

# College Senate Meeting Minutes

## 8 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, D. Krzyston, D. Aikens, D. Cutting, D. Holub, E. Ericson, E. Wagner, J. Fishner, J. Lindsay (proxy held by Laurie Jones), M. Fields (proxy held by Rob Piurowski), A. Krause (proxy held via Lindsay Walker), L. Ciafardoni, J. Cash, W. Shaffer, L. Jones, S. Babcock, D. Conklin,

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

**Guests:** Desiree Kever, Nii Teteh (Student Senate President), Lars Schweidenback, Bret Meckel, Carol Bishop, Katie Bucci, Monica Liddle, Karen Teitelbaum, Thomas Jordan, Landa Palmer

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

### Meeting Minutes

- Motion to approve the 2-22-2021 meeting minutes: Jason Cash made the motion, Ward Shaffer seconded. Doug asked to have the meeting minutes clarify that meetings between e-board and leadership will be bi-weekly. So noted. Motion approved.

### Uniform Course Syllabus – Monica Liddle

- Recommendations for Monica:
  - Teaching philosophy may get too long to include on syllabus. Should be discussed in class instead.
  - Online syllabus – take out mental and physical health services as these might not be available for online students?
  - Plagiarism language updated. Link to academic integrity
  - Make document accessible
  - Add information regarding the library services to the syllabus – Amanda has this now and emailed Monica
  - Technical support section – link to helpdesk
  - Technology requirements should be the same for on-site and off-site course
    - Minimum requirement for accessing VH – same for online and in-person
- Discussion:

- Do online students have access to the health services? – Depends on if they are fully online or merely taking an online class. Students can still get a referral from the health services.
- How to include information for students when we might have different kinds of students in a course (e.g. some fully online versus sometimes online)?
- If there's additional information that doesn't apply to course, faculty can remove that information from the syllabus template.
- SLO alignment table – can we include this kind of information in a different way than the table?
  - Trying to be consistent from course to course
- PLO/SLO section course be problematic for courses that fit into multiple programs; do we need to align that info for multiple programs?
  - Good question. Could be very difficult to do. Probably not then.
- Should the SLO table include every single assignment that fulfills the SLOs?
  - No – more generic than that. Describe the kind of assignments that fulfill SLOs. Give them an idea of what the course will be like so it isn't a surprise.
- Thinking about the order of the syllabus. Want to make it so students can find information quickly (e.g. schedule, books required, etc.).
  - Again, just want things to be consistent throughout courses so students know what to expect in the courses.
- Is it necessary to have two separate syllabi templates (online and in person) – or is it better to have a blurb to faculty member saying you can customize info that is relevant to your course?
  - Main differences between two: communications etiquette, location, technology requirements, expectations about logging in to VH. This could be in the template and then delete it if not relevant.
  - It'd be easier if there were just one because many folks use the wrong one.
- Merging information into one and then see this again at a future meeting.
- Thanks, Monica!

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

- Process has evolved since last time we discussed this at Senate in December
- ILO Steering Committee met with program areas and non-academic areas to give feedback on ILO plan – 30 hours of meetings
- ILO Plan has been shown to assessment committee and with different program areas
- Shifting toward programmatic ownership of assessment of ILOs
- Three proposed ILOs: Responsible; Apply knowledge; Diversity/Equity/Inclusive minded
- Responsibility and Applied Knowledge ILOs will be assessed in at least 2 different points in their program; rubrics will be designed by the program/unit;

- For DEI – map where this is being taught; assessment committee will create survey to assess students in the first year on this ILO
- No assessment in this next year – focus on set up (e.g. creating rubrics, etc.)
- Want areas to start working on their three year assessment plan. Templates in VH. Within the template there's a tab re: ILOs.
- But are these really ILOs if they are so determined to the programmatic area?
  - Each program area students will graduate with different skills
  - Open to the area to define these goals
  - Students can perform at the level of their field
  - Aren't just from the classroom – interacting with other students, Res Life, programming, etc.
- This process has been open to the needs of all the different areas.
- Have all of the areas seen this presentation?
  - Not yet.
  - In the interest of making sure that everyone gets to see it, can we have Senators take this back to their areas for feedback and then at the next meeting we can move to endorse this? Want to do due diligence.
- Can we have a deadline for feedback beforehand in order to have time to think about that?
- Take ILO Plan back to your areas for feedback for next meeting. Vote on it on March 22.
- Thanks, Katie, Monica, Landa, and Des!

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

- CC20-59: CJUS 335 - Juvenile Justice – for CJ major. Motion: Ward Shaffer; second: Terry Hamblin. Motion passes.
- CC20-60: add ENGL 200 to pre-req for ARTS 300. Motion: Doug Holub; second: Erin Wagner. 1 abstention. Motion passes.
- CC20-61: HIST 110 History of Latin America to HIST 240 Latin American History. Change of course description and pre-req. Motion: Jason Cash; second: Rich Celli. Motion passes.
- CC20-62: HONR 280 Honors Capstone. Motion: Lindsay Walker; second: Lisa Tessier. 1 abstention. Motion passes.
- CC20-63: LASC 290 Capstone for General Studies/Humanities & Social Sciences. Helpful for assessing PLOs. Motion: Erin Wagner; second: Donna Cutting. Motion passes.
- CC20-64: Changes to General Studies AA degree – adding capstone and more 200 level classes
- CC20-65: Changes to General Studies AS degree - adding capstone and more 200 level classes
- Motion for 64 & 65: Rich Celli; second: Ward Shaffer. Motion passes.

- Small changes to CC forms. Please use the new ones!
- Thanks, Lars!

