

Needs and Solutions

We, THE General Body, expect to engage the senior leadership of Syracuse University in discussions on implementing the following solutions to meet our needs:

A legally-binding non-retaliation agreement for all those involved in THE General Body rally and sit-in.

Signed immediately

Administrative Response 11/12/14: The University is committed to upholding all of its policies. It further commits that participation in the occupation of Crouse-Hinds Hall will not result in sanctions through the Code of Student Conduct, the Code of Ethical Conduct, or other disciplinary policies. Going forward, any persons whose activities are found to violate policies governing the conduct of members of the University community will be subject to the sanctions appropriate to the conduct in question.

“"[T]here is a history here and it is a history of students speaking out and expressing concern about the University in various ways under every Chancellor, and so this event is very serious and very important... So as I hope you can tell from my opening statement, and particularly from my reference to history, nothing I have seen or am aware of to this point should be cause for retaliation. Can I say that? Nothing I have seen or I'm aware of, and I should be very aware, should be cause for retaliation because this is Syracuse, and by 'this' I mean the expression of concern about the institution, okay, and so I want to read the language carefully but I certainly would expect that as part of a resolution of this, I'd be willing to sign."

- Kent Syverud, Syracuse University Chancellor, 8:45 pm, Wednesday, November 5, 2014, in a meeting with THE General Body.

“First of all, I was curious when you said seven matters [to discuss tonight from THE General Body document of grievances and needs and solutions] - how you got to seven from the longer list because they all seemed important. I should just tell you, and in one point in reading it, someone asked me, “Well, what’s your priorities among them?” and it feels like asking somebody to choose between their children, right? It really feels that way. So they’re all important.”

- Kent Syverud, Syracuse University Chancellor, 8:45 pm Wednesday, November 5, 2014, in a meeting with THE General Body.

- 1. The student body needs transparency with changes in student services and university policy. Transparency is defined as accessible information about said changes prior to finalization and implementation, student involvement and consultation in the decision-making and change process, diverse student representation at the table and respect for the will of governing bodies such as the Student Association, Graduate Student Organization and the University Senate in addition to the larger student and faculty bodies. The student body needs:**

Administrative Response 11/7/14:

We acknowledge that we can provide more advance discussion and opportunity for input on matters that affect the broad constituencies of the University. We will do better. A policy communication strategy is

being put in place that will ensure that there is broader communication/consultation about policies and changes in policies that affect the community. There are some decisions that ultimately affect individual members of the University community (e.g., legal, personnel, individual salary details) and some decisions that must be made based on fiduciary responsibility and long-term viability of Syracuse University.

GB Response 11/8/14: We would like to see this proposed 'policy communication strategy' and have input in it. We believe that the administration may not entirely know the best methods for communicating. We think that the entire community should have input into this new communication strategy.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: One of the Operational Excellence workgroups was convened to work on developing new policies around communication processes. The workgroup has not yet finished its report or presented its recommendations to the Fast Forward Steering Committee, and this is one of the workgroups where we are pleased to add students, preferably one undergraduate and one graduate student, via a broadly participatory process.

- 1.1. The Board of Trustees vote on new Mission/Vision Statements for Syracuse University, scheduled to take place Thursday and Friday, November 6 and 7, 2014, must be postponed.**

Administrative Response 11/12/14: This is a global response to all issues included in Section 1.1: It is important context to understand that this is the first time that Syracuse University has developed vision and mission statements that have included an opportunity for the entire University community to participate, in this case through open fora and via comments to a website. Because we do want to make sure that everyone is heard, the Chancellor has committed to opening a one-month period for additional feedback from the entire campus community regarding the draft Vision and Mission statements. We also commit to a focused reach-out to engage with the entire student body, including emails from Chancellor Syverud, the GSO, and the SA.

- 1.1.1. The entire SU community must participate in a collectively-drafted, co-created process to write the new Mission/Vision Statements (if indeed the will of the entire SU community is to have new statements).**
- 1.1.2. *The process will begin immediately.*
- 1.1.3. It will include a student-focused reach-out to engage directly the entire student body.
- 1.1.4. Among other efforts, Chancellor Syverud will use his email account to reach out to student, faculty and staff.
- 1.1.5. Among other efforts, The GSO and SA will email the student bodies as well.
- 1.1.6. This new Mission/Vision Statement, if we agree we need a new one, must be passed through the SA, GSO, and University Senate, and must have had at least the direct participation of 25% of each section of the entire community.
- 1.1.7. *The end date for passing these statements will be May 2015.*

Administrative Response 11/7/14:

Today, the Board of Trustees passed the following motion:

“At the strong urging of the Chancellor, the Board of Trustees approves in draft form the Vision and Mission statements. If recommended by the Chancellor, the Board will consider revisions from various stakeholders.”

The Chancellor is prepared to open a one-month period for additional feedback from the entire campus community regarding the draft Vision and Mission statements. Please see Fast Forward website (<http://fastforward.syr.edu>), where the current draft statements are provided (revision of the previous version circulated campus-wide is based upon input from faculty, staff, students, and alumni).

GB Response 11/9/14: Though we are pleased that the new Vision and Mission statements were passed as a *draft* form rather than a finalized version, we are disappointed that Chancellor Syverud urged the Board of Trustees to approve them at all. This contradicts Chancellor Syverud's direct statements to THE General Body. In Chancellor Syverud's meeting with THE General Body which took place in Crouse-Hinds Hall on November 5, 2014, Chancellor Syverud indicated that he would seek to delay the Board of Trustees vote on the Vision and Mission statements. According to the stenographer's report, Chancellor Syverud said, "This Vision and Mission Statement, as I understand it, is on the agenda for the Board of Trustees either tomorrow or Friday and what I want -- and so I do not, as Chancellor, control the agenda of the Board of Trustees, but I certainly do have input into it.

So what I will commit to do now is, certainly as quickly as possible tonight, contact the chair of the Board of Trustees and ask this; that this be delayed and that opportunity for comment and interaction on the Vision and Mission Statement occur before it is adopted.

I can't promise that will happen but I can promise I should have an answer to that question by tomorrow."

Chancellor Syverud goes on to say, "I will ask and strongly encourage the Chair of the Board of trustees to delay action on a Vision and Mission Statement for the University until a reopened period for public comment and dialogue in the wider community of those who -- particularly those who have not yet been aware of and engaged with that discussion." And, "And whatever decision is made, I will communicate to you promptly."

It is evident in the previous statement that the Chancellor committed to something which did not happen (at least according the administrative response above) in which the administration reports that the Chancellor, rather than ask that the Board of Trustees to delay the vote, instead urged the passing of it as a draft version.

We never heard directly back from the Chancellor about why he had decided on this course of action instead. This is yet another indication of the administration not communicating fully, and going back on its commitments to students, contracts (such as with the Posse Foundation), and faculty.

The current working version of Vision and Mission statements, whether in draft form of not, continues the problems we initially pointed out, removing important language reflecting values of community engagement, diversity and accessibility. Please note our original address of this issue, which reflect our still-valid concerns:

1.1. The new University Mission/Vision Statement.¹² See appendix.^{A11}

- 1.1.1. These statements were pushed forward very quickly, without diverse or widespread input, and certainly not with enough time or context for students to adequately weigh in. By October 1, 2014, comments were closed on the new Mission/Vision Statement. This timeline may have worked well for administration and the Trustees, but is completely out of touch with the timeline of students and faculty who are on campus September through May.
- 1.1.2. Indeed, the phrase "strengthen democratic institutions" has been removed from the proposed version. This indicates less interest in democracy, whether within the future of SU, or in the larger world.

¹ <http://fastforward.syr.edu/strategic-plan/mission-and-vision-statements/>

² See Proposed New Mission/Vision Statements in appendix. ^{A11}

- 1.1.3. Lack of the word “safe” in the new versions; “diverse and inclusive” does not necessarily imply safety, and is not sufficient to make campus safer for marginalized students.
- 1.1.4. The phrase “We provide access to opportunity” has been deleted from the proposed Vision Statement.³
 - 1.1.4.1. This indicates that the new vision for SU will be less concerned with making the university accessible to qualified applicants, regardless of financial and other circumstances.
- 1.1.5. Removes the term “diverse backgrounds,” as in the following phrase: “We want our students to feel they have been given real, entrepreneurial opportunities in settings where students with diverse interests from diverse backgrounds can “mix it up.”⁴
- 1.1.6. Includes less language about diversity than the previous iteration.
 - 1.1.6.1. It implies a move away from ensuring the University will keep a commitment to recruiting, serving and sustaining a diverse population among students, faculty and staff.
 - 1.1.6.2. There is no reference to “community engagement” in the current proposed version. They have removed “public good” from the statements.
 - 1.1.6.2.1. This is a clear indicator that the university will be turning away from the commitment to engage with the larger Syracuse community which we experienced during Chancellor Nancy Cantor’s tenure, which means moving towards the older model of the ‘Ivory Tower on the Hill.’
 - 1.1.6.2.2. To move more towards an Ivory Tower model again will breed further division and anger towards not only SU but its students, as well. To be clear, 80% of the students at the Syracuse City School District live in poverty. “Furthermore, among the nation’s 200 biggest cities, only five have higher estimated poverty rates than Syracuse.”⁵
 - 1.1.6.2.3. We cannot step back from community engagement and commitment to the “public good.”

We would like to add that it is unclear exactly who was involved in the process of creating the new Statements or when the process began. Even the SA President, who was involved in the process, does not know when the process was initiated. The SA President and the GSO President pushed in meetings to retain important language around community engagement and inclusion, but their concerns were disregarded.

At this point, now that the Board of Trustees has passed the new Vision and Mission statements as a draft form, we must move on. However, the administration’s proposal that one month is enough to engage fully the community in the new process of rewriting and engaging around the idea of new statements, is inadequate.

³ <http://www.syr.edu/about/vision.html>

⁴ http://www.syr.edu/chancellor/selected_works/scholarship.html

⁵ <http://onliteracy.org/uploadeddocs/SyracuseNYCSAP.pdf>

Given that the Chancellor also said in his November 5 meeting with THE General Body that, “So first of all, generally, I really have tried to engage and seek opportunities for engagement of students, faculty and alumni and staff a lot since I came here, and that is very important to me. I realize from really carefully working through this [THE General Body’s Grievances and Needs document] that I think the people here think those efforts have not been successful and I regret that. I just need to say I regret that, on this [the Vision and Mission statements] and on others. And I think it’s really important to me, as it is to you, that that change. ... I do want you to know that I presume good faith in everything that has been said in this document and everything I’ve been aware of, and good faith meaning caring about the University, and I don’t expect you to believe I have that good faith, too ... but I just want to say I do and that, that good faith means that my intent is actually to have more engagement than ever before on things like a Vision and Mission Statement” a month is nowhere near enough time to have “more engagement than ever.” Therefore we propose:

1.1.8. The entire SU community must participate in a collectively-drafted, co-created process to write the new Mission/Vision Statements, i.e., the community will write the new statements, not simply give feedback to the current draft.

1.1.9. *The process will begin immediately.*

1.1.10. It will include a student-focused reach-out to engage directly the entire student body.

1.1.11. Among other efforts, Chancellor Syverud will use his email account to reach out to student, faculty and staff.

1.1.12. Among other efforts, The GSO and SA will email the student bodies as well.

1.1.13. This new Mission/Vision Statement, must be passed through the SA, GSO, and University Senate, and must have had at least the direct participation of 25% of each section of the entire community.

1.1.14. *These new statements will not be completed until May 2015, allowing adequate time for full community participation in the process.*

1.2. The freezing of current investments in the fossil fuel industry and a plan to withdraw those investments within 5 years.

1.2.1. by the end of the Spring 2015 semester

1.3. A meeting between Divest SU and the Socially Responsible Investment Matters Committee and relevant parties to begin action on fossil fuel divestment.

1.3.1. by the end of the Fall 2014 semester

Administrative Response 11/7/14: The Socially Responsible Investment Matters Committee commits to meeting with Divest SU, will share relevant information about the strategies employed in investment, and will listen respectfully and carefully to the Divest SU members. The University's endowment does not directly invest in any coal or fossil fuel companies. Any exposure would be through third party investment managers (such as index funds), which are not direct University investments. The University is committed to working with these managers to minimize/eliminate this exposure.

This effort mirrors what Stanford University did earlier this year.

GB Response 11/8/14: We, THE General Body, are pleased with this response. We request two additional commitments that are both reasonable and that will help the Fossil Fuel divestment movement and Syracuse University. First, we ask that the university commits to a policy of maintaining no direct investments, now or in the future, in the fossil fuel industry. Second, we ask

that a committee of students and faculty, chosen by Divest SU, set up a work group with members of the Socially Responsible Investment Matters Committee in order to minimize and eliminate exposure to the fossil fuel industry. We need the administration/the Socially Responsible Investment Matters Committee to identify dates, or general dates, when these meetings will occur.

Admin Response, 11/9/14: These requests are understood, but the discussion should occur directly between the Socially Responsible Investment Matters Committee and the Divest SU membership, as both bodies have the most relevant information and knowledge. This meeting will occur as soon as possible, but no later than the May 2015 Board of Trustees meeting.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: We have reached agreement with respect to 1.3.

1.4. Disclosure of all names of fossil fuel companies with whom SU is affiliated, and amounts invested in them within the endowment. This includes divulging full records, including any discrepancy in percentages.

1.4.1. by the end of the Fall 2014 semester

1.5. An official statement from the Chancellor, acknowledging the distress the closure of the Advocacy Center has caused the student body, in a meaningful way, and apologizing for:

1.5.1. closing the Advocacy Center without student or faculty consultation.

1.5.2. closing the Advocacy Center when the majority of students were away from campus, unable to ask questions or say goodbye.

1.5.3. closing the Advocacy Center without replacement services available for those students who were on campus over the summer and without a comprehensive plan to cover for necessary services for victims of sexual assault and relationship violence.

1.5.4. forcing people out of their jobs with only one business day's notice, and essentially forcing them into other positions, while eliminating one position entirely.

Administrative Response 11/7/14: As it is a personnel matter, details cannot be provided, but this statement is misleading.

