

College Senate Meeting Minutes

10 May 2021

Attendance

Senators Attending via Zoom:

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

Senators Absent: D. Green, J. Warren, M. Fields, M. House, S. Babcock

Guests: Nii Teteh (Student Senate President), Michael Laliberte, Dana Santos, Katie Bucci, Amy Brown

Meeting called to order at 4:32 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 5-3-2021 meeting minutes: Doug Holub made the motion, Lori Ciafardoni seconded. One abstention. Motion approved.

Consultation Updates – Liz

- This meeting is only surrounding Consultation business.
- College Council meeting last week; President of College council has read consultation report.
- Received an email last week from SUNY – wanted to meet with Senate eboard, Student Senate, and leadership
- SUNY Provost and others from SUNY were on campus today. Eboard met with Shadi Sandvik (SUNY Provost), Beth Berlin (Chief Operating Officer), John Graham (Associate Provost and Student Advocate), Marianne Hassan (Chief of Staff Office of the Provost), and Gwen Kay (UFS President); Lisa, Liz, and Don attended in person; Shannon, Dave, and Shelly attended through Zoom. They wanted to know where we are in this process; not sure what will come of this meeting – but will follow up with them about this. Wanted to keep you all in the loop with regard to this.

Campus Effectiveness Task Force – Liz

- Information in Delhi Today has been sent out twice now. Link for the document was in today's Delhi Today. Anyone can join these task forces.
- Katie and Liz will meet to decide when we will have our first meeting
- Erin: is there an internal goal regarding how many folks from Senate should be on these committees? Or should folks from outside Senate be on these more? Liz: Only a volunteer basis. We don't want to force anyone to join. If you're interested in being involved, please join one. We aren't limiting it to a certain number of campus members versus Senate members.

Work Group on Workplace Violence Statement Update – Doug, Don, Rich, Ellen, Ericka

- Workgroup was posted in VH. Hopefully you've had a chance to read it.
- Ericka – made changes to initial draft. Some of the edits were to take out language that seemed too accusatory while still maintaining the message that these problems and concerns have been brought to the Senate's attention and that the Senate doesn't condone this behavior. Also identifies resources folks can use if they experience or witness this behavior.
- Added footnotes to things that were referenced like the consultation report, workplace violence policy program.
- Issues weren't about level of training; access to HR trainings.
- Issue is really about reporting and naming incivility.
- Thank you to the entire workgroup for working on this important and difficult topic.
- Ellen – Campus has a workplace violence policy and there's already a statement on the website. Reiterated that this is a Senate statement to avoid confusion.
- Ericka: "Senate Statement Regarding Workplace Violence"
- Any comments or final suggestions?
 - Ellen – to show support and to empower people, I thought we were going to add a line like "if you or anyone you know is experiencing this situation" then give a link to the website and the workplace violence policy. That could be a way to wrap it up.
 - Liz: This will go out through Delhi Today so that could be included in the message. I agree, Ellen, that could be a possible solution. Wanting one last wrap up sentence. But your suggestion for a shorter message for Delhi Today with the pdf statement would be helpful.
 - Shannon: "we stand together in community" versus "we stand together as a community"?
 - Erin: Thanks again to the committee for this. In the first paragraph, we mention the consultation report, but this might not be something folks in the future

would know (future proofing – perhaps add a date)? With regard to Liz’s question, could we swap two paragraphs to provide a conclusive note at the end.

- Ericka – final paragraph felt disconnected initially. Could we take the “we stand together” sentence as the end?
- Mary W: I agree with Erin regarding flipping the two paragraphs, but then linking them. These ideas shouldn’t be disconnected. Something like: “While we encourage civil discourse...we encourage people to come forward.” Statement should be concise and clear.
- Lisa: I like the idea of flipping the paragraphs. Not convinced about connecting the ideas though because some behaviors might not be brought about by civil/uncivil discourse.
 - Mary: Maybe that statement just needs to go?
 - Liz: Thinking about how we as a Senate work through these things.
- Amanda: It sounds like the committee couldn’t figure out how to connect this statement. Also want to support Ellen’s suggestion about putting links into the statement itself. You expect to see it links to the policy/protocol/website itself.
- Ericka: This is already in the footnote.
- Ellen: With regard to Erin’s comment regarding the context: not everyone will know what the consultation report is and the history. Referencing the consultation report gives it credence. There are folks in my constituency that think it (consultation report) is not fairly represented because consultants were only faculty, and our senate is a blend of faculty and staff. It gives credence to statements that are not substantiated. We went back and forth about keeping it in or not. At this point, it’s a yield and a compromise. If we’re working through consultation and recommendations, then we should give it a timestamp. But if it’s a statement about workplace violence, then it should be irrelevant about the context: should just make a general statement of support regardless of the consultation report. Not everyone felt that the consultation report was credible. If you want to put a timestamp in, that’s a discussion point.
- Liz: We could put 2020-21 Consultation Report for context.
- Lori: There are a lot of folks who haven’t read the report. Maybe we could take out the “as the consultation report recommends” – yes this was the catalyst, but we’ve passed a lot of resolutions without a consultation report. Start with “incivility must be made” – this senate supports the consultation report recommendations and include the link. This might be a happy medium for folks. I know some folks don’t believe this report is valid – but this statement is valid, we do support those who have experienced incivility. I think a lot of things happen on this campus that we don’t know about until we do.
- Lisa: I would speak against striking it. While things have not been substantiated per se, there was a theme of this in the report and people’s perceptions and

lived experiences of workplace violence. Would like to see a vote on this. Would make a motion to see how the body feels about this statement.

