

# College Senate Meeting Minutes

## 22 March 2021

### Attendance

#### Senators Attending via Zoom:

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

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

**Guests:** Desiree Keever, Nii Teteh (Student Senate President), Lars Schweidenback, Bret Meckel, Carol Bishop, Monica Liddle, Karen Teitelbaum, Linnea Goodwin Burwood, Kathryn DeZur, Mike Miller, Alice Krause (on leave), Kelly Keck, Jack Tessier, Barb Sturdevant, Jackie Howard, Susan Deane, David Brower, Kristen DeForest, Mary Morton, Brianne Slocum, Nancy Macdonald, Lauren Sloane, Jessica Backus Foster, Michael Sullivan, Lori Tremblay, Ted Martin, Carol Bishop, Doug Gulotty, Dana Santos, Will Warner, Justin Foster, Heather Taggart

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.

### Meeting Minutes

- Motion to approve the 3-8-2021 meeting minutes: Rich Celli made the motion, Terry Hamblin seconded. Motion approved.

### Eboard Updates

- Eboard met with Leadership team on March 10, 2021
- Survey of recommendations was made; Leadership would also take survey and will compare that with the Senate survey results
- Also discussed possibly sharing survey of recommendations with the campus

### Uniform Course Syllabus – Monica Liddle

- Monica put together a course syllabus that could be used for online or in-person instruction
- Disclaimer at beginning – instructors can move things around or delete aspects that don't apply to their course (e.g. lab info, etc.)

- Instructor teaching philosophy was removed and modality is removed.
- Discussion:
  - Question regarding academic integrity policy re: intentional versus unintentional plagiarism; should the link to the policy be there only instead of adding this additional information regarding intention vs unintentional
  - Ericka – middle ground for plagiarism/cheating section could be including the outline of plagiarism and students can click through the policy.
  - In the table regarding PLOs, unsure how we will address that if courses fulfill multiple programs.
    - Address this outright; thinking about curriculum map and how a course fulfills similar PLOs – use best judgement for what works best for your students and you.
    - Ericka is happy to help with outcomes and aligning them.
  - Susan – In Dean’s Council meeting with the Deans and Katie Bucci on November 18, 2020, Deans requested that there needed to be two distinct templates (one for online and one for in-person); needed to be reviewed by the Deans and then go to Senate. Think we mis-stepped here.
    - Liz - Could we gather faculty input here at Senate and then take that back to the Dean’s Council and see what they think? We can table the discussion. We were not aware of the Dean’s Council decision. It seemed that people were in favor of having one.
  - Lisa - Last time, we looked at the differences, and we didn’t see many differences. Since we could add or remove sections, people favored a single form (especially for those who teach both online and in person). But different areas may have special information they might have. Could these areas add that information themselves?
  - Erin W. – part of the impetus for the single format is the changing landscape of education as many of us might be teaching hybrid. What form would we use for that?
  - Ericka – has looked at a lot of different syllabi from lots of different areas; courses that aren’t fully online still use VH heavily even pre-pandemic; information from the online version (e.g. minimum tech requirements) is still important/valuable for students regardless of modality;
  - Ellen – are we not going back to Dean’s Council? We don’t want to disempower them.
    - Liz - We are just providing feedback that we can offer them regarding whether there should be one or two forms. We certainly aren’t trying to disempower anyone.

- Linda – Confused on how we can call it one if people can make changes. How can you use only a single form?
  - Monica – In practice, most of us do make edits. Whether we're supposed to or not, we do. If things don't pertain to our course, we take it out.
  - Ward – it's a pattern/template. Something to work off of but can be modified.
  - Ericka - Syllabus template is mandatory across the board
- Susan – We need to think about accreditation. We want to be mindful, if we call it a uniform course template, that's different than a template. In Nursing we have a lot of differences that we do have to put on our syllabi.
- We'll table this discussion until there's more information for us.
- Thanks, Monica!