GB Response 11/8/14: While we respect your choice to not divulge information about personnel matters, calling our statement misleading is also misleading because we cannot see the evidence to back the claim. We cannot accept this description and reinforce our original claim. We know for a fact that one person was entirely let go of their job in the closure of the Advocacy Center. Whether the administration wants to claim this was due to 'personnel issues' or something else, it is still a fact that a person was forced out of their job. And two others were also forced out of their jobs, while offered other jobs within SU.

Please address 1.5.1-1.5.3. These statements are factual and deserve a response.

1.5.5. breaking trust with the entire community.

1.5.6. in an official email to all faculty, staff and students

1.5.7. by the end of the Fall 2014 semester

Administrative Response 11/7/14: The Chancellor and Senior VP Reed Kantrowitz have communicated on this matter multiple times since the summer and have explained the complex

environment surrounding this change, including legal, personnel, and a desire to achieve greater integration of services across units (as noted by the newly appointed Chancellor's Work Group).

GB Response 11/8/14: Please see the following evidence from our grievances document:

-No students or faculty were consulted about these changes nor the University Senate, and no surveys were ever conducted, yet, when we pressed for more information, we were told that this idea of closing the Advocacy Center had been in the works behind closed doors for two years prior to its closure.

-We have not been told exactly who was involved in the process of closing the Advocacy Center. See appendix.^{A2}

-The campus community still has not gotten a straightforward explanation for why the Center was closed.

-It appears that the Chancellor believes legal necessity led him to close the Advocacy Center; however, Rebecca Reed Kantrowitz has contradicted this statement, claiming liability was not the reason for the change.

Additionally, please see the following evidence from our appendix, which demonstrates that the administration has not communicated effectively about the “complex environment surrounding this change”:

In recent communication, as in the comments made by Chancellor Syverud at the Fast Forward Syracuse Town Hall held on September 22, 2014, the Chancellor asserted legal necessity led him to close the Advocacy Center. He said, “If I knew then everything I know now I imagine some aspects of the process would be different but **I can never apologize for aspects of the change which I feel have had to be made for legal and other reasons.**” However, in a private email dated July 4, 2014, Rebecca Reed Kantrowitz wrote that, “**Liability was not the reason we made this change.** We have been operating in a legal manner.”

This statement does not fulfill the need for an apology for the way in which the Advocacy Center was closed without community consultation, in closed-door settings, or for the lack of services available for sexual assault survivors and the confusion, particularly over the summer. This statement appears to claim that it has ever explained in enough detail why the Advocacy Center was closed, however, it is yet more obfuscation. We maintain we have yet to be given a detailed, authentic account of why the center was closed. However, that is not necessary for meeting our demand at this point, as we believe that we will never get a full, honest accounting of why the decision was made, or who was part of the decision making process. However, our prime goal with this demand is for an apology addressing each of the several points we made.

It appears that the administration may be claiming that the Work Group has stated certain things. Please provide documentation that the Work Group stated, or else make clear who wrote: “**a desire to achieve greater integration of services across units (as noted by the newly appointed Chancellor's Work Group).**”

- In May the University overhauled several key departments within the Division of Student Affairs to create a stronger and more integrated set of support services for students impacted by sexual violence and provide them the best possible service.
- Previously, there were more than five different points of entry within the University for students seeking these services. The new structure offers a primary point of access via the University's

Counseling Center by integrating in it advocacy services and the Offices of Student Assistance and Health Promotion.

- Recent federal guidelines have encouraged universities to offer the highest degree of protection possible to survivors of sexual assault while they consider their options. This restructuring achieves that goal. As a result of these changes, the University is investing more in services that support students affected by sexual assault.

- As we explained in point 1.3.4.2 of this document, most other universities do not interpret these new federal guidelines in this way.

- Although there was a time lag between the implementation of the new structure and the comprehensive communication, this claim in 1.4.3 is inaccurate; services were available at all times without any disruption.

- Available services such as meetings away from the Frat Row location, and the additional 3 counselors on the SRVR Team, were not communicated until weeks after the Advocacy Center's closure. Lack of communication about services that are available renders them useless to those who need them.

- In response to concerns about this change, the Chancellor created the "Chancellor's Workgroup on Sexual Violence Prevention, Education and Advocacy. Moving forward, this workgroup-including students, faculty and staff representatives will provide ideas, suggestions and proposals for how service gaps can be identified and filled.

The Work Group is now "on point" in communication to the campus community, in addition to ensuring that we achieve an optimal set of policies and services.

- [Chancellor's Work Group on Sexual Violence] [Timeline to be determined by the Work Group]

GB Response 11/8/14: Some members of the workgroup report feeling discouraged; they have spent most of their time so far speaking with administrators. This speaks to the confusion also experienced by the workgroup to fully understand sexual assault and relationship violence services and policies on campus. Additionally, some report discouragement because they have been told that a new center and an apology are off the table. This causes us to wonder whether this administration will implement their recommendations when the administration has already made up its mind. Furthermore the only clear and direct communication regarding services offered by the SVRV team has been a result of the Work Group's identification that communication regarding services was a defined GAP in actual services (See Work Group's letter to the DO regarding services). This response does not thoroughly address the needs of the student body in terms of reconciliation for this decision as discussed in 1.4. It is a complete denial of our request for an apology, instead it is a completely defensive statement. This is a refusal to be accountable to many members of the community who are requesting a direct, honest apology.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: We recognize and agree that there are many complicated issues around this concern. The Syracuse University Clery report, to be reported at the end of the academic year, suggests that many survivors of assault and abuse have been using the new collaborative unit of resources on campus. By bringing together services that exist across multiple offices, we have increased the services to our students and are responding in the best way to the maximum array of experiences of survivors of sexual and relationship violence. The Sexual Violence, Prevention, Education and Advocacy workgroup, which includes faculty, staff, and students, is looking at all of the new resources and has been charged to look for any gaps in services. The workgroup will put forth their findings early in the Spring 2015 semester, which will be communicated to students through the established student organizations, SA and GSO.

Also, below is a campus message from the Chancellor that will be sent later tonight to the campus community. It includes an apology:

November 12, 2014

Dear Students, Faculty, and Staff,

The past ten days have demonstrated much about the importance of listening to our students and responding to their concerns.

On November 3, students organized as THE General Body rallied on the steps of Hendricks Chapel before marching to Crouse-Hinds Hall. Like our students have done throughout the ages, they carried signs, chanted and encouraged passersby to join their cause. I cannot say enough how much I admire and respect the students' commitment to this University.

The students demanded action and I believe we have responded.

University College Dean Bea González, my executive team, and I have given this effort our full attention. We have thoughtfully reviewed and responded to multiple demands and documents, offered a wide range of very substantive actions that will be implemented right away, and have committed to a process for future action. The experience has been a learning one for all of us.

To make significant change, though, we need to move forward. Tonight we responded with our final written response and have informed THE General Body that our time must now be spent addressing the needs of the entire student body. To do this best, I believe we and THE General Body should work collaboratively with the duly elected representatives and governing bodies that are currently in place, including the Student Association and the Graduate Student Organization, to bring continued action and resolution to these concerns. I look forward to being an active participant in this process.

Finally, on behalf of Syracuse University, I apologize to those who have experienced stress and anguish owing to the process and communications regarding decisions made on issues important to members of our community. In particular, I apologize that decisions about the Advocacy Center, as well as the Posse Program, have caused this to occur. I have sincerely tried to engage and seek opportunities for students, faculty, staff and alumni to provide their thoughts and opinions on these important issues. However, I recognize some in our community have felt left out, and I regret that.

We will do better.

Sincerely,

Chancellor Kent Syverud

1.6. An official statement from administration promising that all recommendations and initiatives made by the Chancellor's Workgroup on Sexual Violence, Prevention, Education and Advocacy will be implemented, and in the timeline the Workgroup proposes.

1.6.1. The SVPEA Workgroup should become a permanent committee.

1.6.2. All other workgroups should also be given actual implementation power so that their hard work and research does not simply get ignored.

- 1.6.2.1. The people running the workgroups and the participants come to consensus around their recommendations. Their reports, proposals and minutes will be available publicly on the Fast Forward or other applicable website.
- 1.6.2.2. Reports from administration showing point by point which recommendations will be used will be reported within two weeks after their official recommendations are made.
- 1.6.2.3. If the recommendations are not carried out, the administration must report back to the workgroup and other interested bodies about other options.
- 1.6.2.4. **Workgroups will not be used in order to usurp the powers of the governing bodies of the university which are already in place, such as the GSO, SA, and US.**

Administrative Response 11/7/14: Workgroups, task forces, and ad hoc committees are an important part of any university. Participation in the workgroups is broadly constituted to include people with expertise in the subject areas, and each Fast Forward committee and workgroup is comprised of individuals from official bodies such as the Student Association and the Senate as well as individuals who are not. The administration greatly values the input of students, staff, and faculty who participate in the various workgroups that exist and will exist moving forward. We recognize the effort that has been put forth by THE General Body to keep the institution accountable to the work of the workgroups and their recommendations.

GB Response 11/8/14: This response does not address what has been requested. We are not looking for a recognition of our efforts. We are looking for an actual commitment to address the concerns we put forth. We want the SVPEA workgroup to be permanently integrated into established governance processes. We want for these democratically established governance processes to be honored and their decisions implemented. While work groups, task forces and ad hoc committees might be an important part of any university, the way they are used by the current administration to avoid taking action on issues is actually detrimental. There are no accountability structures in place and they are being used to justify undermining current governance structures.

1.6.3. by the end of the Fall 2014 semester

Administrative Response 11/7/14: This Workgroup has not made a recommendation about future organization or work, although the members may do so. Recommendations from this workgroup and all workgroups and committees on the campus will be considered.

- [Chancellor's Work Group on Sexual Violence] [Timeline to be determined by the Work Group]

GB Response 11/8/14: This is a direct denial of our need for the recommendations of the SVPEA Workgroup to be enacted. "Considered" gives us no more assurance than that which currently exists. It seems counterproductive to ask the Work Group to identify critical gaps in services and support in the new structure and to then propose a set of recommendations if those identified gaps and proposed recommendations are then ignored. This would effectively leave our campus in the same place as we were on May 30th when the Advocacy Center's closure was covertly announced. Without enforcement power, the Work Group solely exists in a public relations function and it is not within their charge to be taking on the roles of communication and public relations. As stated previously, some workgroup members

already feel discouraged, they feel they are wasting their time, since they feel the administration has no intention to enact their recommendations. While we understand the hesitance to agree to implementing the recommendations when the administration has not yet seen them, we have experienced many instances of the administration overruling student and faculty government decisions, making closed door decisions, that we have no faith that the administration will take the workgroups recommendations seriously. This response does not address our demand that the Chancellor's Workgroup on Sexual Violence, Prevention, Education and Advocacy becomes a permanent University committee. Additionally, while we understand that the workgroup has not yet made recommendations and initiatives regarding future work, and therefore it would be difficult to agree to commit to them ahead of time, we request that all and any recommendations be highly considered. We also request that after submitting the recommendations, the workgroup continue in negotiations with the administration in order to further advocate for the recommendations they have recommended. Further, a report must be accessible to all students and the wider campus community detailing the manner in which these specific recommendations were carried out.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: The recommendations made on this topic and any other recommendations by the Sexual Violence, Prevention, Education and Advocacy workgroup will be communicated to students through the established student organizations, SA and GSO.

1.7. The creation of a program separate from university administration for students to express grievances and have them be addressed.

1.7.1. by the start of the Spring 2015 semester

Administrative Response 11/7/14: While the ability of such programs to address issues is necessarily limited, we are willing to explore how more avenues for concerns to be expressed (in addition to Stop Bias, the Office of Equal Opportunity, Inclusion and Resolution Services, Hendricks Chapel and other programs) could be supported.

- [Senior VP Reed Kantrowitz]

GB Response 11/8/14: We appreciate the Administration's openness to exploring additional programs that allow students to express their grievances and have them addressed, outside of university administration programs such as Stop Bias. We also have the understanding that the Stop Bias committee hasn't met this semester, so we are reluctant to accept this as a viable option. We are also more than willing to work closely with the strategic planning committee and implementation of said programs and it is our hope that such programs have a system of accountability to be sure they are meeting and working in a timely manner.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: As stated previously, we are willing to explore additional avenues for the intake of student grievances. We agree to make sure that the current avenues for grievances are fully communicated to the student body.

1.8. A seat at the table as part of major or significant decision making on issues and services that affect us. This needs to be provided in a systematic and regular manner.

1.8.1. While the SA and GSO Presidents are typically brought in to some of these discussions, more students must be directly engaged in the decisions that are made. These additional students, and student representatives to the various university bodies, both permanent and temporary, should be chosen by the student governments and organizations and not by the administrators.

- 1.8.2. More work must be done to bring in all groups of people in the campus. If a significant portion of the SU community has not been part of any particular process, more time and effort should be made to ensure wide participation. There are multiple ways for people to express their thoughts, and being part of administrative initiatives should not be considered the only way to participate.
- 1.8.3. Both voting and nonvoting student and faculty positions on the Board of Trustees must be established.
- 1.8.4. Students should be treated as shareholders and not customers of the university.
- 1.8.5. *by the end of the Spring 2015 semester*
- 1.8.6. In Fast Forward, there must be at least 1/3rd representation of students in each committee, and at least 2/3rds of those must be undergraduates.
 - 1.8.6.1. If recruitment is seen to be a problem, provide incentives. For instance, some grad students who are on Fast Forward committees are receiving graduate assistantships which effectively pay them to do research for and be on these committees.
 - 1.8.6.2. *begin recruiting students immediately*

Administrative Response 11/7/14: Given all the work underway (e.g., Fast Forward Syracuse), we have been very focused on including student representation and input. We are very eager to work with you to determine how best to reach students, as significant efforts have been made to ensure that existence of open forums, web sites, focus groups, and work groups are communicated to students. We take responsibility for the need to do a better job of communicating (we use official syr.edu emails, as students are informed), but we also ask students to take personal responsibility for listening, reading, and staying informed. We are working with-and will do more-with SA and GSO presidents to create more opportunities for them to be involved with some additional leadership groups, and we will work with them to identify additional students to engage.