- Don seconds the motion.
- Liz: Any other discussion?
- Ericka: I am for maintaining it in the document because it's important. Framing it with the year and footnote helps. Important to continue to integrate recommendations from the consultation into documents we create.
- Erin: In support of Lisa and Ericka. As a model we could use the UFS resolutions. I know these aren't the same, but they have whereas clauses that provide context. Whether it's at the beginning or end.
- Ellen: Moving more toward Lori's idea of putting it toward the end. It'll read better. We were discussing this and that felt collaborative. But now in that discussion, we put a motion and that seems to limit discussion.
- Liz: This is an important piece of this document. If this were going through UFS, there would be a motion to amend and a discussion. We have the privilege of making a motion and having discussion whether to include or not. Still good discussion; just trying to figure out this one piece with regard to context.
- Lisa's motion: to keep in the "as the Consultation Report recommends": 3 no, 1 abstention; motion passes. Phrase will not be struck.
- Should we add to clarify when the Consultation Report happened (in case there are future ones or folks are reading this in the future)?
- Lori: with regard to dating of things, for archival purposes, timestamping it both in the 2021 Senate Statement as well as the 2021 Consultation Report: helpful for next set of Senators/employees, etc. Who knows where it will live in the future. Good record keeping for the future.
- Ericka: that's a good point about dating things - one thing I've noticed working on the middle states work groups is it makes things easier when dating and time stamping is done
- Liz: Going back to ending: re: College Senate paragraph. Removing or keeping it in?
- Lisa: Healthy reminder of the discourse climate we want at Senate. But this is also with regard to everything, not just Senate, so I could see this going both ways. It's a good reminder of how we want our Senate discussions to occur.
- Ellen: Paragraph seems like a caveat. Seems like it's trying to describe part of our identity. First sentence should be edited/deleted.
- Cheri: While I'm not opposed to it, I am not sure it's necessary. This feels like a given that shouldn't be said.
- Shelly: I would say that this entire statement should be a given that shouldn't have to be said, but here we are.
- Doug: Doesn't seem to fit with the statement.

- Ericka: What is the goal for the paragraph? Is there a way to reframe it to get to its intended goal better?
- Lisa: I make a motion to take this paragraph out. I'm not trying to discourage conversation, but rather to get us to a point where we can further discuss and see how we feel about it as a body. Second from Shannon. Motion passes. 4 nos, 3 abstentions. Second to last paragraph is struck.
- Shannon: Add in at end: If you or someone you work with has experienced or witnessed workplace violence there are ways to get help. Please refer to: Add in links with reporting options. <https://www.delhi.edu/mydelhi/hr/violence-prevention/workplace-violence-policy/>
- Once approved we will send it out to campus.
- Ellen: When do our constituents get to weigh in on this?
- Liz: This isn't a statement from our constituents. This is something coming from the Senate.
- Ellen: But we represent the campus. If we are voting autonomously and independently without the feedback of the campus, that may put the Senate at risk. We would just add a week to get feedback from campus. If we're saying it's just the senate, then we're saying we're above the others.
- Doug: I would like to motion that the Senate votes to approve this statement. Lisa T seconds.
- Shannon – as the elected representative for 35 constituents on campus. They elected me to stand in their stead. We have the opportunity to send out this statement. This does not mean we're above anyone. When curriculum comes to us, we approve those without seeking input from our constituent. This is coming from the governing body of the Senate to the Campus. They voted for us to do this work.
- Lori C: Senate represents the campus. But we are not saying this is a campus wide statement. We are saying as the senate, we feel this. This is our statement for our particular body. This does not need constituent feedback. This is our sitting senator feedback. I would not support putting this out to a constituent feedback delay.
- Laurie Jones: Representation is done by voted in representative.
- Ellen: We need a moment of awareness and to reflect on where the campus is. The pulse check is that some people are losing trust in the Senate. They're confused and questions about what we are doing. I reached out to you, Liz in an email about this. You did not reply. How does it matter if we give them voice at this point if it will continue to engender trust. We're not walking about saying we have the only voice, we have privilege. If you're going to push it through, that's how it's going to come across. I caution everyone to think about perceptions and how folks perceiving the Senate. Don't we want transparency. What is one week?
- Liz: We need people to know that we, the Senate, support folks going through the proper channels. This is not a statement of/by our constituents. What are we asking of

our constituents? This is a statement saying we support our constituents and pointing them to resources.

- Ellen: If they want to discuss the statement, they can reach out to their senator. We have a long tail here of consultation, votes of no confidence.
- Lori: How many of your constituents come to our Senate meetings? These are open meetings. If people are concerned about what we're doing at Senate, then I would encourage any of them to come to a meeting, and pull up a seat at the table. As an at-large Senator, I talk to a wide variety of people. This statement has been worked on for months.
- Ellen: Yes my constituents attend meetings, and it seems that every time I bring up my constituents, you try to discredit me.
- Don: Need to move forward now.
- Liz: Need to agree to disagree. We're not discrediting, we're disagreeing. And trying to do that civilly.
- Nii: Does this relate to the consultation report specifically?
- Liz: A few meetings ago there was a statement from a campus member that matched up some of the phrasing in the consultation report to the language in the workplace violence. These reports that folks shared with the consultation report, then they should go through HR, the Union, or external agencies such as the Dept of Labor. We decided that a statement would be helpful to remind folks about what resources are available and that the Senate supports them.
- Nii: Who could be against this? Not to say input isn't necessary for this, but if this is about protecting employees, then we don't need that extra week and we should move forward.
- Erin: If our role is to vote and support/reflect the voice of our constituents, then we can vote how they would vote. That is the point of the vote.
- Vote: one abstention. Motion passes.
- Thank you, everyone. We know this is difficult. We need to be able to engage in these difficult discourses in a civil manner.

Adjourned at 5:49pm

Next Meeting: Monday, May 17, 2021 @ 4:30pm (Zoom)