

# College Senate Meeting Minutes

## 18 April 2022

### Attendance

#### Senators Attending via Zoom:

L. Frisbee, R. Celli, L. Ciarfardoni (proxy held at times by Cheri Rossi), E. Liberatori (proxy held by JoAnna Brosnan), E. Wagner (proxy held by Alice Kraus after 5:55pm), S. Shoemaker (proxy held by Rich Celli after 5:30pm), A. Krause, C. Rossi, M. Wake, J. Cash, S. Jones, J. Fishner, L. Tessier (proxy held by Shelly Jones), D. Holub, L. Jones, D. Gashler, D. Aikens, M. House, A. Lang (proxy held by Jason Fishner), L. Reyes, J. Brosnan, A. Balcom, D. Wakin, Lindsay Walker (alt for D. Keever), Simon Purdy (alt for T. Hamblin), J. Warren, J. Collins

**Senators Absent:** Brigid Finn Maguire (new School of Nursing Senator)

**Guests:** John Padovani, Michael Sullivan, David Brower, Susan Deane, Genevieve Salerno, Lauralea Edwards, Mary Bonderoff, Joyce Shim, Shawn Brislin, Terry Hamblin, Lars Schweidenback, Amy Brown, Lauren Sloane, Lisa Heimbauer, Carlos Cabrera.

Meeting called to order at 4:30 pm by Presider, E. Frisbee via Zoom.

#### Welcome! – Liz

- Welcome! Thank you for attending!
- Reminder: please use the “raise your hand” feature. Guests can speak, but cannot vote.

#### Meeting Minutes

- Motion to approve: Doug H, Cheri Rossi seconds.
  - 22 Y, N 0, 2 abstentions. Motion passes.

#### Dr. Bonderoff Updates

- As the CET proposals come in, we’re writing an official response to the groups. Hoping you’ll use that document as a kind of feedback mechanism to engage in conversations about implementation.
- Doug: When you use the term “we” – who is “we”? The Leadership Team.

#### Time Limits for Meetings Clarification– Liz

- Some confusion on this last time. Approved to motion to adjourn by 6pm to be respectful of people’s time.
- We were in the middle of a vote last time. We can motion to adjourn at 6pm; if it’s voted down, we can complete the agenda item we’re on. If we notice it’s getting late, we can motion to extend the meeting to finish what we’re on.

- Don't want to be inflexible – but need to finish the items we're on if possible.

### **Discussion on Senate Political Statements/Resolutions – Liz**

- This was a topic brought up by Ellen, but she could not be here tonight due to a last minute family emergency. We feel her voice is important in this discussion item. If the body is okay with it, we can postpone this.
- Motion to postpone: Lori C. Second: JoAnna. No discussion.
  - Vote: 22Y, N 0, 1 abstain.

### **Voting on Two Local Resolutions – Dan and Jason Cash**

- Black Lives Matter local resolution – wanted to make this as relevant as possible; met with Lou Reyes, Tomas, and Lionel regarding concerns of staff of color on campus; this resolution is the result of that collaboration.
- Could we limit comments to those that are substantive rather than minor grammatical changes, etc.
- Motion: Simon Purdy; second: Jenny Collins.
- Discussion:
  - Erin: Expresses support and grateful to the committee to work on it. Thank you for commenting on “anti-racist” versus “not racist”
  - Cheri: Constituent feedback – 1 in support; 2 with concerns – negatively impacting promotion or continuance if a faculty doesn't agree with the diversity statement; statements around police – BLM positioned itself as aggressively anti-law enforcement; inclusion of mandatory race trainings (content? Who would deliver?).
  - Andrea B: Positive feedback from Vet Sci/Applied Science; one comment re: diversity statement – is this something we're including with promotion? Could include more drama/problems. Suggestion of: “Highly recommended” instead of “mandatory” – motion made. Second: Lori C.
    - Jenny Collins: Nothing that says you have to say Black Lives Matter and I support that. If someone is not clear what a diversity statement means, we can discuss that. A diversity statement could be about working with students with different learning abilities, with different backgrounds, etc. Not sure if this pushback would happen if this weren't tied to BLM.
    - Lori C – Is there something currently that specifically discusses DEI? Or would that be in addition? Why not FAR instead of promotion? Jenny – if it isn't in you PDP, it isn't there. There's no current mechanism regarding diversity in the promotion process. Maybe not about requiring it instead of decoupling it with promotion?
    - Erin W: Against the amendment: diversity statements catch us up with current practices. Not a political statement but an educational statement

(e.g. how will you plan to accommodate our diverse students?). How will I make myself accountable to my diverse student body?