- [Senior VP Quinn] [Spring 2015]

GB Response 11/8/14: We appreciate the apparent agreement on the need for adequate student representation on the Fast Forward Steering Committee and Work Groups. These groups will be significantly changing the structure of the university and for that reason must reflect the needs, desires, and perspectives of students. As the "About" page for Fast Forward states, it is meant to "prioritize students as the primary focus of everything the University does." We ask how this can happen when out of 93 seats for the Fast Forward Work Groups, only 11 are students and only 6 are undergraduate students. Furthermore, there are only two students out of 28 on the Steering Committee. We know this university has communicated the value of student input, we ask that this value be acted upon with adequate representation. For this reason, we must have a commitment to add additional students to the workgroups and steering committee as outlined above.

We also must have these students represent the diverse population of campus and thus be selected by the GSO, the SA, and the General Body, not by the administration.

GB Notes from meeting with Dean Bea González 11/8/14:

-Percent representation based on the size of the committee.

-Dean Gonzalez asked THE General Body to forward the names of students who would like to be on committees.

-THE General Body clarifies that this is not just about Fast Forward.

-When told that certain Fast Forward Groups are nearly finished meeting, THE General

Body requests FF extend their deadlines in order to give adequate time for fuller campus-wide engagement with the process of such an important task for the future of SU.

[Admin Response, 11/9:] THE General Body should forward names of potential student members to Vice Chancellor Spina (for Strategic Plan groups), Executive VP Marcoccia (for Campus Space Master Plan), and Senior Advisor to the Chancellor Kaplan (for Operational Excellence). In full transparency, there is not yet a commitment to add a specific number of students to these groups, but we agree to continue this conversation and have final decisions by November 17th.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: Vice Chancellor Spina has spoken with Strategic Plan workgroup chairs and the leader of the Campus Master Plan and Operational Excellence efforts, and they have been receptive to including additional students in the ongoing work of the groups. They have also been thoughtful about how to do so in such a way as to respect the work done to date and the very significant level of input from faculty, staff, and students. The seven Strategic Plan workgroups currently have 11 students participating (6 undergraduate and 5 graduate) and given the charges and compositions of the various workgroups, 11 additional students can be added (5 undergraduate and 7 graduate). The Steering Committee itself can accommodate one additional student. The Campus Master Plan currently has 3 students (2 graduate and 1 undergraduate) out of 14 members, and one additional undergraduate should be added. There is also a commitment to add students to most of the Operational Excellence workgroups, and as the particular workgroups are more dynamic, it will be a few days before specific numbers can be provided. We anticipate a broadly framed nomination process in which students can self-identify or be nominated by others.

1.9. A policy guaranteeing implementation of the will and resolutions of governing bodies (Student Association, Graduate Student Organization, University Senate, etc).

- 1.9.1. Significant changes must require consultation with governing bodies before finalization and implementation.
- 1.9.2. Resolutions passed and policies proposed by governing bodies must be taken seriously and considered in open-door meetings that include members of the concerned bodies.
- 1.9.3. This policy must include specific repercussions if policy guidelines are not adhered to.
- 1.9.4. *by the end of the Spring 2015 semester*
- 1.9.5. A written recommitment to implementing shared governance.
- 1.9.6. *immediately*

Administration 11/7/14: There already is significant discussion of major policies and major policy changes in representative groups such as the Senate, Student Association, and Graduate Student Organization. As referenced above, a new strategy is being developed to increase communication around critical issues and to ensure respectful deliberation of all viewpoints and concerns. That said, not all resolutions or recommendations from these bodies will end up being accepted and implemented for a variety of reasons based on administration perspective or chancellor or trustee fiduciary responsibilities.

GB Response 11/8/14: There needs to be a written checks and balances system within the university to make sure that shared governance is being upheld. It is not acceptable that in a system that claims to practice shared governance, we have things such as this occur (From our grievances):

-Tenure and Promotion. See appendix.^{A10}

-In the May 2014 Board of Trustees meeting, a University Senate-approved policy was rejected in favor of one closely matching that of an ad hoc committee and the Provost's own recommendation (itself similar to the ad hoc committee). The final decision, made in opposition to that of the faculty voice, was made in a closed door meeting (as are all trustee meetings). While the chair of one of the involved University Senate committees spoke in front of the Trustees' Academic Affairs Committee about the issue, there was no other direct faculty input at the meeting. Instead, it was made as a black-box decision.

-No further responses have been made back to the University Senate concerning why the trustees ignored the recommendation of the primary shared governance structure of the university as of this date. Neither has upper administration explained why they made recommendations in opposition to the University Senate. As such, the shared governance structures have been effectively ignored and diminished by these actions.

-Divest SU

-In March 2014 the Divest SU campaign sent a formal request for divestment from fossil fuels to the SU administration.

-On April 29, 2013 the Syracuse University Student Association passed a resolution in support of fossil fuel divestment.

-On April 16, 2014 the University Senate passed a similar resolution in support of fossil fuel divestment.

-The nine-member Socially Responsible Investment Matters Committee held a meeting at which they declined to divest in fossil fuels. This meeting was closed door and no representatives from the Divest SU campaign were invited. The Committee sent a letter to Divest SU months later on June 16, 2014 stating its decision.

-On September 30, 2014 a rally was held on the quad at which students, faculty, and alumni expressed their support for divestment and frustration with the administration's handling of the issue.

It is not that we completely oppose the idea that there are times where certain groups should have veto power, however, these decisions should not be made in completely closed-door meetings, where nothing can be released about how the decision was made, or who made it. And there is no system for appealing these decisions either. therefore, the system of checks and balances is not in place, and ultimately it is only the administration or Board of Trustees who enjoy ultimate veto power. This is not an unreasonable demand. We are asking for open-door, transparent meetings. We are asking for student and faculty government decisions to be upheld. After all, why have student and faculty government if one can always go around them with closed-door decisions that overturn the original will of the majority of the SU community, with no ability to then address these concerns again.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: We recognize the principles of shared governance and acknowledge the important role that the University Senate plays in shared governance. However, shared governance does not mean there will be agreement on each and every matter. The administration works closely with the leadership of SA and GSO to take seriously their requests and recommendations. We are committed to continuing our working relationships with these groups. The Board of Trustees is also committed to the principles of shared governance.

1.10. The creation of a permanent student advisory committee to the Chancellor, his Executive Team, and the Board of Trustees, open to all students.

- 1.10.1. This advisory group must be diverse, large, and representative of the entire student body, with oversight by THE General Body. Representatives will

be nominated by THE General Body and other student organizations. The committee's focus will be on providing cooperative oversight of administrative decisions which will be inclusive to all students. Any new groups wishing to appoint candidates to the committee will be endorsed by a committee vote. This committee will be chosen based on the common interests and concerns of the student body.

- 1.10.2. This is to help ensure that student voices are heard and solidify proof when they are not.
- 1.10.3. This committee must be in the room and receive direct communication about any financial decisions which significantly affect students or any decisions with relation to campus diversity and inclusivity; all committee members must have knowledge of the process and the option of being in the room with administrators at any point during the decision making process.
- 1.10.4. The students on these groups must not be the same students who are on all other groups as well.
- 1.10.5. *Committee members must be appointed by December 5, 2014 and the committee must be functional and all members must be in communication with the chancellor and administration by January 12, 2015.*

Administrative Response 11/7/14: We encourage more active use of existing governance structures and nascent advisory structures; for example:

- The Chancellor, Provost, Senior Vice President for Student Affairs, and other senior officers would be pleased to attend SA and GSO meetings on occasion to engage in discussion about particular issues or more general conversation.
- The Division of Student Affairs is developing a Student Affairs Advisory Board that will have 20 students recommended by SA and GSO presidents.
- The Chancellor's Chief of Staff and the Senior Vice President for Student Affairs meet regularly with SA and GSO cabinets.

- [Chief of Staff Tran]

GB Response 11/8/14: We have seen that the recommendations given by these "existing governance structures" are generally ignored. The committee established by THE General Body would directly represent many more groups on campus than do the existing forms of communication between the students and administration. SA and GSO involvement while valuable, is not sufficient.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: As previously stated, we encourage more active use of existing governance structures, such as the University Senate, SA, GSO, and other nascent advisory structures.

1.11. The Student Association president must be able to email the entire undergraduate student body.

1.11.1. immediately

Administrative Response 11/7/14: Yes; to inform students of additional important information related to student life, the Student Association president will be able to provide a bi-monthly/monthly report to be featured on the Student Affairs website and also in the form of an emailed student newsletter. The president will be able to submit these updates to Student Affairs and they will be broadcasted via these channels on a regular basis.

- [Senior VP Reed Kantrowitz]

GB Response 11/8/14: THE General Body will accept this commitment. However, we would like to express concern that this does not mirror the listserv system used by the president of the GSO, who can email all graduate students at any time without first submitting to Student Affairs.

[Admin Response, 11/9/14:] SA President Gresely has previously indicated that this was acceptable to him, but Senior VP Reed Kantrowitz will double check and discuss with Student Association.

GB Response 11/9/14: We request an explanation for why the SA President is not afforded the same privileges to email the student body they represent. Is it possible that grad students are considered by the administration to be more responsible than undergrads? We believe that the most fair policy would be a consistent policy for both Presidents regarding their email access to their respective student bodies.

Administrative Response 11/10/14: There will be consistent ability for both the GSO and the SA Presidents to communicate with their constituents. We commit to developing a system that has consistent parameters for both GSO and SA.

- 2. The student body needs faculty, staff, students, and administrators to acknowledge, learn about, and redress the oppressions, aggressions, violences, and discriminations faced by students with marginalized identities and experiences (race, gender, sexual orientation, ability, mental health status, religion, nationality, documentation status and socio-economic class). The student body needs:**

- 2.1. Further sexual assault advocacy training for the SU Title IX Coordinator**

- 2.1.1. This training should consist of the 20 hour Department of Health training on sexual assault advocacy completed by Vera House advocates.

- 2.1.2. *by the start of the Spring 2015 semester*

Administrative Response 11/7/14: Title IX Coordinators are responsible for overseeing all of an institution's Title IX compliance efforts. This includes gender discrimination, sexual harassment, retaliation, sexual assault, and athletics. The University's Title IX Coordinator, Cynthia Maxwell Curtin, has performed or overseen over 1,000 investigations of harassment and discrimination, including a significant number at Syracuse, in addition to providing training and education to academic, administrative, and athletic units. She has received extensive training and education in this area.

GB Response 11/8/14: While understanding the amount of work that the coordinator is responsible for, the extent of training programs completed by the Title IX Coordinator must be openly detailed. While the Title IX coordinator may have attended many trainings focused on legal objectives, it has become apparent through her interactions with survivors, both in the closing of the Advocacy Center and her interpretations of responsible reporting at the 2014 Take Back the Night speak out, that training on the victim/survivor experience and sexual assault victimology is needed. This specifically victim/survivor-focused training experience will only enhance her ability to effectively serve and interact with victims/survivors, so it seems counterproductive to a campus wide trauma informed response to sexual and relationship violence for her to refuse to attend. We already know what is covered in the Vera House training, and we feel it is imperative that the Title IX Coordinator

have the knowledge covered in this specific training. We believe this is necessary because the Title IX Coordinator must be as in touch with the needs of survivors as with the pursuit of perpetrators. We are advocating for this because in part we believe, though are not clear, due to the administration's failure to disclose directly the process or reasons for closing the Advocacy Center, that it was an interpretation of Title IX which prompted the closure of the Advocacy Center. Perhaps if more people in that decision-making process had been more aware of the needs of survivors, the need for more choices, not less, for instance, the closing of the Center would not have been considered. Moving forward, we believe the Title IX Coordinator must put survivor needs and consultation in the forefront of all decisions and counsel, and the full Vera House advocacy training would contribute to making this a reality.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: We maintain our response from 11/7/14.

2.2. A public address and apology for the POSSE cuts.

2.2.1. Full reinstatement of the POSSE program at its 2014-2015 level, and written commitment to remain at these levels for the next 5 years at minimum.

2.2.2. The student body needs Syracuse University to honor its original contract with the Posse Foundation and continues to bring Posse's from Atlanta, Los Angeles and Miami for 5 years.

2.2.3. *by the end of the Fall 2014 semester*

Administrative Response 11/7/14: Vice Chancellor Spina and Associate Provost Costello Staniec have offered personal apologies in three meetings with Posse students for the way in which the changes to the Posse program were communicated and multiple public statements regarding the changes have been made. We believe that the future number of Posse cohorts is appropriate to support our current and future osse students and to address sustainability of the program as a whole. While Posse is a highly successful program nationally and at Syracuse, we believe that our University can best benefit from a range of student support programs. Posse Directors from each city visited campus in October and met with Posse students. In addition, Chancellor Syverud traveled to New York City to meet with Posse Foundation President Debbie Bial and had meaningful discussion about our continuing partnership. In early December, President Bial will visit Syracuse University to continue that dialogue and explore ways to deepen the Syracuse University-Posse relationship. The University remains committed to developing programs that sustainably support the success of all students at Syracuse University.

GB Response 11/8/14: The contract for POSSE programs from Los Angeles and Atlanta were prematurely terminated. While we understand that it may be too late to save the Los Angeles POSSE program, we ask that Syracuse University fulfill its original commitment to POSSE scholars, who are leaders from diverse backgrounds.

We ask that the original contract for the Atlanta POSSE be fulfilled just as the Miami POSSE contract is currently being fulfilled. We also ask that you make a commitment to renew the Miami POSSE and the Atlanta POSSE for an additional year beyond the original contract, making up for the two years that were prematurely cut from the Los Angeles POSSE.

[Administrative Response, 11/9:] The Miami Posse commitment will be no less than the original five-year commitment. The broader question is being dealt with by the "Recruitment, Support, Retention, and Success" Work Group; whose leadership (including student leaders) are meeting on Monday, 11/17.

