

College Senate Meeting Minutes

15 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, J. Cash, S. Jones, J. Fishner, L. Tessier, D. Holub, L. Jones, D. Cutting, A. Calabrese, D. Gashler, D. Aikens, M. House, N. Wagner, 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, Monica Liddle, Dez Keever, Adriene Clifford, Dana Santos, Susan Deane, Ben West, Carol Bishop, Lauren Sloane, Rob Piurowski, Ted Martin, Charlie Mole, Linnea Goodwin Burwood, Karen Teitelbaum, Jessica Fell, David Brower, Amy Brown, Trish DeAngelis, Jen Aikens, Katie Bucci, Barb Sturdevant, Lynne Smith, Jessica Pruschki, Kathy Hibbard, Ralph Perez Rogers, Joshua Lopez, Kelly Keck, Terry Hamblin, Michael's iPhone, John Padovani, Jenny Lukovsky, Doug Gulotty, Kathryn DeZur, Laura Pehrsson, Riikka Olson, Joan Erickson, Sean Babcock, Allene Slating, Kenny Fass, Birgitta Brophy, Bruce Jones, Kirby Olson, Michele Frazier, Mary Lewis, Lori Tremblay, Shawn Cobstill.

Meeting called to order at 4:33 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. Using Robert's Rules to help us work through these difficult conversations.
- Only Senators may vote, but guests may also speak.

Meeting Minutes

- Motion to approve: Shannon. Rich seconds.
 - Y 26, 2 abstentions. Motion passes.

Eboard Updates – Liz

- We posted the letter to the Chancellor with the areas listed on Vancko Hall.
- Eboard met with the deans and Rob P about the academic programs conversation that happened in a previous Senate meeting.

- Hoping we can bring this up again at a future Senate meeting. Need to further discuss SUNY definitions of deactivation and discontinuation. Rob will come to a future meeting in the Spring.
- CET – large group meeting tomorrow. Hoping each work group will present one proposal that recommends a change outlined in the Consultation Report.
 - Susan Deane has stepped into the co-chair role. Thank you Katie Bucci for your previous work on this committee.
 - Hoping to bring these recommendations forward to leadership.
- Received an email from Student Senate leaders – Clyde Van Dyke shared a resolution that was in favor of the VONC. They sent that resolution on to the Chancellor.
- Around 2pm the President sent out an email to the campus. I hope most of you were able to read that.
- Questions? None.

Academic Policies: Alt Methods for College Credit – Jess Fell

- Took this back to Academic Policies committee – only change since our last meeting was that the Master’s program should be 50% - in response to conversation that happened at last Senate meeting.
- Any questions? None.
- Motion to approve: Erin Wagner. Second: Lori C.
- Vote: 27 Y; 0 N; 0 abstentions
- Thanks, Jess!

VONC Resolution – Lisa

- Want to reiterate some rules that we sent out previously. Want folks to feel safe and heard.
- Please raise your hand if you want to speak. Address the Presider, avoid responding to specific people. Avoid inappropriate language. If you violate these rules, they will be removed at the discretion of the presider/parliamentarian.
- Motions to amend a clause will be made and voted on via the raise hand feature.
- Please don’t put amendments into chat until you are recognized by presider.
- If you are requesting to add a whereas clause, please wait until we have gone through all the others first. Same with resolved clauses.
- Each person is permitted to speak twice to each amendment. If there’s an amendment to the amendment, you can speak twice to that. But we need to allow time for others to speak.
- Once we go through all the clauses, we will vote on the resolution as a whole using the anonymous voting feature, as outlined by the bylaws update from the last meeting.
- If we go over 1-2 hours, we will table the discussion and call an emergency meeting next week.