#### **ILO Plan – Monica Liddle, Des Keever**

- Monica received feedback from Vet Sci; implementation and who is responsible (is the expectation that students should have this coming into program?)
- Setting own standard based on responsibility in our own areas
- Question over how things will be assessed – but that is still to be determined
- How is this different from assessing PLOs since it's so program-based; ILO will be assessed both in classroom and out of classroom; holistically meeting ILO in different areas
- Motion to endorse the ILO Plan: Lisa Tessier; second: Ericka Ericson. Motion passes (1 no, 1 abstention)
- Eboard received email from Des wondering how assessment committee works within the larger Senate body (e.g. as compared to Curriculum Committee, etc.). Will work on that and get back to assessment committee.
- Thanks, Monica and Des!

#### **Academic Planning Update – Lisa Tessier & Dan Gashler**

- Big take away: admin is pushing for us to be F2F in the Fall; from marketing and student perspective that is desired
- Trying to be flexible; continue to use online modalities (e.g. hybrid?)
- Lisa and Doug pushed for making a decision as soon as possible
  - This was also coming from facilities
- Fall 2021 schedule – live
  - Scheduled as f2f classes
  - August 30, 2021 = start date of Fall semester

- Rest days/mental health days
  - Want to reach out to faculty in the classroom currently
- Putting together a calendar for future
- Andrea Dibble is taking notes for these meetings going forward – very helpful; agreed to have an agenda
- Next meeting will be after graduation committee met (they did)
- Please send feedback your thoughts about
  - Going back f2f in the fall
  - Lessons you've learned if you're already f2f now
  - Questions you'd like answered by this committee
- No date or agenda set for the next meeting
- Doug H. – Some discussion by Kelly Keck regarding the contact hours/potential overload – labor issue.
- Thanks, Lisa and Dan!

### **UFS Consultation General Feedback and Discussion – Liz Frisbee**

- Thank you to the Senators who participated in the anonymous feedback tool on VH.
- Liz will read/summarize this feedback.
- Anyone can speak who is present at the meeting. Please raise your hand and wait to be acknowledged by the Presider. Everyone can speak for five minutes. Please keep things civil. We need to be able to discuss these things and come up with a solution. We will remove people not being civil.
- Anonymous feedback entered into the VH tool
  - Anger and disappointment with the President's responses to the report
  - Theme of not taking ownership in the document; blaming others
  - Some people called for a vote of no confidence based on this
  - Some people reported the president's responses were false information
  - Retaliation, blaming, no ownership
  - Questions of financial issues; calls for an audit/investigation of finances
  - Request for leadership to acknowledge how people are feeling
  - Continued lack of incivility, bullying, yelling
  - How do we know the president's responses are true?
  - Comments brushed aside the lived experiences of people on campus
  - Not a lot of confidence that President will interact with staff/faculty
  - Consideration of search processes – questions regarding these practices
- Senators – comments on this feedback?
  - Shannon – most of the comments were very similar to what was previously mentioned; lack of acknowledgement of people's perceptions; issues being ignored/brushed aside instead of listened to