Notes from November 10th meeting with TGB, Eric Spina, Rebecca Reed Kantrowitz, and Bea Gonzalez:

Spina: We discussed this yesterday. Met 3 different times with Posse students and mentors. I recognize that this was not done well, apologized personally for that, sometimes explained not very articulately why we did this, and why I think it is important for us to look at all our other programs. Can't continue to support three posses. In terms of the level of human and dollar resources. As much as I love the kids, can't do 30 kids a year.

Miles: I would like to point out that you made that decision without any contingency plan. It's a break in trust of not continuing this network of support that you alluded to. Not satisfied with your response. Please revisit our demands and take them very seriously.

Nick: Premature to cut the Posse program without another one in place.

Spina: So, I don't think I can do better than Posse, I don't know of a program that can deliver higher graduation rates for students. But I do believe that administrative leaders can develop something to support more students.

Francis: SU has a right to understand where the money is from. The point we're trying to make is the gap that is taken with reducing Posse, where is that money going? You're claiming the money is being held somewhere.

Spina: No gap this year in money, we're talking about next year.

Becca: Fact is that you broke your contract with Posse. This is about Posse, yet more than Posse. How can we trust anything administration says going forward if it can end contracts like that, as well as override university government processes? University raised 1.04 billion dollars recently, this is about shuffling of funds, austerity measures. Honor the original contract with Posse.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: Below is a message from Deborah Bial, Posse Foundation Founder and President, that was sent earlier tonight to the Syracuse University Posse Scholars:

Dear Posse Scholars,

I have heard about what's happening on campus and wanted to write to you all. (I am copying Chancellor Syverud on this email as well.)

I know you have spoken with Chancellor Syverud about the changes to the Posse program. I am really proud of how you have made your voices heard and shown how much Posse means to you.

I wanted to make sure that I reached out to you all directly so that you know we are working closely with Syracuse on all of this.

I can tell you with full confidence that Chancellor Syverud and his administration are committed to Posse. I met Chancellor Syverud for the first time in October. He came to visit the Posse office in New York. We had a good meeting and I know he wants the Posse program to continue to be strong at Syracuse.

I think you have heard that I am going to come visit you at Syracuse on December 9th. I will meet again with the Chancellor and the administration and of course all of you.

For now the best suggestion I have is for you to get back to classes. I hope that you trust that Chancellor Syverud and I will find the right balance for both Posse and Syracuse moving forward. I know you will continue to be engaged on campus and contribute to an open and productive dialogue.

Debbie

Deborah Bial
President + Founder
The Posse Foundation
14 Wall Street, floor 8A
NY NY 10005
212-405-1691

2.3. Reinstatement of the Multicultural Spring Program.

- 2.3.1. Written commitment to work with Office of Multicultural Affairs to address the lack of Multicultural Spring and the bring it back by fall 2015. Includes allocating funding.
- 2.3.2. The Multicultural Spring Program was a very helpful and meaningful program for the minority students here at Syracuse University. Understanding the situation that resulted in the discontinuation of the program, we believe that the program is still a necessity for our campus. If the program is reinstated, to prevent a repeat of the past situation, we would like a more thorough and intensive training for the student host.
- 2.3.3. *for the Fall 2015 semester*

Administrative Response 11/7/14: The majority of the students involved with this program are not Syracuse University students, are minors, and we have enhanced responsibilities to them and their families to ensure that their visit is safe and well supported by campus and campus services. The "Own the Dome" program best meets these important legal and visitor safety concerns. Collectively, we believe that having early opportunities to have students involved in coming together as a class is important. We are committed to programming that supports and develops communities of differences within the incoming class.

The Office of Admissions has very carefully considered its campus visit programs, and the stand-alone Multicultural Spring Program was seen as valuable, but also something that could be improved. As a result, the Multicultural Spring Program was discontinued in 2012 and the broad-based "Own the Dome" visit program was established, and this has been incredibly successful for the University. We are open to suggestions about finding ways to support students from locations beyond NYC to be able to come to visit campus during that program, and one of the Work Groups derived from the Express Yourself diversity and inclusion forum (and including students who volunteered) is examining this question.

- [Associate VP Ryan Williams and the Express Yourself Work Group]

GB Response 11/8/14: We acknowledge that "Own the Dome" is a very important program for potential first-year students in terms of fostering a class camaraderie. But *Own the Dome*

does not foster the same benefits to multicultural students at the MSP program once did, and it has also burdened Syracuse University since it is a more expensive event. We graciously request that the administration discuss and seriously consider reinstating the MSP program with a more a selective application process for current students to be hosts, and more a comprehensive training for hosts. We understand there is room for improvement, but we request that the reinstated program follow its traditional structure.

If this is in no way possible, we request that an additional night be added to Own the Dome on the Saturday preceding Own the Dome since it usually takes place on Sunday. Since safety is of concern, this additional day could take place inside of the dome with multicultural students and involve the same sequence of events as MSP including a student panel of students of color, teaching potential students about the resources available to them, and giving them a tour of the campus, etc. The multicultural students would then take part in the regularly scheduled Own the Dome events with the rest of the students of their class.

[Admin Response, 11/9/14:] The Recruitment, Support, Retention, and Success (Express Yourself) Work Group (including faculty, staff, and students) will carefully consider this specific recommendation.

Notes from November 10th Meeting with TGB, Eric Spina, Rebecca Reed Kantrowitz, and Bea Gonzalez:

Spina: Bring buses, make Own the Dome program larger. Create opportunities in an integrated way to provide some that has been done previously in MSP. Not segregated. Convo with Maurice. Safety, security, critical mass around that event, issues raised by the General Body.

Danielle: What made MSP awesome for me were the different activities that were engaged in, own the dome not sure if going to be enough time to ... which is why we suggested an additional night.

Spina: First thing earlier at noon 5 or 6. Express su workgroup. If the workgroup brought up the same issues, how would that then work out in terms of the administration.

Molly: I heard your concern about separating these marginalized students from the rest of the students. What made msp so influential was the inter-community work that happened there.

Becca: Clarify idea of 'integration.' Community empowerment vs. idea of 'segregation.' Big difference, big need for historically/currently oppressed groups to form that empowerment together.

Spina: The idea is that own the dome 5pm to 8am next morning. Can we get people here earlier like at noon? I think we can also commit to having the 4 directors of the Cultural Centers in working with admissions on this.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: Dean of Admissions Maurice Harris will work with faculty, staff, and students to review, revise, and enhance the Own the Dome program to reflect the conversations that the administration has had with THE General Body, with specific intent to fold the most valuable elements of the former multicultural program into the one-night Own the Dome program.

2.4. Conduct cooperative, collaborative research between the administration and departments that specialize in marginalized identities to address funding and other needs.

2.4.1. *by the start of the Fall 2015 semester*

2.4.2. Updated facilities for the African American Studies' MLK Library and increased funding for the department as a whole.

2.4.3. *begun by the start of the Spring 2015 semester*

Administrative Response 11/7/14: Needs and directions for all academic units are being determined in the strategic planning process, which is being conducted at the University-level this year and will be done in the schools and colleges early in the 2015-16 academic year.

- [Vice Chancellor and Provost] [2015-16 academic year]Spina

GB Response 11/8/14: We want to have a copy of the budget for the AAS department and MLK Library, as well as a copy of the research budget for faculty studying marginalized identities. We would like the funding for all three of these increased by the fall of 2015, or encourage a different plan be made to increase funding over the next five years.

Notes 11/10 from meeting with TGB, Rebecca Reed Kantrowitz, Eric Spina, Bea Gonzalez: Notes for transparency to see how the funds redistributes.

Spina: You're not going to like this response but we are going to be looking around to see which programs. Would rather not on any academic programs rather than not get in front of the process what is our set of academic programs, etc. we're locked into.

Danielle: Can we get a sense of some time frame to see that data, what money is being allocated?

Spina: This round is not looking at budgets so far, that round will begin this summer, gathering data, to deans and dept chairs, in the fall of next year is when we will be looking at schools and programs.

Danielle: Is there a commitment to fund depts that may need that program?

Spina: I wouldn't go that far, but if we need a program... we are maybe going to cut some. some that need more, others that are fine the way they are. There will be a process.

Danielle: Can I be a part of that process?

Spina: No, it will be for mostly for deans and etc.

Danielle: Encourage research there too.

We want to make sure that is still one of the priorities to this administration.

Spina: Does require more time than we require that we have right now.

CJ: Everyone in this group won't necessarily leave this space without a nonretaliation agreement signed. When we got the response it just had students in there. We would like staff and faculty also.

Spina: I haven't been involved in those discussions but I agree.

All non-retaliation, things like scholarships or job opportunities too.

CJ: Peaceful process going on here i am sure you agree?

Spina: I think there are entirely peaceful, productive.

CJ: A few of us don't feel safe with DPS coming in every night, with new rules, no tangible written evidence.

Spina: I have written down in big letters, I am committed to giving you something in writing, I am disappointed it wasn't here today. By 10 am tomorrow morning (November 11th).

Nick: Can you make sure the written rules are not vague, but very specific, make sure they are passed through by you, not vague terminology like 'bulk food'.

Koy: Non-retaliation agreement, mainly operates off a if, then causality. If we leave....is there a way to alter said condition?

The things we're committing to, we're committing to because we believe in them.

RRK: I think we are very lucky to have this many students who care this much about the university. I think I know that trust was broken, and we're sorry about it. We're not trying to get anybody in trouble. I don't know where we are on the actual agreement but we are lucky to have students who are so committed to making this a better place.

Spina: Good dialogue tonight, thanks, I appreciate your time.

CJ: Is there a way to get the Chancellor here?

....

Bea Gonzalez: I can't make any commitments about meeting tomorrow. But we do have work to do, to respond to this, the key tomorrow is the issue with the rules.

Ryan: We just want to see some sort of response to us being peaceful, to treating us like criminals locked in this space, inconsistent rules and rule enforcement, throwing us off as to what we can do and what we can't do.

Bea Gonzalez: We are continuously in dialogue with these issues.

CJ: Officer in plainclothes with her gun showing today. We're not criminals here.

Bea Gonzalez: Request is that not to happen.

Miles: I think this comes down to ordinances. We can hold you to things that grow and develop left and right. I think it's pretty clear when we're asking to see the rules, when, who from, written down, not in good faith, doesn't exist.

Bea Gonzalez: Asst General Counselor Gabe Nugent is the keeper of the rules. We are

working hard on making it the same thing.

Nick: can you ask the person you just mentioned to print out whatever he had down and hand it to us and so we can say the violations. That would give us a lot of, we have no power, and i don't think it is legal to do that. It could be a violation of our rights.

Bea Gonzalez: If meeting, I will let you know at noon.

B Gonzalez: No one with exposed gun, no one wants that.

Nick: Clarity of communication we're losing trust on.

Ella: Filmed 3 times on bodycams. What you say is one thing here, but then what happens at night, is a very big discrepancy. 10 male officers.

Bea Gonzalez: There will now be female officers here. Situation with the gun, no one asked for that, an accident. I have asked about the radios so people can speak, I will do that again, and the Provost promised the rules by tomorrow.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: As discussed on 11/10/14, Vice Chancellor Spina indicated that it would be inappropriate to bypass the strategic planning process in regards to any individual academic or research program.

2.5. Conversations Around Race and Ethnicity (CARE)/Safer People Safer Spaces (SPSS) trainings for all senior administrators, as well as on-going diversity training.⁶

2.5.1. *by the end of the Spring 2015 semester*

2.5.2. Timeline: Begin meeting as soon as possible, during the 2014-2015 year to revamp for Spring 2015 semester

Administrative Response 11/7/14: We acknowledge the value of education and training around campus culture and diversity. It should not be assumed that no administrators have attended these diversity trainings; also, there are other quality training opportunities that many administrators have attended.

The Chancellor's Executive Team will discuss ways in which its members can be acknowledged as leaders in these areas as well as in the general areas of the campus.

- [Senior VP Alston]

GB Response 11/8/14: If some administrators do have prior diversity training, please allow this and the date at which training was completed to be announced and be noted which aligns with our tenant of transparency. We also want to know if administrators have completed training within the last two years. If training was completed outside of the two year window, administrators must go through CARE and SPSS again. We currently have no knowledge of which senior administrators have gone through these, and this issue is relevant and urgent because administration has failed to create/maintain/build a campus culture committed to

⁶ Including Chancellor Kent Syverud, Rebecca Reed Kantrowitz, Senior Vice President and Dean of Student Affairs, Eric Spina, Vice Chancellor and Provost, Andria Costello Staniec, Associate Provost, Rebecca Dayton
Email lgbt@syr.edu to sign up for Safer People, Safer Spaces (SPSS)
Email jswest@syr.edu to sign up for C.A.R.E.

diversity and respect. We also understand that there are other quality training opportunities, however, SPSS and CARE trainings are specifically tailored to Syracuse University, and should be attended by senior administrators to better understand the hostile campus culture that marginalized students face, as well as how to change that culture into one where students actually feel safe. Ultimately, administrators must commit to going through further training.

[Admin Response, 11/9:] We believe in the value and importance of diversity training. The Chancellor's Executive Team will consider this request for additional/further/required training in Spring 2015.

Notes 11/10 from meeting with TGB, Rebecca Reed Kantrowitz, Eric Spina, Bea Gonzalez: Chancellor is committed to education around diversity and safe space. Chancellor and Executive Team will make a commitment that we will not only continue our education not only as individuals but as a group as soon as we can identify someone to come in.

Molly: Here's places to contact. We've given you that already. I know that safer people, safer spaces, they can schedule a meeting just with administration.

RRK: First of all, I have a lot of respect and knowledge of these training esp. around CARE. Lots of convos. We have spoken many times about mandating these trainings. The caveat is to put out there when we start that it begins to shape the work of those offices. The leaders have said we have to have the capacity to do these trainings. Maybe giving us a little more time to get that done. Keep in mind some of these trainings esp. CARE training, sometimes it's better to be not with everyone you work with. Better without your supervisor in the room. Important to do the trainings.

Spina: We understand the importance. We are going to do it and we want to do it soon.

Koy: Will we be allowed input into how this process works?

Danielle: You all are agreeing that all these admin will receive training, but maybe not CARE or SPSS? And we will be told exactly which trainings those are?