### **UFS Resolutions – Lisa Tessier**

- UFS Resolution on Shared Governance was approved previously. Modified it to make it SUNY Delhi specific (e.g. look at Senate bylaws; administration to commit to shared governance in times of crises). Motion: Donna Cutting; second: Doug Holub.
- Discussion: none. Motion passes.
- UFS Resolution - BoT acknowledges that Black Lives Matter. Petition the state legislature to include anti-racist language in the SUNY Mission
  - Wouldn't need local action on this as it is from UFS to BoT.
  - Motion: Dan Gashler; second: Dennis Aikens. 2 no, 3 abstention. Motion passes.
  - Discussion:
    - Don – any times there's segregation by race/group, this has led to divisions.
    - Ericka – is there a goal to include over-arching anti-racist behavior, not just including BLM (e.g. recent up-tick of anti-Asian acts of violence, etc.)
    - Katie – SUNY Delhi is thinking broadly about this matter (e.g. SUNY Diversity Plan). DEI ILO was put forth by faculty/staff. Need to continue to advocate for this.
    - Lisa – these two resolutions came from the BLM subcommittee; could have additional resolutions in the future.
- University Faculty Senate recognizes the Black Lives Matter. Asks campus governance bodies to work to eliminate white supremacy and racial injustice on campuses. Campus bodies would include curricular and co-curricular opportunities re: BLM.
  - Motion: Erin Wagner; second: Terry Hamblin. 3 No, 4 abstention. Motion passes.
  - Discussion:
    - Some Business constituents were supportive of the idea, but didn't like the term white supremacy being used.
    - Is this looking for us to be pro-active about this issue?
      - Per our resolution process if this were approved, this would be taken to the resolutions committee and we would come up with our own resolution that is the same, but tailored to SUNY Delhi. And then we'd vote on that.
    - Reiterating what Ericka said – could there be future resolutions that are broader in scope.
    - BLM as a movement versus the idea of supporting Black lives
- Thank you, Resolutions Committee!

## UFS Consultation General Feedback and Discussion – Liz Frisbee

- What was the overall feedback on the consultation report that Senators heard?
- Questions/Comments:
  - Don – few responses from each side; very polarized feedback
    - Some folks thought this should've been done a long time ago; others felt that e-board has caused unnecessary drama. No one in the middle really.
  - Donna – comments of surprise at some of the issues that were included in the report; interest in knowing how some of these issues will be resolved;
  - Ericka – took multiple read-throughs of the report; trying to digest it; one of the most important and easiest things to work on is communication on campus;
  - Shannon – folks are still going through the report; biggest feedback was really about: what are we doing next? How are we breaking down the goals?
    - Low-hanging fruit: communication – what additional ways can we communicate this information?
  - Ellen – communication is a common issue; people should forget their scripts/storylines; took a lot of time to read and people still didn't get it all; yay footnotes; if everyone is committed to the institution as evidenced by the Middle States meeting, seems so different than what is in the consultation report.
    - Doug – Forgetting scripts – what does that mean?
    - If we're starting on a clean slate, maybe forget the old rhetoric.
  - Ward – I was dismayed at the report mostly because the administrative response in the footnotes seemed to be “no no we don't do that. That's not true.” Administration was not engaging in this process. Expected to see some sense of acknowledgement and accountability.
  - Terry – Where do we go from here? There's a lot of info from that report. There's clearly a division regarding the validity of the comments in the report and where we go next. This body needs to figure that out. Has anyone reached out to the president and come to speak to us? Some people who read those footnotes might have some questions. There needs to be willing parties to heal. This body has entered this process in good faith. People have been more than conciliatory about the report. But we need to hear that from leadership, specifically the President.
  - Thomas Jordan – what's been agreed upon is that the delegates will work with the eboard to move forward. Delegates will be able to speak to the points. Most of what was written was what was not right about administration. There was nothing in there about what's wrong with faculty. To get to a place of healing we need to focus on the resolutions, to improve the situation for the students and the institution.

- Liz – as of now the e-board and leadership team delegates, as well as the President, if he is able, to meet bi-weekly. We feel that the President's involvement will be really important to building trust. Hoping to start them within the next week or so. Focusing on recommendations.
    - Would like to create a poll for the Senate that lists the recommendation in each section. Choose top 3 short-term goal and 1 long-term goal to focus on. Hoping to set this poll up this week and have results at next Senate meeting. Place to start.
    - Important for everyone to realize that there aren't things going well. Should be an acknowledgement on both sides that there are problems. From the e-board's perspective, we are sorry to anyone that we have offended or been dismissive. That's not how we want to function as the Senate. We want to be supportive of the academic and staff side of the Senate. We would like to do better.
  - Lori – People were disappointed to see how defensive the administration was in the comments and not taking responsibility for the situation.
  - Katie – for clarification only Liz and Michael were allowed to comment.
  - Doug – I was disconcerted by the President's comments, but it's important not to dwell on that. We want to encourage open dialogue. We would hope that everyone on the leadership team would show their commitment to participating.
  - Erin – Middle States Steering Committee has been praised; could serve as a good model for how to function in a good way. Everyone is invested in making this a good place.
  - Liz – We need to keep in mind the system-ness of this process as we decide how to move forward. We can take pieces of that to help us build this new process to move forward. We can't function without each other; we all have our roles on this campus (e.g. students, faculty, staff, admin).
  - Dave – most important thing now is what do we do with it. We need to let go of whatever we're harboring versus focusing on blame. Need to solve the situation.
  - Katie – Liz and I have been working on a schedule so that the majority of delegates can be in the room a majority of the time. Trying to solidify these meetings.
- Thanks, everyone, for your patience and feedback.

Agenda complete.

Adjourned at 6:28pm

**Next Meeting: Monday, March 22, 2021 @ 4:30pm (Zoom)**