- At this point we're not taking any amendments to the resolution, but we can answer points of clarification.
- Are we putting amendments into the chat with everyone, or would it be better to send it to a specific person? - Everyone, but only when you are recognized by the presider so we can know what changes we are proposing and working through.
- Ellen – point of information: given that the President sent out a Delhi Today Extra and has lengthy points, would it be more fair to allow for all of us to read those? And postpone the meeting? If this is such a vital thing, the Senate wants to appear fair. Maybe we consider a postpone and have a special meeting just for that (special meeting next Monday). Motion to postpone this discussion for one week and have a special meeting Monday, Nov 22 to allow everyone to read the President's Delhi Today.
Second: JoAnna.
- Discussion:
 - Dave W.: is there a timeline we're under to get the resolution drafted?
 - No, no time limit/due date.
 - Then we should read through the President's responses.
 - Dan G: I did read the President's letter. It's in response to the petition, not the resolution. Would be fine to continue our meeting. If people feel better to wait, that's fine too. But there was nothing new in his response. These are things we've been hashing for the last two years.
 - Lisa T.: Speaking against the motion to postpone. Resolution has been in hand for two weeks. President's email speaks to petition not the resolution.
 - Jason F: Agree with Dan that there is a lot of crossover between petition and resolution. If Senators have read it, I'm comfortable moving forward. A straw poll to see how many people read the email.
 - Want to leave that up to each individual senator. They know whether they read the email. Don't feel we need to know whether folks read the email. Hopefully Senators are using this vote wisely. If you haven't read the email, it is wise to read that before making a decision on this resolution.
 - Lori C: Against postponement. Letter came out today and timing was probably not unintentional. Petition this is speaking to went out weeks ago. Letter is just a letter and not necessarily evidence itself. Resolution is separate from President's email. We have already discussed to our constituents and listened to their points.
 - Donna C: In favor of postponement. Not a specific time limit – then would rather speak at the next scheduled meeting – the 29th. Ellen accepts friendly amendment: postpone until 11/29 instead of 11/22.

- Charlie Mole: Ask those in favor, if a long statement comes out before that meeting, will you postpone again and again? I speak against postponing. Timing of that email was clearly done on purpose.
 - Ellen: Clarifying – if a senator hasn't read the email, you would be uninformed. Regarding Charlie: I don't think any of us know the motivation of any of us here. Including the president. To say that it is intentional is unfair. We can't presume his intentions. Chasing our tails to figure out a future scenario. Don't want a rhetoric around intentions.
 - Main motion: to postpone resolution discussion to next meeting 11/29: Y: 9; N 19; Motion fails.
- Lisa – hopefully you've had a chance to get feedback from your constituents. Please be clear if you want amendments proposed. We will make edits on the screen as we go. Suggested edits should be substantial. Trying to avoid wordsmithing. First 7 statements are factual in a chronological fashion. 8 – 17 suggest concerns we've heard over time. 18 and 19 are factual again.
- We'll go clause by clause.
- Whereas Clause 1:
 - Ellen: 1 through 5 relate to Consultation Report. As stated previously, don't know how germane it is to give a chronological order to this. We should strike those related to the Consultation Report. They are not germane to the conversation.
 - Motion to strike Clause 1 outright. – No second.
 - Shannon: School of Business and Hospitality wants to change Whereas 1 to include "and explained" after "first discussed". Feel it is important that the process of UFS Consultation had to be explained to the President. Second: Cheri.
 - Jason: is there information from an agenda from a meeting to provide evidence for this change? Liz – yes, this was in an eboard meeting with the president. President asked what Consultation was and that was explained. Previous eboard when Dave Krzyston was the presider. Are the executive board meeting minutes on the Senate page? No, but these minutes were included in the evidence file to request the Consultation process.
 - Vote: 22 Y; 1 N; 5 abstentions.
- Erin: not an amendment, but I think these whereas clauses are useful as they provide context and reasoning.
- Motion to accept Whereas 1: Simon; second: Rich C. Y: 24, N: 0; 3 abstentions.
- Whereas 2: Motion to accept: Lori C; second: Shannon. Y 26; N: 0; Abstention 3
- Whereas 3: Motion to accept: Erin W; second: Jim Warren.
 - Discussion: Ellen: Re: consultation – don't recall all of this. Don't remember stating major themes. Liz: When we started to discuss if we wanted to move forward with this process, we asked Senators to go back to their areas. As people

brought feedback forward and we voted on consultation, there were more themes. Themes were asked to be put in a feedback tool in VH. We identified these major themes. We sent forward these themes in a letter to UFS.