Spina: I hope we are going so we don't have to do a bed check on it. We want to do this right. We will spend money on it. I hope you will trust us.

Molly: The reason we picked these specifically, is because they deal with the campus climate and campus culture.

Spina: Good point, we will find with local culture is important.

Molly: Still confused as to why we would be bringing someone in when we already have trained facilitators here, I've talked to them, and they'd be very willing to do trainings for upper level administration.

RRK: I think that is an option. We are trying to broaden and look at what training looks like. We can say and get advice from people on our own campus. Teaching intergroup dialogue on campus. Work us through a training. Trying to broaden what that might look like. People have a full plate.

Becca: I critique the idea of external consultation, such as Bain Capital, Sasaki, expensive 'professional' services, out of touch with SU. Bain Capital survey called SU an 'organization.'

Spina: Good point, local training or educators from elsewhere. We will figure out someone if it is not local how they can get the local context. If it's local folks they probably don't need that context.

RRK: I think we can commit to working with experts on this campus. We've been through the trainings. Working closely with those cultural centers directly, where our need is. Work with them on advice they might have. Just for your own knowledge dialogue is based, experts often have already informed and helped shape the program we have on campus.

Molly: I hear you and I think that's great that you are willing to work with the cultural center directors on that. Can we get that in writing?

Danielle: How about all the other groups?

RRK: RAs are required to go through CARE.

Molly: The RAs only go through basic trainings but not the full 3 hour training for SPSS.

RRK: I will commit to this. I will commit to talking with those different directors, and see about mandating.

Molly: What about DPS? As a queer person I have felt so unsafe with DPS here... I would really like for all the DPS officers to go through trainings.

RRK: They do have some training but I absolutely commit to talking to Chief Callisto to look at the feasibility of that training.

Spina: The trickier one is faculty. Workgroup coming out of express yourself that includes faculty, staff and students.

What faculty would not want to go through these trainings?

Administrative Response 11/10/14: The Chancellor and the Chancellor's Executive Team believe in the value and importance of continuous development in diversity and inclusion education. We commit to diversity education for senior leadership during Spring 2015. We will also commit to finding a central web space for the campus community to find and access all diversity training and education, to be made available by the end of the Spring 2015 semester.

2.6. Mandatory CARE and SPSS trainings for DPS, Department Chairs, Faculty, Elected Student Association representatives, RAs, Conduct Board members, and executive boards of RSOs.

2.6.1. by the end of the Spring 2015 semester

Administrative Response 11/7/14: A working group populated by students, staff, and faculty that came out of the Express Yourself forum is tackling this issue; we believe that they should continue to be empowered and should come forth with recommendations rather than being short-circuited by an administrative decision at this point.

[Express Yourself Work Group on Education Initiatives]

GB Response 11/8/14: This suggestion must be presented to the working group. It should also be pointed out that this was a solution devised completely by students for students and

the administrative action would only be a response to the student voice.

[Admin Response, 11/9:] We will present this suggestion to the working group and the chairs of the working group at its next meeting.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: Generally, please see our response to 2.5. Specifically, there will be appropriate training for DPS, department chairs, elected Student Association representatives, RAs, Conduct Board members, and executive boards of RSOs. Given the large number of individuals in these groups, training will be completed as soon as practical.

2.7. The development of intersectional trainings.

2.7.1. There are many types of trainings available through SU, as well as local groups. Those who lead these trainings must meet to create more intersectional trainings.

2.7.2. *by start of the Fall 2015 semester*

Administrative Response 11/7/14: This proposed enhancement in campus trainings will be relayed to the various teams who provide training, with the request that they meet across the University divisions.

[Senior VP Alston]

GB Response 11/8/14: We will accept the administration's response on this issue.

11/9/14 Addendum: We look forward to the creation of intersectional trainings which better integrate the fact of overlapping identities and oppressions. We hope the relaying of this information and the work on the creation of these trainings will begin as soon as the Spring 2015 semester.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: We believe we have reached agreement with 2.7.

2.8. More staff for the LGBT, Disability Cultural Center, SCIS, and OMA centers.

2.8.1. *begin hiring by Fall 2015 semester, complete process by the start of the Fall 2016 semester*

Administrative Response 11/7/14: Any such plans for cultural centers will also come out of the strategic planning process, both the University-wide and Student Affairs processes.

- [Senior VP Reed Kantrowitz]

GB Response 11/8/14: If the strategic plan cannot meet this goal, it must be covered in a work group topic.

Notes from November 10th meeting with TGB, Eric Spina, Rebecca Reed Kantrowitz, and Bea Gonzalez:

RRK: I agree, it's been a long-term concern for us. Not staffed appropriately.

Spina: Everyone has been asked to think about their organization, how functional, how had to go through this. Will look at all of these and then figure it out.

Molly: How about increasing the budget for these areas?

Spina: Time out here, some efforts of operational excellence was focused on identifying resources that can be put to the institution's highest priorities.

Student Affairs--I suspect cultural centers will get more.

RRK: Student Affairs top priorities are health and wellness, diversity, discovery and engagement.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: We agree but will not know until the full strategic plan process is completed.

2.9. Commitment to hire more faculty of color.

Administrative Response 11/7/14: The Office of Academic Affairs is working with deans and faculty hiring committees to ensure that hiring pools are diverse. We are all committed to understanding implicit bias in the search process and have introduced workshops to reduce implicit bias and to provide tools for building diverse search pools and recruiting a diverse faculty.

GB Presence 11/8/14: Thank you. We suggest a diverse group of students be permitted in the process of new faculty hires. Furthermore, in order to foster transparency, we request the demographic information on all new faculty, staff and administrative staff each year be readily accessible to students.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: We will encourage departments, schools, and colleges to ensure that undergraduate and graduate students have widely publicized opportunities to meet with faculty candidates and have input to the individual(s) responsible for making the hiring decision. All dean search committees will have undergraduate and graduate student representatives. General demographic information, to the extent it is available, is normally available on the OIRA website (oira.syr.edu).

2.10. Commitment to recruit more students of color representative of U.S. demographics.

Administrative Response 11/7/14: A working group populated by students, staff, and faculty that came out of the Express Yourself forum is tackling this issue; we believe that they should continue to be empowered and should come forth with recommendations rather than being short-circuited by an administrative decision at this point. They have already begun a full discussion of this area of intervention.

GB Response: The Express Yourself Work Group on Recruitment and Retention has only met once. From the experience of several of THE General Body members attending who have joined these work groups, the leaders of these groups do not have a clear sense of the specific charge that the groups are meant to accomplish, nor are they clear on the decision making power of these groups. When asked if a report would be forwarded to the administration during the participatory education workgroup, for example, the response from one group leader was "I was not aware of any specific charge to create a report, but it would probably be a good idea to write these things down."

In a conversation between members of the General Body and administration on Monday, November 2nd, Vice Chancellor Spina said that "good ideas" from these groups have power but clarified that it would be the Chancellor's Executive Committee that would be determining what qualified as a good idea.

We need these groups to be empowered to make changes and to have their work and the effect of their recommendations be made publicly available. This is out of respect for the people putting hard work into these groups and for a transparent and democratic university. They must be more than simply listening meetings, they must be empowered decision making bodies. Particularly in the area of recruitment of students of color, we want a more permanent model that becomes part of the governance processes that are currently in place and not an after thought to be handled in a work group.

We would like the administration to commit to not cutting any needs-based scholarships from their current levels. Or to not cut them without comprehensive review. For instance, we would like to see the actual needs-based document showing an itemized list of where money goes at this point for funding, broken down by loans, grants and scholarships.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: The Express Yourself workgroups are composed of self-identified students, staff, and faculty. As Vice Chancellor Spina indicated on 11/10/14, the recommendations from the workgroups will be presented to the Chancellor's Executive Team and the recommendations from that group will be made public through the SA and GSO. To date, we have not identified any need-based or merit-based financial aid that has been decreased. Any changes in current practices will be made with comprehensive review. Annual information on financial aid for Syracuse University students is reported to IPEDS and is available at: <http://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/?q=syracuse+university&s=all&id=196413#finaid>.

2.11. Expansion of the Intergroup Dialogue program and campus wide diversity requirements in academic curricula.

2.11.1. This change will occur with the consultation and consent of a diverse and large student representation.

2.11.2. This change will occur in the following steps:

2.11.2.1. **We would like all first year students to take an online Diversity Training course during the summer before they come to Syracuse.**

2.11.2.1.1. This diversity assessment would feature interactive learning and virtual education similar to the Drug and Alcohol quiz mandated for first year students to take the summer before arriving on campus. The assessment would educate all students on race, religion, sexuality, and gender identities so that everyone will have a chance to be educated on social and individual topics. The program will offer different testimonies of students that have felt discriminated against at Syracuse University by the use of hate speech and the program will encourage future students to stand up against such actions.

2.11.2.1.2 *for Summer 2015*

Administrative Response 11/7/14: We commit to studying all of the online training, education, and assessment that are part of first-year and transfer programs.

GB Response 11/8/14: Thank you for your commitment to reassess these programs, but in reassessing we would hope that administrators acknowledge the dire need for a quiz or an interactive online tool teaching about diversity in terms of intersectionality. This would be an imperative initiative for incoming students

in terms of the true values of Syracuse University and its commitment to all students and their experiences and identities. It would be necessary to have a designated group of people or individual The General Body can follow-up with to ensure a decision on this matter or an alternative suggestion that sufficiently carries out the concerns expressed agreed on by both The General Body and administration.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: As stated on 11/07/14, we commit to studying all of the online training, education, and assessment that are part of first-year and transfer programs. Follow-up regarding this concern can be directed to Vice Chancellor Spina.

2.11.2.2. Creation of a mandatory university-wide curriculum requirement.

2.11.2.2.1. *by the start of the Fall 2015 semester*

2.11.2.2.2. Students could fulfill this requirement through coursework from a pre-approved list of courses from specific departments such as African American Studies, Asian/Asian American Studies, Disability Studies, Jewish Studies, Latino-Latin American Studies, LGBT Studies, Native American Studies, Women's and Gender Studies, etc., as these departments regularly and palatably address identity intersections, structural oppression, and critical theory in lower-division coursework. The diverse constitutions of these classes often involve students from other disciplines who have never before encountered their privilege in an academic setting; professors are prepared for such interactions and successfully lead discussions on power and oppression.

Administrative Response 11/7/14: A working group populated by students, staff, and faculty that came out of the Express Yourself forum is tackling this issue; we believe that they should continue to be empowered and should come forth with recommendations rather than being short-circuited by an administrative decision at this point. They have already begun a full discussion of this area of intervention.

GB Response 11/8/14: Through knowledge of people directly involved in the "Express Yourself" workgroups, we know that there has not been a formal charge or decision-making power granted to these groups. We ask that the administration name the group that would be working on this charge and specify what decision-making power, if any, that workgroup would have in implementing the sort of curriculum changes described above. This work group needs now to be prepared in moving forward with a decision of a more inclusive university-wide curriculum for students independent of individual major electives or requirements.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: As Vice Chancellor Spina indicated on 11/10/14, the recommendations from the workgroups will be presented to the Chancellor's Executive Team and the recommendations from that group will be made public through the SA and GSO. Any recommendation for a university-wide curriculum will follow the normal academic curriculum process through the School and College curriculum committees and the University Senate.

2.11.2.3. **Reinstatement of *This is My Story* first-year student week event.**

2.11.2.3.1. This was a very influential program for entering first-year students that occurred as a tradition during freshman week that gave a good first impression to the new students that Syracuse University is a safe space for students of all backgrounds.

2.11.2.3.2. *by the start of Fall 2015 semester*

Administrative Response 11/7/14: We are happy to have student input on orientation activities for upcoming years, and Senior Vice President Reed Kantrowitz and her staff should receive your detailed recommendations.

GB Response 11/8/14: Thank you for your enthusiasm towards meeting this demand. We look forward to setting up a meeting with Senior Vice President Reed Kantrowitz to further discuss the reinstatement of This is My Story.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: We have reached agreement with 2.11.2.3.

2.11.2.4. **Expansion of the Intergroup Dialogue Program**

2.11.2.4.1. in terms of funding, number of facilitators, number of sections per semester, and potential cross-listings

2.11.2.4.2. expansion as deemed appropriate by current Intergroup Dialogue Program facilitators.

2.11.2.4.3. Dialogue facilitators will continue to receive training and participate in workshops and regularly scheduled team meetings that cover theory and praxis for intergroup dialogue as social justice education.

2.11.2.4.4. maintenance of current classroom dynamics despite influx of students.

2.11.2.4.5. this sustainable expansion will create a foundation for the eventual requirement of Intergroup Dialogue Program for graduation.

2.11.2.4.6. *by the start of the Fall 2015 semester*

2.11.2.5. **Requirement of the Intergroup Dialogue Program or other diversity coursework for graduation beginning with the Class of 2019.**

Administrative Response 11/7/14: A working group populated by students, staff, and faculty that came out of the Express Yourself forum is tackling this issue; we believe that they should continue to be empowered and should come forth with recommendations rather than being short-circuited by an administrative decision at this point. They have already begun a full discussion of this area of intervention.

- [Express Yourself Work Group on Education Initiatives]

GB Response 11/8/14: Clarification: What role does the Express Yourself workgroup play in the final decision making process of the Intergroup Dialogue expansion?

Future Action: Moving forward, we strongly suggest the commitment of the expansion

of the Intergroup Dialogue program as being cross-listed with other required courses. Furthermore, there should be a sufficient amount of staff to allow this transition to occur smoothly.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: As Vice Chancellor Spina indicated on 11/10/14, the recommendations from the workgroups will be presented to the Chancellor's Executive Team and the recommendations from that group will be made public through the SA and GSO. The process for a required Intergroup Dialogue Program will need to follow that outlined above in 2.11.2.2.2. In addition, any expansion of the Intergroup Dialogue program would require additional staffing. Therefore, expansion will also be addressed by the Express Yourself workgroup and be brought to the table in the strategic planning process.

2.12. New student center that houses LGBT Resource Center, Disability Cultural Center, SCIS, and OMA in a safe, central, accessible location.