- Alice: This “be it resolved” garnered conflicting feedback. Some were in favor of the diversity statement; this is a fairly standard document for applications. Some constituents were concerned about academic freedom. Confusion around what diversity and equity mean. If this were passed, this would take time to implement.
  - Jason F. – This seems to address the process of academic faculty and not staff. The wording should specify “not required” if that’s the intent so that there is no confusion. Unclear if this process is applicable for non-academic faculty.
  - Vote on the amendment to include “highly recommended”: 6Y, 17N, 6 abstain
- JoAnna – Is the Prodig grant being used as an example here? Yes, just an example. JoAnna – Wanted to make sure that we can be inclusive of all the opportunities, not just limiting us to one.
  - Lori – Constituent concerned about what discrimination looks like specifically. Also, how are we recruiting more and providing greater support to diverse students? Who is responsible for that? Would this be a new position?
  - Shannon – Most constituents were in support, but some concern with aligning ourselves with a specific organization/movement (BLM). Is there a different approach in how we’re naming this?
  - Jason C. – This started as an attempt to localize the UFS resolution that we approved last Spring. Not specifically in support of the organization as opposed to the spirit of the sentiment.
  - Erin W. – Still speaking in support of the resolution. Appreciate Jason’s clarification. Sometimes if we universalize every statement, we accomplish nothing and won’t address anything. BLM as a sentiment doesn’t have to be correlated with an organization.
  - Cheri – Possibly aligning ourselves with an organization that hasn’t been nice might not be a good idea. The title of the resolution is specifically about African American people, but then later in the resolution it brings in Indigenous people. The resolution is trying to address more than one race.
  - Jenny – In favor of resolution. “Niceness” is not productive when individuals are murdered in the streets. BLM as a political movement – largely disconnected from a specific organization. If we’re having these discussions, they need to realize we’re making contributions to a specific organization/LLC, but rather in support of a larger/broader idea.
  - Jason C – This was written in collaboration with the DEI Advisory Board. While the scope may broaden out, it is rooted in an attempt at equity and inclusion. This was driven by faculty and staff across various experiences.

- Dan G. – Echo Jason. Original version that Jason took to Lionel, Tomas, and Lou was mild/meek. Very happy with this version and the impact it could have on our campus. Really appreciate the collaboration that went into this.
- Alice: From LAS, there was support for this resolution overall. Praise for the writing, the spirit of it, the scope of it. Concerns that were expressed: academic freedom, defining some of the terms – we have work to do on campus about some of the basic definitions of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. Hopefully with the DEI ILO and GE, we can get some of that work done.
- Jason F: The whereas regarding faculty instead of non-academic/staff, would like to refer this back to committee. Second: Shannon.
  - Dan: Is there a simple solution to wordsmith this? Liz: Need to continue on.
  - Jason F. – Don't know enough of the inner workings of UUP in terms of what can be on. Would a custodian need to write a diversity statement?
  - Shelly – Just want to reiterate that this is a resolution and the “how to implement” is beyond the scope of this body. That would be figured out by the administration, if they choose to support this resolution. They can deny it.
  - Vote to refer back to committee: Y 11, N 13, 2 abstain. Does not pass.
- Vote: Y 15, N 9, 2 abstain. Resolution passes.
- Dan: Resolution regarding Cameroon and Haiti – we are uniquely poised in NYS to be welcoming to immigrants. The whereas statements are specific to Cameroon and Haiti, but the resolutions are broader measures that would help all immigrants (e.g. Ukrainian refugees, etc.). Originally written for UUP statewide, but adapted it to our local situation, particularly after we made a statement regarding Ukraine.
- Motion: Jenny Collins; second: Simon Purdy.
- Discussion:
  - Erin: Thank you, Dan, for working on this. You've been doing important work on this for a long time. The place of education is to include everyone and provide resources to everyone, regardless of their status as a citizen, I approve this.
  - Jenny – My area had questions about Sanctuary cities and status and will we lose funding regarding this? The only legislature about that never passed. Written statements from SUNY and Governor that we'd lose funding over statements or policies like this. In support of the resolution.
  - Simon – In support of the resolution. Creative use of the SUNY resources. New York has historically been the epicenter of immigration and asylum.
- Vote: 25 Y, N 1, abstain 0