- Ellen – acknowledging people’s feelings, but not taking sides. Consultants have put this on paper. This does not give this more credence. People thought the president was lying? Someone could say the same thing about the other side. Where is the healing? We could keep going back and forth and keep talking about it, and keep stirring the pot, but if we never go beyond this, we’ll never heal.
  - Liz – people are wanting the acknowledgement that the info in the document is what people have experienced, not just perceptions. Just acknowledging would be helpful, is what folks are saying. There wasn’t an acknowledgement that there could be something going on, that these feelings are valid.
- Amanda – Does this change our plan on what to prioritize and what to move on?
  - Liz – one of the thing that we keep hearing is that people are still processing the report. We want to make sure that people are ready to move on. Some haven’t been able to say what they want to say. Hoping that this is acknowledged by other side so we can move forward. Trying to give time.
- Ward – We keep saying that others (and this goes both ways) aren’t acknowledging their blame/culpability. At this point those have to be bygones if we’re going to move forward. Blame and guilt need to go away or we won’t move forward. This has been an on-going thing that is going to take a while to fix. There will have to be a point where we need to set a deadline for feedback so we can move forward.
- Terry – 1) People don’t like to be told to get over something. Insulting their intelligence and feelings. This has been going on for months. Concerns that were raised in the report go back years. People aren’t being heard. If someone brings a charge/claim forward, they need to be heard – but we’re being told we need to move on. 2) Since the president is named in the report, he needs to come to the Senate and address these concerns. He is the one in the footnotes that addressed some concerns, but his comments raised more questions. People have a hard time moving forward until that is addressed. Leadership team is meeting with the Senate as his delegates. That is a good step forward; it energizes people into this process. That said, they cannot speak for the president. Until we are able to have that dialogue with the president, we cannot move forward. We are dithering. The president could designate the entire campus to represent him, but until he comes here and listens to us, it doesn’t matter.
- Lisa T. – Most of the themes you discussed, Liz, reflect what I’ve heard. Issues regarding reserves and financial situation (even pre-covid). Issues regarding civility. President’s comments don’t always include evidence. For example one of his comments discussed senior faculty’s lack of willingness to help with student retention and new programming and that has been questioned by faculty.

Comment on Delhi Today – could this be arranged to allow for stronger communication. Confluence – some members don't have access to confluence (problematic if this is the tool we use for secure information like budget).

- Doug Gulotty – the report suggests we have a lot of areas to improve. As a former CEO, the president sets the tone and culture – it is their primary responsibility. They have to be accountable. Reading those notes – they were inappropriate. They have hurt our shared goal of moving forward. If you're part of the community, there are things we can't change. But we want to hear "I regret these things happened" and then move forward.
- Mike Miller – President has addressed many of the issues, but one that the consultants labeled as uncivil behavior was not addressed. In order to move forward, we have to do so in good faith. We have to listen to all grievances; they have to be investigated; they must be discussed. If any of us were accused of uncivil behavior, there would be an investigation. I think this sets a dangerous precedent if we do not address it correctly.
- Liz has something to share written by a campus member that was sent to their senator, who sent it to the eboard.
  - Serious findings in the consultation report – uncivil actions, issues of retaliation, bullying, harassment
  - People said that they were afraid to speak up for fear of reprisal and threats of intimidation
  - This is workplace violence as defined by NYS Department of Labor and by our SUNY Delhi workplace violence policy.
  - None of these issues mentioned in the report were commented on by the president
  - This was a hard letter to read, but brought up important points that paralleled the workplace violence policy
  - Because it was brought up, we want to do due diligence; if people have things to report, they should speak up. We cannot really do that in the Senate, but we could request something, but we cannot do an investigation ourselves. This needs to be reported.
  - Chart shows how consultation report evidence parallels the workplace violence policy
  - While we want to move forward, now that this has been reported in this manner, we feel like silence is tolerance. We have a responsibility as a campus for creating a healthy environment.
- Comments?
  - Shannon – after reading the letter and the chart, we want to move on, but it's hard to forgive when there's no acknowledgement of what has occurred. It's not about blame; it's ownership that this could happen under this leader. Forgive

and forget doesn't work in this situation, because forgetting means we could do this again. We don't want this behavior to occur again. We can't forget the lessons we are learning from this. We need communications. We need leadership that will allow us to go forward. Not all of the things listed in the consultation report may relate to the president, but he is the leader and has allowed these things to happen. We need him to address that these issues have merit and value. Seeing that chart was eye-opening. Hopefully we can put this into the changes that need to occur.

