come to the meetings. Not in support of striking these four points.

- JoAnna – These four bullets could be umbrella-ed under Roberts Rules. Not taken off the table. Folks are concerned it's not in the best interest of the college. If it's already covered, leave it as is. Re: retaliation that isn't just leadership team – folks are afraid of retaliation here (Senate) too.
 - Charlie M: Find it interesting that people in favor are voting, how would you know? If the fear of reprisal, would the information not get out regardless? I'd be against any of this. I think people should vote the way they think they should vote and it should be a matter of public record.
 - Kelly K: I find it interesting: if the criticism is that the last vote was illegitimate, it wasn't because it's in Robert's Rules. The ones being stricken are required to have anonymity because of the sensitive nature of these votes. I can speak to retaliation as Chapter President of the Union. I would suggest no amendment to this motion and voting on the original bylaws as written.
 - Jason F. – People are saying things are in Roberts Rules but they aren't in there. I have Roberts Rules right here. Tell me what page. If we want to start citing pages, please do so. That is incorrect.
 - Josh F – If people are in retaliation, we are all in a union. If retaliation happens, that is a grieve-able offence.
 - Ellen – I'm getting texts from people that they believe the bullying and harassment that goes on here is part of the reason folks don't attend. And the way people react with me; I cannot have a grimace without being attacked. I am tough enough to handle it, but there is retaliation going back and forth here. There's no accountability when it's not in your favor.
 - Liz – I appreciate you bringing that up. Did you want to speak to striking the last four points? No. Speaking to retaliation aspect of that.
 - Doug H. – Against this motion to strike these. I agree that theoretically the union can protect me and others, but there are many different forms of retaliation. Not necessarily so clear cut that the union could step up and stop such an act.
 - Vote to strike the last four bullet points: 8 Y; 18 N
- Back to original discussion:

- Ellen: Comment was we're following UFS. People have asked what is the composition of UFS.
 - A body made up of representatives from all SUNY campuses. Faculty and staff because there are some schools that have separate faculty and staff senates. How large the school is determines how many representatives they have.
 - Ellen – concern of over-reach of UFS related to our campus. After the last meeting, people asked “who is that guy” (meaning Keith Landa). Are we sure that we aren't being interfered with from an external source?
 - Liz – We're discussing the bylaws change. Are you in favor of the bylaws change? Ellen: No.
- Erin: First: I would argue we are very much internal to SUNY. So I would question why we're considering ourselves external to that. Consider how these bylaws were created. We've had a dept of labor investigation, a state investigation, a consultation report about this – we cannot ignore these reports. I speak in favor of these changes.
- Josh F. – I move the previous question.
- Vote: 22 Y; 7 N
- Need two-thirds for bylaws change; Shelly forgot someone was holding proxy – apologies! Lots going on. 22 Y is correct.
- Roll call vote – Jason; objection. Roll-call vote is for a voice vote when it is unclear. We have a counted vote. It is unnecessary.
- Adam seconded.
- Vote for a roll call vote: 6 Y ; 23 N;
- Bylaws proposal passes.
- Ellen: Does the Senate realize that it is visibly apparent that there are issues amongst the voting procedures?
- Liz – everyone has an opportunity to speak. We only ask that Senators are able to vote on these topics. All Senators should vote the way their constituents would want to vote on these topics. All expressions are welcome here. This is how we sort through here; this is where disagreements happen. It is ok if someone disagrees with us. We should be bringing forward these points. When we are discussing these things, because they can be sticky items, we should be discussing the topic and not going back and forth with each other. You should be directing your points to the president.
- Five minute break.
- We are not voting on this resolution tonight. We are just bringing it forward.