2.12.1. Including a nonacademic Women's (& Trans-friendly) Center

2.12.1.1. by the start of the Fall 2015 semester

2.12.1.2. The planning of this center must include a diverse and large student representation of the students that would be accessing resources at this new facility.

Administrative Response 11/7/14: The concept is being seriously considered by the Division of Student Affairs and is being studied in the Campus Master Planning Process. [Senior VP Reed Kantrowitz]

GB Response 11/8/14: This demand deserves greater commitment. Students must have a say in the design of this building, as some cultural centers have privacy concerns for their students that could compromise their safety on campus. Please see to it that a diverse group of students be appointed to the decision-making process immediately. Timeline?

Administrative Response 11/12/14: As the Campus Master Planning process unfolds, Sasaki & Associates are committed to involving students in various information gathering processes. There are currently 3 student (2 graduates and 1 undergraduate) representatives on the Campus Master Planning committee. Student input can also be submitted through the existing student governing structures, SA and GSO. Input can also be submitted through the "Share Your Idea" link on the Fast Forward Syracuse website: <http://fastforward.syr.edu/submit-an-idea/>

We look forward to receiving additional student nominations for the campus master planning.

2.13. Revise "No place for hate" to include "No place for silence" and encourage empowered bystanders.⁷

2.14. Written commitment to begin conversations with Office of Residence Life

2.14.1. by the start of the Fall 2015 semester

Administrative Response 11/7/14: This is a reasonable request, but one that deserves more conversation, especially among students, as the phrase "No place for hate" is widely supported by some students (for example, Resident Advisors laud its use). We encourage students to engage students on this issue, and the University administration will be supportive of the outcome, as long as

⁷ This emphasizes not only the need to end the mistreatment of all members of the SU community, especially those marginalized, but also the need to end the fear of speaking out for what is right.

it is deemed appropriate and effective. Significant work to develop empowered bystanders has been part of Student Affairs publications and programs over time. Although the proportion of emphasis on bystanders, deterrence of perpetrator behavior, or other modes of prevention, is a matter of some debate in the literature, all means of engaging empowered campus citizens should be in the mix of strategies.

- [Senior VP Reed Kantrowitz]

GB Response 11/8/14: We are not necessarily asking to change the slogan from “No Place For Hate,” only that “No Place For Silence” be added. It is from the experiences of marginalized students that silence can be a form of violence, and it is imperative that the entire campus community recognize that. In moving forward, we highly recommend a space during welcome week be dedicated to such conversations fostered on the residence floors and in a larger collective group.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: The Office of Residence Life (ORL) would be happy to expand these discussions to include the role of silence and the importance of bystanders. ORL would also welcome student participation in a focus group, should interested students come forward.

2.15. Readily accessible information about methods for reporting DPS targeting, harassment, and misconduct.

- 2.15.1. These databases must be beyond the jurisdictional influence of the Department of Public Safety for fear of bias or tampering.
- 2.15.2. This evidence must be reviewable by a council of said SU student’s peers as well as representatives of DPS (who are not the accused or charged persons).
- 2.15.3. *by the start of the Spring 2015 semester*

Administrative Response 11/7/14: All members of the University community may report allegations of misconduct through EthicsPoint or StopBias websites. All incidents reported through those mechanisms are investigated (external to the unit). The additional request in 2.11.2 is unclear.

[Chief Callisto]

GB Response 11/8/14: Both access points (StopBias and EthicsPoint), while they may provide a method of reporting consistently, route reports back to DPS. In an investigation external to DPS, it was never clearly identified which recognized official body would be reviewing DPS misconduct, and as an extension, what their protocol is for doing so. There is no clear point of access for persons who filed complaints to access the database that holds their records in terms of personal review of information. We THE General Body were not directing the attention to DPS about a review group present under DPS jurisdiction; we were demanding that the administration create a cooperative council beyond the jurisdiction of DPS, allowing for fairer representation of misconduct accusation.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: The StopBias website along with the Ethics Point Confidential Hotline (which can be found on both the BFAS and Audit homepages) do not route complaints to DPS. We commit to exploring additional reporting locations. Given the sensitive nature of reports, we do not make these reports available to the general public.

2.16. With the advent of body cameras for DPS officers, it must also be permitted that those who are recorded via the officer’s point of view also be allowed to submit video evidence without the threat of invalidation.

- 2.16.1. Cameras should never be permitted to be turned off.
2.16.2. *by the start of the Spring 2015 semester*

Administrative Response 11/7/14: Bystander videos are currently often submitted for use in investigations; there is no intention of curtailing those submissions, as they are sometimes helpful. If the body camera program becomes permanent and it is technically feasible, DPS will consider having cameras engaged at all times.

[Chief Callisto]

GB Response 11/9/14:

- In this October 20, 2014 Daily Orange article (<http://dailyorange.com/2014/10/dps-to-start-using-body-cameras-on-trial-basis/>) it was stated by the Department of Public Safety associate director for administrative and technical services Donna Adams that cameras in their function will be disengaged during moments that officers deem as being sensitive material. THE General Body believes that this approach is flawed for two reasons. 1.) Because the decision as to whether or not the body camera should be active is left to the discretion of the DPS officer present, creating a form of evidence that is fallible in execution because the function itself is utilized only under conditional circumstances. In the scenario that body cameras for documentation were implemented as protocol, an inactive body camera would actually *complicate* case reviews. 2.) Because an officer's unvideotaped account of an event may contradict an outside party's recording of officer conduct. Also, documentation of protocol for the use of these cameras must be published and accessible to the public and clearly define the limits of using video cameras for recording evidence versus engaging in surveillance.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: Body cameras will be activated upon an officer leaving their patrol vehicle (patrol vehicles have dash cams) in response to an incident or when engaging in community policing. Cameras will not be required to be activated during officer breaks, rest room activities, private phone conversations, or other private moments during work hours. Further, upon mutual agreement with the victim of a sensitive incident, the DPS officer may stop recording. All policies related to body cameras will be communicated verbally and in writing to all DPS staff.

2.17. Readily available public access document for students and faculty that addresses the relationship, rights and responsibilities between Department of Public Safety (DPS) and the Syracuse Police Department (SPD).

- 2.17.1. The student body understands that there will be cases handled that affect the Syracuse University community in which SPD officers will be involved because of geographical jurisdiction overlap.
- 2.17.2. DPS officers are to have video evidence of their conduct recorded and submitted for review, and so must SPD officers when operating in the Syracuse University limitations and boundaries (this way, cases that affect students would fall similarly under the guidelines of imposition and requests made of DPS).

Administrative Response 11/7/14: Recorded incidents involving DPS officers will be reviewed by appropriate University administrators. To be in compliance with student rights to privacy and to ensure investigation integrity, these recordings cannot be reviewed by students. Recorded incidents involving SPD officers is outside of the jurisdiction of Syracuse University and would not be granted.

GB Response 11/9/14: THE General Body has found that the routes available for reporting are to either email the Title IX Coordinator, Cynthia Maxwell Curtain, or call the office directly (Office of Equal Opportunity, Inclusion, and Resolution Services), thus eliminating

aspects of anonymous reporting by manner of execution. In this response, DPS representation referred to individual complaint, insinuating that DPS as a recognized body could thereby no means be held accountable as a recognized body of enforcement that perpetrates harassment or misconduct. There is no clearly identified database available to access reports that have been filed.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: The StopBias website along with the Ethics Point Confidential Hotline (which can be found on both the BFAS and Audit homepages) do not route complaints to DPS. We commit to exploring additional reporting locations. Given the sensitive nature of reports, we do not make these reports available to the general public.

2.17.3. We also demand public access to the University Area Crime-Control Team operations modus operandi inclusive of information of registered officers and their titles (badges, precinct position, etc.).

Administrative Response 11/7/14: The University crime control team is an overtime detail, staffed with any volunteer officer from DPS and SPD. Therefore, there are no regularly assigned officers. Chief Callisto will post the functions of the University Crime Control on the DPS website.

GB Response 11/9/14: The General Body is satisfied on this point.

2.17.3.1. There is no official document for the joint effort collaborative that can be accessed for the relationship between DPS and SPD.

Administrative Response 11/7/14: The joint operational procedure between DPS and SPD is posted on the DPS website, under "About Us."

GB Response 11/9/14: The General Body is satisfied on this point.

2.17.4. Anonymity cannot be the plausible basis for dismissing accusations and/or information on the grounds for contesting harassment cases as members of the student body.

Administrative Response 11/7/14: DPS cannot hold an individual accountable without a complaining witness. That said, patterns of anonymous harassing behavior are investigated and addressed with the accused by the Office of Equal Opportunity, Inclusion, and Resolution Services regardless of the presence of a complaining witness.

GB Response 11/9/14: The General Body seeks clarification on the above point.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: Anonymity is not used as grounds for dismissing a reporting complaint nor does it preclude The Office of Equal Opportunity, Inclusion, and Resolution Services from investigating complaints.

2.17.5. *By the end of the Spring 2015 semester*
[Chief Callisto]

2.18. Accessible gender-neutral single occupancy bathrooms (with showers for residence halls) in all buildings.

2.18.1. *Construction should begin by the end of the Spring 2015 semester*

Administrative Response 11/7/14: Beyond the many single-use bathrooms in place, since 2012, Campus Planning Design & Construction has added gender-neutral, single-use bathrooms in Newhouse 11, Dineen Hall, the Hoople Building, Bowne Hall, and Link Hall and student residence

halls including Shaw Hall, Sadler Hall, Walnut Hall, Sky Halls, Lyons Hall, Flint Hall, and Lawrinson Hall. Plans for additional gender-neutral, single-user bathrooms include locations in Carnegie Library, Bird Library, and Holden Observatory. Future work will be developed in conjunction within the guidelines of the Campus Master Plan.

[Executive VP Marcoccia]

GB Response 11/9/14: This needs to be made a priority for students, as it is also an issue of safety. While we recognize that accessible gender-neutral single occupancy bathrooms are being constructed, we also recognize that the ones that have already been implemented cannot necessarily serve the entire building or buildings they are in. Having two (2) accessible gender-neutral single occupancy bathrooms in Newhouse II to serve all of the buildings is not sufficient. Additionally, it is imperative that gender-neutral bathrooms in residence halls be equipped with showers. We encourage the administration, especially Executive VP Marcoccia, to refer to the report compiled by 2014 graduate Erin Carhart regarding these types of bathrooms in campus buildings. We do, however, appreciate the commitment to continuing the construction of these bathrooms.

2.19. The changing of Columbus Day on the SU Calendar to Indigenous Peoples' Day.

2.19.1. by the start of the Fall 2015 semester

Administrative Response 11/7/14: SU does not commemorate Columbus Day nor mark it on its calendar.

GB Response 11/9/14: This change to SU's calendar was made a few years back. If one looks on the website though, the discover SU's Columbus Day Program from 2010 is still accessible. However, we urge the administration to go beyond merely removing "Columbus Day" from the SU calendar and changing it to recognize the history of Indigenous students at SU. This year Indigenous students placed the messages regarding Indigenous People's Survival Day on the grassy knoll in October.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: We will work with the Director of the Native American Studies program on additional programming to recognize the history of indigenous people at Syracuse University.

2.20. Commitment to being a worldwide leader in addressing and ending sexual assault.

2.20.1. The creation of a new standalone center for sexual assault and relationship violence services, advocacy, education, and outreach that combines the advantages of both old and new structures.

2.20.1.1. The creation of such a center will be predicated on the input of survivors and students, faculty, and staff involved in sexual assault advocacy and prevention education on campus.

2.20.1.2. *planning must start by the end of the Spring 2015 semester*

2.20.1.3. A campus wide survey addressing the climate of rape and sexual assault modeled after M.I.T.'s recent survey.⁸

Administrative Response 11/7/14: Please see 1.4 and 1.5 above, which indicates that the new (representative) Chancellor's Workgroup is actively engaged reviewing our current support and

⁸ <http://web.mit.edu/surveys/casatips/develop.html>;
http://web.mit.edu/surveys/casatips/CASA_2014_Student_Final.pdf

will be responsible for bringing policy and structural recommendations forward. A survey process, based on best practices, needs of campus, and the desire for maximal student response rate, is in the beginning stages and will engage students in the thematic development. We have been a leader in this arena for years:

- being one of the first universities to have an Advocacy Center but also being one of the first Universities to recognize the need and value of providing to victims (in that moment just after the trauma, the person generally has not made (yet) the journey from victim to survivor) with the services of a privileged professional counselor who is knowledgeable regarding working with people who have been traumatized and providing advocacy services;
- being one of the first universities to recognize that even though a professional counselor can (and does at Syracuse University) provide advocacy services, an advocate who is not functioning and licensed as counselor cannot provide the trauma-informed counseling;
- being one of the first Universities to have a Title IX coordinator with over 30 years of relevant experience;
- being one of the first Universities to coordinate the efforts of the professional counselors, the advocates, public safety and others to ensure that a victim can move from victim to survivor to thrive; to ensure that an accused is treated fairly; and to ensure that campus safety and culture issues are addressed.

This is essential campus-wide work needing a lens that is not about one issue but is about use and abuse of power, intersectionality, the multitude of ways in which people are oppressed and marginalized. These efforts need to be and are a part of organizations and efforts campus-wide from the Disability Cultural Center to Hendricks Chapel; from Athletics to Fraternities and Sororities; from the Provost's office to Parking, etc. This synergy of efforts is now being achieved because we have freed the issue of sexual violence from a single physical location. It is now being integrated synergistically into broad campus-wide efforts.

The University constantly reviews and adjusts our efforts as we discern areas for improvement. A key tool for that discernment is a campus climate survey. Planning for the survey has begun. We intend to solicit student feedback in developing themes for the survey during Spring 2015.

- [Chancellor's Work Group on Sexual Violence]

GB Response 11/9/14: Counselors are not the only privileged and confidential sources on this campus, as per the designation that the chaplains in Hendrick's Chapel are also privileged and confidential resources on campus. To say that only licensed counselors can provide trauma-informed counseling is doing a great disservice to the chaplains.