- Lori C – Acknowledging and apologizing for mistakes is important. There was very little of this in the report. Hadn't thought about the incivility as a workplace violence before today. Michael's absence at these meetings speaks volumes. The main person we need to move forward hasn't been here in a year. Everyone's busy – but we're here. We wish he would say something, but that's what we need, even if that's not what we want to hear.
- Kelly K – Just want to offer my services (as president of UUP) if people need to come and report any incidents related to this topic.
- Terry – 1) I echo the other points that have been made about the chart. Puts this into perspective. 2) What is the next step here? I agree with Lori's point that acknowledging a wrong-doing is important. But something like this...we can't really investigate it. With these allegations, I think we've moved past the point of moving on. What recourses do we have?
- Liz – We don't feel like we can just move on; that would mean ignoring and thus tolerating this behavior. What are people's thoughts on this information? Do we request an investigation by HR or the Union?
- Ellen – I need to say that when I've spoken about a common ground or a way forward, it is not to disregard people's feelings or a complicit act of incivility. I think there is a process for issues/allegations related to civility/workplace. They need to go to HR. What is the Senate's role here? The Senate can make a statement regarding not tolerating incivility. But if everything is anonymous, what can we do?
  - Liz – we should make a statement for sure. But the problem is that the complaints go to the alleged perpetrator of those actions. Dean Meckel – people are afraid of going to HR. Liz – when we decided to do the consultation, there were HR issues that were brought up. The Consultants told us that HR issues were beyond their purview. I know that some people did not participate in the process because they didn't feel protected. If the issues are about an upper level administrator, people don't know where to turn or how to report it.
  - Mary – workplace violence complaints go to HR; if necessary other arrangements can be made for investigations; there are external reporting options if someone doesn't feel comfortable reporting on

campus. If you file a complaint, investigation processes have to be followed. If they aren't, then a complaint of retaliation goes into that reporting process. Those are protections that are outside of SUNY Delhi. Look what is happening with our own governor. But people have to come forward for things to be investigated.

- Terry – Acknowledge the anonymous nature of this process. The report is supposed to be anonymous. We shouldn't diminish anything in the report just because it's anonymous – that was the whole process. It's not important, just because it was anonymous. We don't know what claims have been made to HR. Anonymity is to protect people. Not everyone wants their information shared with a body like the Senate.
- Lori C. – The anonymity issue is important as Terry said. Maybe folks have gone to HR and didn't get a result; external agencies and the whistle-blower act support and protect people. We are a really small school.
- Lisa T. – Messages from the chat. Rich had a point that we didn't cover regarding the fact that we can't assume wrong-doing without an investigation. Also Carol Bishop encouraged folks to go to HR.
  - Rich C. – This is different than a criminal investigation. A person could remain anonymous in this process. People are afraid. I'm not tenured and I would have reservations coming forward if this happened to me.
- Doug G. – If I were a CEO, a board would ask why people are feeling the way they are. I'm hoping that someone above the president would resolve this issue by having a conversation with him. We have to have some venue where people can talk. The tone of the conversation forecloses our options. Institution can't acknowledge the issue. That isn't serving anyone's needs. I don't see how anyone can find a resolution without continuing, moving forward with the formal process, the next step beyond Consultation. The report wasn't generated in a vacuum. Administration is duty-bound to investigate. I see this report and a lot of blame landing in my area. None of us can acknowledge. There is no other side. There's one side. We need help finding this out. I'm very anxious over this. Paths we could have had are no longer available to us.
- Mary Wake - The process did need to be anonymous in order to express the breadth and depth of the concerns. Difference between the Senate saying we want to request an investigation versus we want the president to address the common theme that they can't speak freely, that they've been bullied (the climate that we're living in). The spirit of the consultation was about those common concerns that we could work together to resolve.
  - Lori – what is the process? We don't know if anyone had gone to HR and were dismissed or had issues. Maybe that's where there is a learning gap.
  - Mary – appeal-type process. That is on our HR website.