VONC Resolution – Lisa

- Resolution committee worked to create a resolution reflecting the recent VONC motion that was passed at the last meeting. Everyone will have the opportunity to take this back to their constituents to discuss.
- At this point we're not taking any amendments to the resolution, but we can answer points of clarification.
- This was a difficult task and the committee worked hard to do the best they could in a thoughtful fashion. Please take back to your areas for recommendations that would approve the resolution. Please be respectful as we discuss this – it will be difficult.
- The first 8 Whereas clauses document some of the context in a timeline. Last two clauses are similar. 9-17 are reflective of the consultation report. "Be it resolved" clauses are offered as well.
- Lou – Thank you for your leadership and comments. With regards to resolution, I have questions:
- Lori – can we set a time limit on discussion since this isn't actually the discussion part and we still need to take this back to our areas. Motion to two minutes of clarifications per person. Suggestions on time limit? Lisa: Points of clarification should be made now and then a robust conversation next time. Keep points of clarification to two minutes? Second: Doug. Cheri – adjourn by 7:30? Not if we want to give folks to clarify.
- Jason – I am concerned about limiting something for such an important topic. This is a very important topic for the school.
- Ellen – I amplify Jason's concerns. We want to be open to discussion and other voices and yet the minute there could be issues, we want to limit that. Seems counterproductive.
- Vote: 22 Y; 3 N; 2 abstentions; motion carries for the two minute limit.
- Cheri as alt presider, please keep record of time.
- Ellen – maybe this should be at the beginning of meeting next time?
- Liz – Yes, the bulk of the conversation about this will be at the next meeting.
- Lou – Want to read the document more thoroughly and call on me later.
- Jason F – Would be helpful to have background for each of these whereas (e.g. reference a consultation page). Right now it's just a document without any evidence. A new person would not know this information. On petition with 100 signatures, two constituents felt intimidated to sign it. Document was put into the record; want to see the signatures. Constituents will foil this information if signatures are not presented. 100 people and a vote of 70% of 31 people is not representative, especially with so many LAS folks here.
- Lisa – In the sake of time I will take notes. We did look at other VONC resolutions. They also do not have numbers for different documents. There are background documents at the bottom and everyone should have access to Consultation Report if you are a campus community member.

- Liz – we did discuss the signatures piece. We were asked to take the petition into consideration. But the vote of no confidence started from there. There wasn't a piece to take this back because the vote came forward that night. We received a number of concerns from individuals about retaliation. Trying to find a middle ground where we can show the distribution of the areas where people signed, but not releasing the names. We discussed this a little earlier in the meeting.
- JoAnna – In terms of the resolution, my constituents have feedback already. Logo is the old logo, same on the agenda as well. In some of the points, they are fearful of others at the leadership level. Don't want our actions to impact others later. Are there Senators who signed the petition and did know that the petition was coming but didn't bring it forward. Faculty knew what was happening, but staff did not know that VONC level had reached that heightened level. The way it rolled out last time was a hell of a coincidence. Fear for others: don't agree with all of the whereas clauses. Should I compile that and send that to Lisa? That would be helpful.
- Lou – Constituents' concerns: what happens next? What are the optics? Two individuals have been targeted. What happens when the Chancellor gets involved? Issues of budget, recruitment, and retention – a lot of energy is going to other places. I was surprised by what happened last time. I appreciate those who reached out to me. I was quite surprised to see how many faculty weren't in support of this. I know some constituents who signed who didn't understand the full ramifications of the document.
 - Lisa: Petition and resolution are separate. Stay focused on the particulars of the resolution at next meeting.
- Ellen – Comments on substantiation on some of the whereas clauses. Not only the consultation report – so folks think it is lies. I've heard from faculty: what is the end game of the resolution? Looks like a faction within the senate has gone nuclear. Division between faculty and staff. Overtaken within one group: LA&S. What really is at the heart of this dissatisfaction in LAS. Some money was spent to remove some of the issues there. How did we get here? Thought we were in consultation?
 - Lisa – Alice is the only LAS rep; the others are at large reps. We're focused on this body.
- Erin – Shannon mentioned this in the chat: division between the letter and the resolution. I signed the letter – but not as a senator, as an individual; it was not a Senate letter. They were separate. While this is a small number of people, a majority of senators voted in favor. These senators represent the community. The end of the document also states what the end goal is.
- Josh F – I was provided a letter from my constituency – can I read that now? Liz: We're talking about clarifying questions about the resolution. If the letter fits into that context, then yes. Letter from Steven Cembrinski: To Members of the Campus Community and the College Senate: While I have tried in earnest to remain unbiased and objective in all of my work, the recent actions of the Senate and the letter read by Monica Liddle on