This administration has many times referenced the Vera House, Inc. model as inspiration for their new structure. At Vera House, Inc. the majority of staff and volunteers are not licensed mental health providers, yet are trained to provide trauma informed care and meet the various need of sexual and relationship violence survivors. To say that only licensed mental health providers can provide this service would negate the majority of work that sexual assault crisis centers do across this country and throughout the world.

Having a stand alone center dedicated to addressing sexual and relationship violence serves as a beacon to the community. It symbolizes a commitment and priority to ending rape culture, gender-based violence, sexual violence, and relationship violence. A center further promotes a comprehensive and collaborative approach to prevention, education, services, and advocacy. Moving the SVRV team to a stand alone center, following a model of community based services, would signify that Syracuse University is a leader in addressing rape culture and violence on campus. This example of a stand alone center is the model of Vera House, Inc..

Please cite your source for the Work Group.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: Please see our response to 1.5.

2.21. Mandatory consent training for all entering students, including graduate.

- 2.21.1. Consent training should be intersectional in nature, and couched in a positive sexuality framework.
- 2.21.2. The training will take place over several weeks, beginning from the first day of orientation. Potential trainers include groups such as A Men's Issue, Vera House, SASSE, and others.
- 2.21.3. The training will avoid victim-blaming mentality.
 - 2.21.3.1. *by the start of the Fall 2015 semester*
- 2.21.4. Clarification of responsibilities and appropriate training for all responsible employees.
 - 2.21.4.1. *by the start of the Spring 2015 semester*

Administrative Response 11/7/14: This training is and has been mandatory for all entering undergraduate students for two years. This training has been done over several weeks starting before orientation with information to parents and new students; continuing with mandatory online training; reinforced in a mandatory orientation session; and then reinforced in the residence halls in small group discussions. The message is then further reinforced with the Got Consent campaign (this year the Be Sure campaign), the Blame Game acting troupe production, and targeted sessions conducted by various groups and trainers across campus. A Men's Issue, SASSE and others are involved in these efforts.

This information was provided to all graduate students via an email at the start of the year. It also was discussed in the mandatory training of all TAs. We also have given in-person sessions to smaller graduate students groups at the request of students or of their faculty advisors. We would be delighted to have GSO support for making sessions for all graduate students mandatory.

Victim-blaming has never been and will never be part of University-sponsored training.

- [Senior VP Reed Kantrowitz] [Fall 2015]

2.22. A university-wide affirmative consent "Yes Means Yes" Policy. See appendix.^{A18}

- 2.22.1. *by the start of the Spring 2015 semester*
- 2.22.2. **University policies addressing sexual assault offenses must be revisited and reevaluated with a survivor-first lens.**
 - 2.22.2.1. *by the end of the Spring 2015 semester*

Administrative Response 11/7/14: The University has been and continues to be a leader in this regard. The following is the University's consent policy. It is a "Yes Means Yes" policy. We had this policy in place before recent legislative interventions:

"The University's policy on Nonconsensual Sexual Activity includes situations in which the victim is unable to consent because he/she is physically helpless, or is mentally incapacitated due to drug or alcohol consumption, or is unconscious, regardless of whether the consumption was with the victim's consent. Consent should be expressed in mutually understandable words and actions, informed, voluntary, freely given, clear, sober, and agreed upon by all participants in sexual activity. In order to consent to sexual activity, an individual must understand to whom they are consenting, what specific activity or activities they are consenting to, when the specific sexual activity will take place, where and how. Consent can be withdrawn at any time. Consent to one form of sexual activity cannot be assumed to be consent to any other form of sexual activity. Silence or the absence of resistance is not consent."

When California and New York/SU NY adopted similar language with a "Yes Means Yes" tag line, we reviewed (again) our policy. We considered adding the "Yes Means Yes" tag this year but because the semester was already underway, to make any change could be perceived as substantive and could be perceived as changing expectations of students in the middle of the semester after the mandatory training discussed above. Thus, we will add that tag line next summer.

The University policies regarding sexual assault are reviewed annually. We do this review (as we must) from numerous lenses: 1) the lens of the survivor; 2) the lens of any accused who has the right to be treated fairly; 3) the lens of the campus community—a campus of respect; a place where people can thrive not just be included or tolerated; 4) the lens of what the government requires of us.

GB Response 11/10/14: While we are pleased that the university has made steps towards a full “Yes Means Yes” affirmative consent policy, frankly, we are shocked that the university would change its policy without notifying the campus community. After all, what good is a policy if no one knows about it? What good is a policy designed to try to stop assaults from happening in the first place, to further educate the entire campus community about what positive consent means, when its existence is unknown?

We also wonder who was involved in this process of writing the policy, and we hope it is under review by the Chancellor’s Workgroup. Perhaps it needs to be improved.

Additionally, simply having a Yes Means Yes policy on record is not good enough. The entire campus must take on the charge of this, from the Chancellor’s office throughout the entire community. It must not only take place in any one particular office, but should be community-wide. And its implementation must be fully connected. For instance, what are the questions the review board asks of victims? Are they operating on a affirmative consent model as well? For example, do they ask ‘did you say yes’ or do they ask ‘did you say no?’ All these offices must be in complete alignment on this new policy or it is not useful.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: The policies at the point of training are communicated to the appropriate audiences including students and staff who work with students. As we undergo review of our policies, we welcome input from any individual of our community.

2.23. A widespread, comprehensive campaign to notify all students about the currently available sexual assault resources.

- 2.23.1. New stickers must be made to fix the errors in the current ones, to clarify which resources are available and which are confidential and privileged. These stickers must be put in every bathroom on the entire campus, including all residence halls. Additionally, stickers on dorm room doors must also be updated.

2.23.1.1. *by December 12, 2014*

Administrative Response 11/7/14: This too is an on-going effort. See § 2.17 above (regarding the mandatory and reinforcing training and educational outreach). In addition, infographics, the information sheet, and the Title IX Resource Guide have been widely distributed and are readily available on University websites. In addition, the bathroom stickers are on bathrooms across campus. We welcome any redesign of bathroom stickers. We also are working on posters to put near copy machines and in coffee rooms. Please provide us with designs of such posters.

- [Senior VP Reed Kantrowitz] [Spring 2015]

GB Response 11/9/14: We are glad to hear of the current efforts to continue

the spread of information concerning sexual assault services available on campus. However, not all of this information is accurate, particularly where it is said that “the bathroom stickers are on bathrooms across campus.” From our own experiences, there are updated stickers missing from bathrooms in Hoople, Hall of Languages, Maxwell, Crouse-Hinds, and from dorm room bathrooms, and many other campus bathrooms. It is also not the responsibility of students to “provide” the designs of posters, as the university employs graphic designers to handle this charge.

We can make suggestions for the redesign of the stickers--it must be made extremely clear that certain areas are NOT privileged, confidential. But that should be easy to indicate, either by language or perhaps a clear black line indicating such. In any case, it should be made explicit. A suggestion would also be to ask survivors for input. As with other changes regarding sexual assault services and policy, survivors were left out the conversation.

There is no excuse for the fact that the updated stickers were not immediately ready to go on every single bathroom door on campus and in the dorms the same day the Advocacy center was closed. We contend that part of the reason the stickers were not ready to go is that the administration closed the Advocacy Center prematurely, when it had not yet determined what the new services would be. We also wonder if the simple placing of stickers everywhere has not yet been done because the administration has been continually changing the services available in regards to sexual assault survivor resources, and is therefore not yet ready to fully commit to the new sticker design. This must be remedied immediately. Not only the stickers, but the gaps in sexual assault services, education and prevention.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: We will continue to work on placement and design of the bathroom stickers.

2.24. Disability accessibility must be enforced.

- 2.24.1. The university must engage in an immediate and transparent search for an ADA coordinator who will lead all areas of SU in meeting the requirements of the ADA and, where possible, to surpass them. This will include open-door sessions for interviews, the time and dates of which will be distributed through mainstream channels.

2.24.1.1. by the start of the Spring 2015 semester

Administrative Response 11/7/14: The University commits to immediately begin an inclusive search process for an ADA Coordinator with faculty, staff, and student representation. In the interim, we have appointed an Interim ADA Coordinator to investigate accessibility concerns on campus. Sharon Terise began a full-time position this week to focus on IT accessibility. Queries and concerns can be communicated through Accessible SU <http://syr.edu/accessiblesu/index.html>, which has been on the University home page and utilized by the campus community for the past two years.

- [Senior VP Alston]

GB Response 11/8/14: We accept this commitment to an expedited search for an ADA coordinator, and urge the administration to complete the search by the start of the Spring 2015 semester. We demand follow-through with hiring ADA coordinator. This is detailed in the section below, which we sent to administration on Friday, November th.

However in addition, we ask that you make the search open and known to the Syracuse Community at large. Lastly, we ask that HR be more flexible in pay negotiations, as the ADA coordinator is of most paramount importance and extremely high in its demands considering the state of the status accessibility .

[Admin Response, 11/9:] We agree.

[GB response, 11/10] In addition, we demand flexibility in terms of pay scale, as we understand salary has been a main factor inhibiting successful hiring of the ADA coordinator.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: We have reached agreement on this matter. We further agree to do the normal comparative benchmarking for the appropriate salary.

- 2.24.2. Provide money immediately to a centralized fund, allocated by the ADA Coordinator, dedicated to providing equipment and services that create equal and inclusive access for people with disabilities that falls outside of the jurisdiction of ODS that students, faculty, staff, student organizations, and programs of Syracuse University can utilize in a quick and convenient manner. (Examples include, but are not limited to: Student groups or campus programs seeking inclusive, accessible transportation for off campus events and activities; providing faculty or staff accommodations such as ASL interpreter or guide dog for travel to international locations for academic research or professional related purposes; wheelchairs for students with mobility impairments in order to functionally maneuver around campus)

[Admin Response, 11/9:] Currently the budgets that fund these services and equipment are highly distributed and this makes accessing them difficult. We need to move to a simpler, streamlined process with clear principles and protocols. The ADA coordinator will work with key campus constituencies to define this need, the Chancellor's Executive Team to identify funding sources and amounts, and then will work collaboratively to develop an approach that best meets the needs at Syracuse. We will ensure student participation and input. To be completed within 3 months of ADA Coordinator hiring.

[GB response, 11/10] We ask that the administration form a committee so that this happens now, without delay, rather than waiting for the ADA coordinator. The reason for this is that key faculty of Disability Studies are on their way to leaving. The committee should be led by Cynthia Maxwell Curtin, and include Sharon Trerise, with the purpose of launching an open campus dialogue, publicized through SU News and emails to the entire student body, about the shape that the fund should take.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: We commit to forming a committee that will develop a plan to identify funding sources and amounts. The committee will include at least the acting ADA Coordinator, the Director of the Office of Disability Services, the Director of the Disability Cultural Center, and the ITS Accessibility Analyst. Student and faculty representatives will be appointed to

the committee from a broadly framed nomination process in which students can self-identify or be nominated by others.

- 2.24.2.1. *by the start of the ADA Coordinator position*
- 2.24.3. Implement and track enforcement mechanisms that ensures all events and activities on campus and off campus be made fully accessible. These accessible event and activity policies need to be designed based off of the Accessible Events Planning Guide published on the Disability Cultural Center website

[Admin Response, 11/9:] This is a critical part of the ADA Coordinator’s responsibility, working together with multiple stakeholders and other University offices.

[GB response, 11/10] We ask that you ensure this tracking happens through conversations with input from students, staff and faculty, and not exclusively from staff in ODS, because of power dynamics.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: We agree.

- 2.24.4. The commitment to maintain funding and support for Inclusive U over the next 10 years.

[Admin Response, 11/9:] This is part of the Strategic Planning Process, both University-wide and in the individual units, including in the School of Education and University College and with the external partners that support the program. This has been heavily dependent upon external funding, and this is a factor as well.

[GB response, 11/10] In that case, please disregard this demand.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: We are in agreement with 2.24.4.

- 2.24.4.1. Expansion and greater flexibility of transportation for OnCampus Students so students can attend events and activities later at night and early in the morning.
- 2.24.4.2. *by the start of the ADA Coordinator position*
- 2.24.4.3. \$100,000 for research and development funds to develop a disability ally training for use on the SU campus, with administration, staff, and students, along with an ongoing commitment for implementation.
- 2.24.4.4. *by the start of the spring 2015 semester*

[Admin Response, 11/9:] The Disability Cultural Center will learn more about this request, and conversations with them should occur.

[GB response, 11/10] This funding should not come out of the budgets for either the Disability Cultural Center or the ODS.

- 2.24.4.5. \$250,000 for research and development of a required inclusive pedagogy training for faculty to improve the quality of teaching for all students' educational needs, not just disabled students, along with ongoing commitment for implementation.

2.24.4.6. *by the start of the fall 2015 semester*

[Admin Response, 11/9:] This is part of the Strategic Planning Process, with several constituencies already identifying this need.

[GB Response 11/10] We will be in touch with Steve Kuusisto to understand where this issue currently stands in the Strategic Plan.

- 2.24.4.7. Office of Disability Services must be re-evaluated by a diverse and large group of students, faculty, and staff who use or have experience with those services, and through a campus-wide survey. The findings must be used to immediately improve services.

2.24.4.7.1. *by the start of the Spring 2015 semester*

[Admin Response, 11/9:] The new Director of the Office of Disability Services (ODS) was hired after a national search and a strong recommendation from an inclusive search committee. Paula Possenti-Perez is a strong leader and already a trusted member of our University community. As she enters this position, she is focused on ensuring that ODS is focused on effective service to its constituents, and will use multiple means to elicit information on areas where ODS must improve.

[GB Response, 11/10] The ADA coordinator should be tasked with evaluating ODS through student input, to best improve the services.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: The ADA Coordinator will be a collaborator on any review of services provided to students, faculty, and staff.

- 2.24.5. For the improvement of campus buildings' and grounds' disability access, 1 minor physical access update must be made per month and at least 2 major physical access updates must be included in all renovation projects. This requirement is to ensure physical access progress be made in a timely manner with minimal inconvenience to the student body.