- Vote: Y 22; N 0; Abstentions: 6
- Whereas 4: Motion to accept: Lindsay Walker; Rich C. seconded. Vote: Y 26, N 0, 3 abstentions.
- Whereas 5:
 - JoAnna: Perceptions – maybe not better to include this as it could go the other way as well. Motion to amend: strike from “that were perceived” to “issues raised”. Second: Ellen. Ellen’s constituents said the same.
 - Shannon: speak in opposition to amendment. My constituents want to see it changed. Amendment to the amendment: “WHEREAS 5 in February 2021, the Consultation Report (December 2020) was released to the campus with anecdotal comments from President Laliberte that did not follow the consultation procedures and interpreted by many as not acknowledging the breadth of the concerns nor taking accountability for the issues raised nor provided evidence for all of his responses;” second: Cheri.
 - Lori: Was going to say that “many felt” because it was dialogue we had on the Senate floor. But I speak in favor of Shannon’s amendment.
 - Ellen: point of order: Liz, you’re saying “we’re voting in favor of” – can suggest that you are railroading the Senate. Caution you against that. Sounds like you’re leading. Liz: Apologies. I just want to try to follow process.
 - Carol B: Question: the president didn’t provide evidence? Thought he was only asked to make corrections, not provide evidence.
 - Liz: Per the consultation process, the consultation team asked the Senate to provide evidence of where we saw the themes emerge. Eboard put together a website of information that touched on evidence as part of the rationale for consultation. President was asked if there was any evidence to give to the consultation team. We were both asked for this evidence. I have emails from the consultation team that corroborate that and can share them if necessary. Thank you for bringing this up, Carol.
 - Lisa: “were interpreted” would be better. Speaking in favor of the amendment as it reads now.
 - JoAnna – point of clarification: is there an example of how the consultation procedures were not followed?
 - Liz: President and leadership did not provide evidence as we were directed to do. Eboard put together evidence, but the president did not. Once we gathered evidence, we were instructed to share it with each other (leadership, Senate eboard, and UFS consultation team). We did

not receive anything and so we reached out to consultation team. They did not receive any evidence/information from the president.

- Ellen: Speaking against this amendment. Chronological order could be taken on the other side. If we were to see the president's chronology, we might have a different understanding of whether things were followed and not followed.
- Vote: Y 18, N 8, 3 abstentions.
- Amendment to the amendment to add "were" ("were interpreted"). Lisa.
Second: Simon. Y: 23, N: 1, 3 abstentions
- Back to amendment to strike out ending (that were perceived etc.). Y: 27, N: 0, 2 abstentions.
- JoAnna – this doesn't represent everyone's feelings.
- Motion to accept whereas 5: Jim Warren, second: Dan G.
- Vote to accept whereas 5: Y: 19, N: 8, abstentions: 2
- Whereas 6:
 - Ellen: Move to strike this entirely. Discusses concerns outlined in the consultation report. Jason seconded.
 - Lou: College Senate created a workplace violence statement. Where are the accusations of workplace violence stated? Liz – this came up in the consultation report under civility: fear of intimidation and retaliation. Those behaviors listed there are in the prohibited behaviors listed by our workplace violence policy. Someone brought this issue forward to a Senate meeting in the Spring pointing this out. Since we're not HR, we created a statement reiterating that we're against workplace violence and discussing resources available.
 - Erin: This is not debating whether workplace violence happened, but the fact that this statement was created. Still valuable as it speaks to the movement that brought us here.
 - Lori: Against striking this. This is factual. Anonymous does not mean untrue. The consultation report was not anonymous, it was confidential. We don't want to diminish what people have experienced.
 - Jason F.: Opposed to striking the entire piece, but I plan on amending "outlined in the consultation report" – not everyone did it for that reason.
 - Ellen: This statement was created. But "in response to concerns outlined" – based on consultation report. These are alleged.
 - Vote to strike whereas 6: Y 1, N 25, abstentions: 3. Motion fails.
 - Jason F: Motion to strike "in response to concerns outlined" – some Senators may have created this for different purposes. Adam seconded.
 - Lori: Friendly amendment: "once the consultation report was released" – didn't arbitrarily come up with this statement. Still needs context. Jason – understand what you're saying. "After continued dialogue on campus" add in.

- Alice: In favor of the changes – however, the workplace violence statement was made in response to the consultation report. However, I don't dispute the changes.
 - Cheri: I don't think this is questioned. The statement was created in response to the concerns of the consultation report. That is a fact.
 - "after continued dialogue on campus" and striking "in response to consultation report"
 - JoAnna: since this is chronological, does it matter that the consultation report isn't specifically mentioned? There is still a date.
 - Vote: Y: 21, N: 6, abstention 1. Motion passes.
- Motion for whereas 6: Jim W, second: Lori C. Vote: Y: 26, N: 0, abstention: 2. Motion passes.
- Whereas 7:
 - Lori – should this be flipped with 8? Lisa: 8 is more on-going and discusses more recent issues like the resignations of folks from CET.
- Jason F: motion to postpone and call an emergency meeting on Monday, Nov 22 from 4:30pm – 6:30pm. Donna seconded.
 - Lori: Can we just get through 7 as it is factual? Friendly amendment to finalize whereas 7 first.
 - Lisa: Against setting a time limit on the meeting. Opposed to postponement.
 - Erin: Only concern with postponing is that we could keep doing this forever. Speaking against motion to postpone.
 - Dan G: Speak against postponing. Let's see if we can finish it. But let's see what the body wants.
 - Ellen: For postponement. For the humanity of it. Don't see what the big hurry is. Would like us to be fresh and level headed.
 - Vote to postpone: Y 11, N 13, abstention 4. Motion fails.
- Whereas 7 – motion to accept: Lori. Second: Dennis A.
 - Lou: Are these offenses about the President or are they about the campus in general? Liz – just in general about our policy on campus. Lou – so we're saying this happened under his watch? Lisa: Yes. Also there was a workplace violence committee and there was an issue with the creation of the committee, which reports to the President.
 - Kelly K: Not allegations toward the president's behavior. There were violations related to our workplace violence policy that we had not followed procedure including a committee that has not been in place for years. Procedures weren't followed and were serious according to the Dept of Labor. I can say there have been substantiated issues of workplace violence on campus, which the President's email claims otherwise. Whether they have been reported properly is