### **Academic Policies: Repeating Courses – Lauren Sloane**

- Changed the “he/she” to “they” – this will be a future change to all policies
- Took back the comments from Senate in the Fall

- Fourth time seemed more appropriate. This is a broad campus wide policy.
- If Senators can gather the constituent feedback, please bring back to Jess before coming to Senate, to make the meetings more efficient.
- Motion to approve the proposed policy: Erin W, second: Doug H.
- Discussion:
  - Cheri – Still against this. Many constituents are against this. This is especially true in Nursing and Vet Sci. Additional concern: putting the policy in place, ties individual program's/dean's hands. Does a disservice to a dean with their own program. Sets Delhi up as a reputation as being easy.
  - Erin – Update from division to dean? Yes – to make the policy up to date.
  - Susan – Schools could still implement their own policy that would supercede this and that should be a statement in there.
  - Lori – Would we have to follow this or have our own individual program policy? How many attempts have we had where students are taking a class this many times? Anyone know the data? Lauren: Anecdotal evidence only. This probably applies more to LAS gen-ed classes. This proposal didn't originate with us (policies committee). Susan: Jeff Stedman's area weighed in that led to the four-time parameters. Lori – Would the student go to the Dean of their program or the Dean of the school of the course? Latter.
  - Lauren: May include students who have withdrawn from campus for a variety of reasons.
- Vote: Y 17, N 6, 2 abstentions
- Liz – do we need to have a vote regarding the policy committee changing pronouns throughout to "they" instead of "he/she"?
  - Alice – We approved a resolution on this (using gender-neutral language) in 2018.

### **CET Proposal Review: Institutional Finance and Search and Hiring Work Groups –Liz**

- Lindsay – Reworded a few things based on recommendations from the Senate. Concerns around a non-academic VP chairing a dean search. The academic VP might have to chair multiple searches. Took this language out. In the research we did, deans chair dean searches. Additionally, broke down VP/Dean in different sections. Direct report change: at least one direct report. Two college representatives – should have a representative from UUP/CSEA. Worried about making a search committee too large. Union often do meet with candidates additionally. Received more information from SUNY and how they do searches.
- Liz – recommendation that this group has worked on. Not a perfect resolve but a start of recommendations that are being brought forward to be discussed and approved where possible. There are some legal points we're still exploring.
- Motion to endorse: JoAnna, second: Cheri.

- Laurie Jones: I have been at Delhi for eleven years; CSEA has always been on a committee. I think we should be in the initial format. VP of Finance has 73 people under them. This should have been taken under more consideration.
- Susan: Dean could self-nominate? Need clarification.
  - David: If a dean wanted to be part of a search committee, if they were on a ballot, then the ballot would be run by the Senate Presider to be more objective. As opposed to the Provost nominating.
  - Confusion about why the Senate Presider is handling the voting.
  - David: The point was just to have someone objective run the vote (if one representative from the school and the dean could be the representative).
- Alice – VP part of this is well done. I'm on the VP search for Finance and I think it's going well. All of the different feedback from areas is important. I have concerns about the Dean piece of this. A lot of LAS folks would rather have a Dean chair a Dean's search. There should be more than one person from the school on that committee. A dean works closely with their faculty/staff. I have trouble endorsing this for that reason. I would want the dean piece uncoupled from this proposal.
- Cheri - #4 – Five schools: is the library not part of this?
  - Library falls under the Provost. Five schools plus the library.
  - Librarians are faculty members in SUNY.
- Lindsay – Noted! Good document from SUNY Cortland that breaks hiring practices further. Just received this a few days ago. Breaking the positions down more might be helpful.
- Liz – This is still the initial proposal. Things can still change.
- Vote: 9 Y, 10 N, 3 abstains – not endorsed.
- Continue to work on this recommendation.
- Motion to adjourn and postpone the rest of the agenda until the next meeting: JoAnna, Lou Reyes second. No discussion. Vote to adjourn: 18 Y, N 5, 0 abstentions.

**Senate Officer Elections – Rich Celli - Postponed to May 2**

**Curriculum Committee – Lars – Postponed to May 2**

**Bylaws Proposal: Officers Section – Alice – Postponed to May 2**

Adjourned at 6:15pm

**Next Meeting: Monday, May 2, 2022 @ 4:30pm**