October 18th warrant a response. First, in terms of the letter. I will not address all points now but three in particular are quite concerning. First, stating that the President has been fiscally irresponsible and citing the time period of September 2018 to September 2020 is misleading. Surely everyone remembers what happened in spring of 2020. So, in effect, the letter is holding President Laliberte responsible for the financial effects of a pandemic. I also do not understand where the \$20M figure came from, but suspect it includes residence hall funds, which are not part of our campus reserves. Next the letter states that the President and the Leadership Team changed our budget process. This is false and disparaging to the campus. I spent 5 months working with the former budget and planning committee and multiple members of our campus to re-imagine our budget process, and then presented the findings to the Leadership Team. The campus, not the Leadership Team, developed this process. Finally, the letter states that we as a Campus stand "united" against the President. How can a letter and petition that was a secret to all but 100 people be a "united" action? I feel more isolated from my colleagues now than at any point in my tenure thus far. Using this letter as an impetus to initiate a motion for a no confidence resolution is well within the rights of all Senate members. But using any item in the letter read October 18th as evidence to support such a resolution is improper and biased. This whole process, as detrimental to the campus as it is, has been rushed, which is in complete opposition to what shared governance stands for. Approving a resolution for a vote of no confidence at this point will do nothing but drive a permanent wedge between people on our campus. And to then request anonymous voting to me says that no one wants to take responsibility for their actions. If members of the Senate truly feel that what they're doing is right, stand behind it, just as I stand behind these words. I also fully support President Laliberte. Thank you. Stephen Cembrinski

- Lori: I signed the letter. The letter is separate from the resolution. The vote has happened. I voted for the VONC. The letter is the talking points about the resolution. I love that we have 60+ people in this meeting, because we did not have this many people in the room a year ago. No other resolutions comes with a handbook of examples, but if folks go back to the meeting minutes, a lot of these issues have been addressed. Not looking to argue the whereas clauses, but fine tune them. Unfortunate that this is what it took to get us here talking about it.
- Alice: Reminder: talking about the evidence, especially the consultation report, that was given in good faith. Lies was used re: consultation report. I participated in the consultation report and I didn't lie. I am the LAS senator, I vote on behalf of my school – whether I agree or not. LAS folks ran and they get voted on by all of the faculty. At any given point it could be another school. This is not a LAS resolution, letter, anything. Not any one school is behind this. Many of the schools have more specific grievances.
- Liz – Please keep in mind that the chat is recorded and is part of our record. It's not okay to blame one area of campus. We just had a VONC. Please speak about clarifying

questions about the resolution, so we can answer these questions now before we have a more thorough discussion next week.

- Shannon: In Whereas 5 re: consultation report – he was not following the rules of the consultation report when he was asked to provide evidence. No evidence was given to clarify all of his responses/comments. Liz: Please bring this up again next week as that would be an amendment to the resolution.
- Lisa – it would be helpful if amendments like this could be written and put in the chat next time so we have exact wording.
- Mary W. – Question from constituents about transfer of power; is there room to amend that as not every VONC removes a president, but perhaps a change to how we work with leadership
- Josh F – Point of clarification re: process: we go back to talk to our constituency. Then if there are amendments that need to be made, does it go back to committee? Or do we discuss it as a whole and motion individual amendments? Liz – yes, we will discuss next week, take motions of amendments, then vote on resolution as a whole. If the meeting goes long, it's possible that the resolution vote could be put off until another meeting. We will need to see how it plays out over the next meeting.
- Liz – Remember this document is not set in stone; amendments can be made. Take it back to your areas and bring back your feedback.
- Lori C – Process question: is it more helpful to come with an amended statement as opposed to folks coming in with yes/no? Yes – specific language would be helpful. Things can also be struck from the resolution as well. Those are all options.
- Lou – When will I get answers for my constituents? What will happen next? Liz – not sure we have answers for that. We can't know what will happen after this.
- Ellen – My constituents – what do I say to them about have we exhausted all other options for re-mediation? People still think this is a shock. Is it absolutely no? Can we amend this to ask for mediation? Liz – resolution can be amended; would need to vote on those amendments.

New Business? – Liz

- None.

Announcements – Liz

- Please take the resolution language back to your areas for discussion. Next time we will discuss any possible amendments and vote on this.

Thanks, everyone!

Adjourned at 7:43pm

Next Meeting: Monday, November 15, 2021 @ 4:30pm