another issue. Maybe we haven't been reporting them properly. We have the report itself from the Dept of Labor.

- Liz: The notification that listed the workplace violence policy violations was required to be posted in a public place on campus until abatements occurred. This is factual.
- JoAnna – If these violations have been fixed, should we strike this information?
- Lori: Do we have anything from writing from DoL? This is about DoL and it's factual. Unless we have documentation from DoL that this has been resolved, then it should stay.
- Carol: We submitted two updates to DoL and they have accepted what we submitted. Not sure if there's one or two that we haven't heard about yet. There's one that we're finishing by the end of the month. Unclear how many have been accepted yet. We got one but I don't know about two.
 - JoAnna – want to keep it as up to date as possible.
- Postpone whereas 7 until we get info from Carol in this meeting: Cheri. Second: Donna. From Carol: "At this point, all the documentation I've received is more than enough to consider all violations abated, with the exception of Citation # 1 Item # 3 (due on 12-03-2021)." 5 of the 6 have been accepted.
 - Cheri rescinds the motion to postpone. Carol was quick!
- Amendment: "WHEREAS 7 in August 11, 2021, the New York State Department of Labor Public Employee Safety and Health Bureau issued a report that found four serious, and two non-serious, violations on our campus of the Public Employee Safety and Health Act of 1980; all violations with the exception of Citation # 1 Item #3 (due on 12-03-2021) have been abated as of 11-15-2021; and" Second: Jason.
- Lou: Citation 1 – was that serious? Yes, it is serious and in response to workplace violence training.
- Lori: Should we include the date when they were worked on? They were worked on from such and such a date. Liz: Inspection happened in May 2021. Report was generated in August and they've been worked on since then? Consistent with dating and when we started working on things. Between August 30 and today, 5 of 6 have been abated.
- Kelly – each violation had an abatement date in the report.
- Amendment to amendment: between August 30 and November 15. Second: Cheri.
- Erin: whereas clause describes a reason. This feels more like a parenthetical. If this is a whereas reason, we're not criticizing that these issues were abated. Want these things to make sense. Speaking against the grammar. Put in parentheses?
 - Liz: Don't want to get lost in this. If folks are against, they can vote no. And we can start over.

- Alice: Agree about the grammatical issue. It shouldn't be a separate clause after a semi-colon. In support of the clarification, but against the formatting. Take out semi-colon after 1980 and put in parentheses.
- Voting on date range amendment to the amendment: August 30 and November 15 and striking date at end. Y: 26, N 0, abstentions: 2.
- Adding in amendment re: "all violations with the exception of Citation #1 and #3, due on December 3, 2021, have been abated." Vote: Y 26, N, 1, abstentions: 1. Motion passes.
- Motion to accept whereas 7: Jim W, second: Dan G. Vote: Y 27, N 0, abstention: 1. Motion passes.
- Whereas 8:
 - JoAnna: motion to postpone until Monday, November 22 at 4:30pm. Second: Jim W.
 - Erin: If we vote to approve the proposal, we finish it then? Or is it still that we could run out of time? Liz: No stipulation on time. Idea would be to finish at the next meeting. Up to the body how we do that. There could be a motion next week to postpone as well. We will continue to use Roberts Rules for process. We would not have any other business.
 - Lori: Will that be an open meeting as well? Yes.
 - Vote to postpone: Y 22, N 4, abstention: 2. Motion passes.

New Business

SUNY UFS Fall Plenary Report – Lisa

- 19 page report is posted on Vancko Hall. Want to be respectful of the late hour.
- D2L new learning environment
 - Asked about Moodle campuses since this is free. SUNY isn't sure what to do about that as D2L will cost us.
- General education update – received
 - Competencies = skills gained over time
 - Knowledge areas = tied to specific course
- DEI, enrollment concerns across SUNY
- Searching for a SUNY Provost
- Expansion of EOP
- Empowering students with disabilities task force
- Grant to tackle food insecurity
- Five resolutions were passed by UFS
 - These will come to our body over the next few months.
- Tech Sector concerns:
 - How will Chancellor advocate for tech campuses?