- Liz – we don't feel comfortable not mentioning these allegations and bringing this to the forefront of our attention. We don't know who felt safe or unsafe to report their concerns. We go through the HR training every year, but this is still hard for some people. We don't want to handle HR issues, but we don't want to ignore allegations as well. We can't have silence. If we make a positive statement regarding our stance on workplace violence, if we can help people understand who they report these matters to – that would be helpful. But we need to have these conversations. People keep bringing these concerns to Senate. We don't feel like we can just say "we can't help you." Trying to find the best answer of how we help others and not sweeping it under the rug. How do we all help each other as a community?
- Ericka – There's no harm in this body partnering with appropriate groups such as the union to outline methodology to report workplace violence. Without overstepping, that is how the Senate can help. But we need to get at the root of why we have this campus climate where people feel bullied, they fear retaliation. Moving forward is not moving on. We need to acknowledge and work on the recommendations.
- Alice – On leave, but did participate in the consultation process. What are our next steps? What you did today is what we can do. You brought the complaint to light and had a good conversation on it.
- Terry – risk of going down the rabbit hole if we just look at a single accusation. We're having a good dialogue here. We can't just submit a statement against workplace violence. We have policies. Where do we go from here? With this information, what do we do?
- Liz – I think a lot of people here today can help with these next steps. We've provided information that the union and HR can take. We can partner with the union to help with education of where people can go to seek help.
- Lori C. – Regardless of what we do next, we need to acknowledge that people's experiences are valid. They can't be dismissed. We went with the consultation process to try to help encourage a healthy work environment. People need to feel safe and secure with the next steps.
- Alice – one of the ways we can address this is by recognizing the recommendations in the report – which are within the Senate's power to address. We should be getting to these actionable items in the report. This conversation is important but it shouldn't derail the report recommendations. People keep wanting to hear from the president. His comments were unfortunate; they were defensive and they're blocking dialogue. We need to make an entreaty to the president to work with us and meet with us. Have you done this in eboard?

- Liz – We’ve been waiting on comments about the report. We’ve gotten feedback now. Only half the senate took the survey. We have ideas of where we can start. President did mention the consultation report in one of his videos.
- Alice – a Vote of No Confidence has been mentioned many times before the consultation. But before we go down that path, we should try to prove due diligence that we tried to communicate.
- Ellen – related to the idea of a statement, in any reporting that you have back, in order to engender a safe space, we should say something in there regarding where people should go regarding these concerns. I wasn’t suggesting a resolution or something out of our purview. These are HR related issues.
- Judy L. – In reference to the incivility and workplace violence, what needs to happen is for the employees to be listened to. That isn’t happening. When you go to HR and say the word “bully” you’re told not to even use that word. People are living these circumstances and need to be heard. It really depends on who is doing the bullying.
- Doug G. – Anyone can reinforce the structural options you have for reporting. We can’t do everything – but we can do what we can and at least that will strengthen our position. If the Senate is going to lead us out of this, they’re going to do so by making these recommendations. The next step is nuclear and nobody wins. Don’t want to end in June in the same place we are now.
- Liz – we have another meeting with the leadership team this Friday. We will bring this information to them so they know this conversation happened. Lisa recommended to make a resolution regarding campus climate. Need to discuss how to communicate with President. Attend formal invitation to the President to attend future Senate meetings.
- Lisa – chat comments: what is the visitation process?
  - This could be the next step after consultation if we aren’t seeing improvement. Much more public process. Similar to consultation – team comes in and do interviews. Wouldn’t necessarily be confidential. Both parties would have to gather evidence. From there the team makes recommendations to the Chancellor and there’s more involvement in SUNY. Visitation usually leads to vote of no confidence or President’s resignation.
- Liz – Some options for next steps include:
  - partnering with Union to educate people on options within/outside of SUNY Delhi for reporting
  - Investigate as to why this culture exists on our campus
  - encourage reporting of forms of workplace violence
  - Address issues/recommendations in the consultation report
  - Develop a statement from Senate on workplace violence and offer info and resources/referral options

- Make an entreaty for dialogue with President
- Request that President come to the next meeting to address the Senate about the consultation report
- Ask President to attend and participate/contribute to future meetings as well
- Postpone the recommendations topic until next meeting due to the lateness of the hour.
- Thanks, everyone, for your patience and feedback.

Motion to adjourn: Ward Shaffer; second: Rich Celli. Motion passes.

Adjourned at 6:51pm

**Next Meeting: Monday, April 5, 2021 @ 4:30pm (Zoom)**