- Wants to invest in our facilities
- Diversify faculty/staff
- Seed money to campuses for diversity
- Providing grant support for international fac/staff – system can help
- New UFS VP – instructional designer from Albany

Curriculum Committee – Lars

- CC21-3 – Nursing – add NURS 265 – motion: Simon, second: Jim. Vote: Y 28, N 0, A 0
- CC21-43-49: Taking “Liberal Arts and Sciences” off of LAS degrees. Motion: Dennis, second: Jason C.
 - Led to an interesting conversation with Provost. Provost said we’re removing direct enrollment of Environment Sciences. Question of whether changing enrollment methods needs to go through CC.
 - Alice: is the plan to still send this on then? These do still have to go to SUNY.
 - Lars: We plan on going forward. Provost believes this is not necessary. CC believes this needs to still go through CC as the program is changing. We’re not assuming the enrollment change is happening.
 - Alice: This amounts to deactivation. These are faculty decisions, not marketing or admissions or any other office.
 - Lisa: Echoing what Alice suggested. There’s a process for deactivation. If we’re not allowing direct admits, then those programs need to go through SUNY process. I support removing “LAS” from these proposals including Environmental Sciences, because we have not gone through deactivation.
 - JoAnna – once these go through CC, they go on to SUNY because they’re title changes? Yes.
 - Lou: Would removing “LAS” from name allow for a potential change as to where they are housed?
 - Lars: That is not the plan. Just that the name is very long and confusing to students. We did this with Business a few years ago.
 - Vote: Y 26, N 0, abstentions 1.
- CC21-50: Same thing as the previous LAS ones except we’re also changing the title to Biology (issues with which sciences and math are being offered). This major follows the SUNY Pathways for Biology. Helps with students finding this major and enrollment.
 - Motion: Simon, second: Dennis.
 - Cheri: Confused how this degree can become Biology? AS degree – only two years.
 - Vote: Y 24, N 0, abstentions: 3
- CC21-51: New Applied Tech course: Lean Construction as restricted elective.
 - Motion: Dan, second: JoAnna.
 - Vote: Y 26, N 0, abstention 1
- No bylaws changes.

- Considering the idea of adding minors. Future proposal regarding adding minors to SUNY Delhi. Start thinking about and discussing with your programs. Seems to be a lot of interest in this idea.

Bylaws Change Proposal – Alice & Cheri

- Changes to Academic Promotion Committee – Doug Gulotty and Joan Erickson are chairs.
- Academic Senators should bring this back to your areas for discussion. We'll discuss and vote next time.
- Person should have continuing appointment, five years of full time service at Delhi
- Doug: Asst Professors would expand our pool of membership; members should have gone through the process once so they can speak to the decisions; having tenure/continuing appointment allows folks to be on the committee without worrying about retaliation or other issues. Protect the membership to feel more comfortable.
- Joan: these changes are necessary to address the new promotion process. We would have someone at the Associate rank by year 4. Necessary that the person should have tenure and gone through at least one promotion.
- Doug: Time on campus to get used to the culture and values of Delhi.
- Lisa: Speak to change from Associate to Assistant professor?
 - We have folks on campus who have decades of experience at the Assistant level but aren't eligible to be on the committee. Driven by service and leadership. They can tell if they've had the dynamic influence on campus.
 - In certain schools, faculty start out at the Instructor level, not Assistant.
 - Amanda: expanding the pool with the change in rank is critical for the librarians, where the pool of eligible people is very small. We have had to leave our seat vacant for multiple years due to the eligibility criteria, and the committee prefers not to have schools without any representation.
- We'll look at this at our next regularly scheduled meeting on November 29.

Announcements – Liz

- Committees to Report at November 29th meeting: Scholarship Committee, Resolutions Committee, Academic Promotion Committee, Budget & Planning Committee, Chancellor's Awards Committee, Continuing and Term Appointment Committee
- We will meet for an emergency meeting for the continuation of the resolution discussion on Monday, November 22 at 4:30pm.
- Thank you for being respectful of everyone's thoughts.
- Thank you, Josh Lopez (Student Senate rep). Either he or Tiffany (Student Senate President) will be at meetings going forward.

Thanks, everyone!

Adjourned at 8:05pm

Emergency Meeting: Monday, November 22, 2021 @ 4:30pm
Next Regular Meeting: Monday, November 29, 2021 @ 4:30pm