2.24.5.1. *by the start of the Spring 2015 semester*

[Admin Response, 11/9:] This issue has been identified for the Campus Master Plan Steering Committee and consultant, with specific recommendations requested for any inaccessible facility. Campus Planning, Design, & Construction will provide through the ADA Coordinator a list of recent, current, and planned renovations that address accessibility issues.

[GB Response 11/10:] This responsibility needs to be in someone's job description. There are so many inaccessible facilities that we ask that the ADA Coordinator, Steve Schroeder, or the appropriate person, actively search for these needed updates.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: This responsibility will be part of the ADA Coordinator's job, to be responsible and proactive to safety and accessibility needs.

3. Public discussions on the funding level of the library systems at SU

3.1. The Libraries system needs an additional \$7 million in the base budget just to reach the median of our peer group. No discussions beyond emergency funding additions have occurred. More funding for principal collection acquisitions is needed, in addition to more funding for physical renovation of Bird Library.

3.1.1. by the start of the Fall 2015 semester

Administrative Response 11/7/14: It is critical that our Libraries set a direction and develop a plan to provide the services and access that our SU community requires, and the additional funding for the Libraries must be consistent with this plan. The University Strategic Planning process, the search for the next dean of the Libraries, and the ultimate development of the Libraries' strategic plan are essential prerequisites for the wise and

GB Response 11/9/14: While it is imperative that a new dean of Libraries be chosen, it is also imperative for the Libraries to have the necessary operating funds. We do not know when the next dean will be chosen. We do know the Library system is in dire straits. Raising the Libraries budget by \$7 million will put us within the median of peer institutions. Our budget falls far short of that. Taken from the Chancellor's message on June 24, 2014: "A Strategic Plan [referenced above], centered on academics, that lays out a shared vision for the University and identifies clear priorities needed to achieve that vision." One would think that the epicenters of learning, the campus Libraries, would be a part of that vision.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: We agree the Library is a critical and central need to academic excellence at the University. As stated above, the process for hiring a new dean and the process for academic strategic planning are underway. We will not bypass a thoughtful planning process and therefore cannot commit to any funding plan for the Library without a specific strategic plan and permanent leadership for the Library.

4. Better pay and services to graduate staff and commuters.

4.1. A minimum of \$14,102.40 for a 9 month, 20 hour per week contract period is necessary to meet the 2014 living requirements of TAs, RAs and GAs in Syracuse.

Administrative Response 11/7/14: Good discussion occurred last year among the Graduate Student Organization leadership, the Budget Office, the Graduate School, the Senate Budget Committee, the Vice Chancellor and Provost, and the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer. The result was a higher than pro forma increase of the minimum TA/RA/GA pay of 7% (faculty and staff pro forma increases were 2%) to \$13,000. This was warmly welcomed by the GSO, and there is a mutual commitment that we will continue to increase the stipend with greater than pro forma increases over the next several years.

- [Vice Chancellor and Provost Spina, Executive Vice President Marcoccia]

GB Response 11/8/14: As stated in the demand, a minimum of \$14,102.40 for a 9-month, 20 hour per week contract period is necessary for students to live on. We appreciate the higher than pro forma increase, and would like a commitment to this minimum. This is not an arbitrary number, and should not be treated as such. \$13,000 is over \$1,000 less than an acceptable living wage, and it is unacceptable to force TAs, RAs, and GAs to live under such conditions.

Note from 11/8/14 meeting with Dean Gonzalez: THE General Body: It is outrageous for grad students who are teaching for the university to be on food stamps.

[Admin Response, 11/9:] As stated previously, continuing to increase the minimum graduate assistant stipend is a high priority for the groups and officers identified above. The Graduate Student Organization has been an effective advocate for the increase of GA stipends, and will continue to have access to senior University leaders and the trustees to make this case.

TGB Response 11-10-14: We would like a commitment to at least a 7% raise to the GA/RA/TA stipend minimum for the next two years, and at least a 3% raise for all GA/RA/TA stipends on campus for the next two years. This will get the minimum to above a living wage in two years.

Notes from 11/10/14 meeting with TGB, Rebecca Reed Kantrowitz, Eric Spina, Bea Gonzalez:
Do you support your teachers having a living wage?

Spina: Yes... This needs to be higher. ... Quickly over the next couple days we will talk with a couple folks.

Sherri: Flat tire, showing how hard it is to get by here on grad student pay.

Patrick: Contractual limitations to get jobs elsewhere. Graduate student loan rates have gone up.

I guess the question is do you support a living wage for teachers?

Spina: Yes, but there's also a tuition scholarship as well. The univ is investing, a straight living wage comparison is challenging, this needs to be higher, we need to get to 14,000 as soon as possible. Difficult to us to commit to anything. We have come very close. I will push and I will be an advocate for that to happen.

Yanira: What does this look like timewise in terms of trustees?

Spina: The Trustees will resist approving one part of the budget before looking at the whole thing.

Danielle: Sounds like a pretty good commitment on moving forward on that one.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: Dean of the Graduate School Ware, Executive Vice President & Chief Financial Officer Marcoccia, and Vice Chancellor & Provost Spina support and will advocate for an increase of the minimum GA stipend by 7% for FY16, which will raise it to \$13,910.

4.2. Graduate students who work as TAs, RAs and GAs (and their dependents) must be offered enrollment in dental care each year.

Administrative Response 11/7/14: The University is exploring changes to the dental options currently offered to GAs, RAs and TAs that would allow for an expansion of eligibility.

- [Senior VP Alston] [Fall 2015]

GB Response 11/8/14: We seek a commitment to offering dental benefits to TAs, RAs, GAs (and their dependents) yearly beginning in Fall of 2015.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: We are unable to commit to this change based on our contract with Delta Dental. We are examining ways to expand eligibility for dental benefits.

- 4.3. For the support of commuters, Syracuse University has a responsibility to reserve the parking spots commuters pay for and not double charge for land already long since been paid off when visitors come to the university for entertainment purposes.
 - 4.4. *by the start of the Fall 2015 semester*
- 5. A financially transparent university.**
- 5.1. Provide transparent records that offer an explicit breakdown of the distribution of students' tuition to the university. Include all salaries.
 - 5.2. The administration must provide the necessary salary data to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). The Administration's failure to provide this data last year led to the AAUP's inability to write the Z report (a critical data source on faculty salaries) for the first time in nearly 50 years.⁹
 - 5.3. The administration must be more transparent about budget priorities at the University. This requires the administration be willing to meet with the Senate Budget Committee with regularity (a privilege not afforded to the committee last year for the first time in years).
 - 5.3.1. *by the start of the Spring 2015 semester*
 - 5.2. Provide a complete, detailed record of the current location of each of the 1.044 billion dollars, which was raised in The Campaign for Syracuse University, concluding on December 31, 2013.¹⁰
 - 5.2.1. *by the start of the Spring 2015 semester*
 - 5.3. Provide a complete, detailed accounting of the financial transactions involving the major SU sports teams, particularly men's basketball and football. Contrary to popular opinion, we have heard that all told, the sports programs do not actually bring a direct net gain into the university.
 - 5.3.1. *by the start of the Spring 2015 semester*

Administrative Response 11/7/14: The budget plan for Fiscal Year 2015 can be found at http://BudPlan.syr.edu/BudPlan/uploads/Fiscal_Year_2015_Budget.pdf. The University does not publish individual salaries, but the cost of salaries and fringe is contained in that budget plan. Budgets for previous years are posted at http://budplan.syr.edu/BudPlan/display.cfm?content_ID=%23%28%28%2D%20%0A.

GB Response 11/8/14: We thank the Board of Trustees for providing the link to the budget plans for 2015 and for years prior, but we find the information provided in these links unsatisfactory for our needs. We find the budget documents lack transparency in terms of use of the funds, line item by line item. We also remain steadfast in wanting the individual salaries of each employee published. This is required of State Universities and we believe in the capabilities of the administration and of Syracuse University to, if they do not already have this data on hand, collect this data in a timely manner. We would like it to be shared. The amount of transparency must adhere to AAUP standards of information.

⁹See, official AAUP statement here: <http://suaaup.org/>

¹⁰ <http://sumagazine.syr.edu/2013fall-winter/features/cantor.html>

GB 11/10/14: We request current statistics and budgetary priorities and demand that the current (or last year's) levels be set as floors for the next 5 years.

- how many students of color from the U.S. are currently enrolled
- how many dollars in financial aid (not including loans) these students currently receive
- how much \$ was spent on rape prevention services before the advocacy center closed, and how much now
- how much \$ is spent on accessibility
- what is the salary of each top level administrator
- how much \$ is spent on community outreach/projects/community centers,
- how many community project proposals were approved last year
- the amount of money given to the university from the Department of Defense
- the amount of money given to the university from the Department of Homeland Security

Administrative Response 11/12/14: We are in the process of setting priorities for the next 5 years through our strategic planning process and are unable to guarantee that current priorities will not change. The value of conducting a broadly based and highly inclusive strategic planning process is to identify University directions and specific budgetary needs of units.

Some of the requested data is already publicly available:

- Enrollment information is available on IPEDS, the SU FACTS website, and the OIRA website.
- Financial aid information is available on IPEDS and the SU Office of Budget & Planning website.
- Salary of some key employees is available on an annual basis via the University's IRS Form 990 and can be found online.
- Monthly grant award activity is available through the Office of Sponsored Programs website.

The Senate Budget Committee reviews and provides input on the University's budget on an annual basis, and collaborates with the Chancellor and his leadership team to identify areas of special focus and assessment. This committee regularly includes both an undergraduate and graduate student. The University budget is reviewed and approved by the Syracuse University Board of Trustees on an annual basis. Other detailed budget requests are best handled by these existing shared governance bodies.

6. Better mental health services and support.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: This is a global response to all items included in Section 6: This is a critically important area of student support, and directly impacts student success and we take these concerns about mental health services and support very seriously. We are actively seeking ways to increase support for the mental health needs of our students and commit to investment in these critical resources. This will be an active topic of conversation between the Division of Student Affairs leadership and the new Student Affairs Advisory Board, which includes the elected leaders of SA and GSO.

- 6.1.** *These changes must be taken seriously and implemented without delay, as they are, for many students, a matter of life and death.*

- 6.2.** Psychiatrists and Counselors should be in the same building. This would streamline mental health concerns and makes it much less confusing for students.

6.2.1. by the start of the Spring 2015 semester

Administrative Response 11/7/14: This is a major priority for the Division of Student Affairs and one in which we have already made progress. To date, we have conducted a comprehensive Health and Wellness Center space feasibility study, and an architectural firm was hired to offer preliminary design plans. The impetus for this plan was the co-locating of all of the health and wellness units in one centralized location. At this point, we are awaiting direction from the Master Space Planning committee for next steps.

GB Response 11/9/14: We would like in-depth student input in the plan, in the form of open stakeholder meetings, a collaborative interaction session, and a vote on the finalized plan from participants in the open forum. Student participants will have background in mental health issues at the university.

- 6.3.** There must be more than one psychiatrist on campus. If 1 in 4 students have mental health issues, and our psychiatrist serves both SU and ESF campuses, with a combined enrollment of 23,517 students, this means there is one psychiatrist serving 5,879 students. This is unacceptable.

6.3.1. At least one more psychiatrist must be hired by December 1, 2014

Administrative Response 11/7/14: There is currently a search underway to hire an additional psychiatric provider. It is our expectation that this search will be completed by the end of the semester.

GB Response 11/11/14: We insist that another psychiatrist be hired -- rather than a "psychiatric provider," by which we note that the administration might mean a nurse. In addition, there should be more than one psychiatrist hired, because two would still not meet student needs. By hiring only one extra psychiatrist, they would be splitting the 5,879 students at 2,939 students apiece, which is a number clearly impossible to serve: it is unreasonable that these psychiatrists can see this amount of people even a single time in an entire year. If one figures that a meeting with the psychiatrist is an hour long, with 8 sessions in a typical work day, that is approximately 640 per semester, for a total of 1,280 students per year. We know that when Health Services had a psychiatrist and a psychiatric nurse, they were both overtaxed as it was. We believe the university needs to hire two additional psychiatrists to its staff of one as soon as possible.

- 6.4.** Psychiatrists must be able to see students on an emergency basis. If a student's life is at risk, they should not have to wait.

Administrative Response 11/7/14: Psychiatry's primary function (which is part of the Health Center) is to provide medication management to students suffering from mental health conditions able to benefit from a medication regime. Should there be an assessment that an emergency appointment is necessary, there are emergency appointments available on a daily basis. However, should a student's life be assessed to be at imminent risk, both our psychiatrists, working in conjunction with the Counseling Center staff, would facilitate an immediate assessment for hospitalization. I6.4n sum, no student whose life is at risk should have to wait to get the care they need.

GB Response 11/9/14: THE General Body agrees that students should not have to wait to access these services; any counselor found not actively in compliance with these standards will be reviewed for professional standards and immediate

termination if standards violated twice.

THE General Body needs the administration and other groups to look into the issues with access. Though perhaps the official policy of SU is to get students the care they need, you can see, by many anecdotes directly from students in our appendix, that unfortunately their mental health needs are not being met. Currently, students that request emergency psychiatry appointments have been told to see a counselor at the counseling center first, and then to wait typically multiple weeks to be fit into the psychiatrist's schedule. Additionally, there are many student now reporting that they are entirely being turned away and told they cannot see the psychiatrist at all, even ones who were prior patients.

6.5. Psychiatrists must see students on an ongoing basis, rather than short-term.

Administrative Response 11/7/14: Currently, students who see our psychiatric providers have not been seen on a short-term basis. Psychiatrists provide medication management until a student's medication regime is stabilized and/or the mental health issues requiring medication have been resolved. Those students with chronic mental health needs will need to be referred to outside specialists once the initial medication regime has been established and stabilized and/or if the condition requiring medication is outside the scope of University providers.

GB Response 1198/14: Please see our point here about confusion in regards to services provided. Your administration may claim this is the case, but why does the current policy on Psychiatric Services website say it is short-term? See this quotation:

“Both psychiatric services at Health Services and the Counseling Center work on a short-term therapy model. Due to increased demand, eligibility for on-campus psychiatric services is limited primarily to those students who are receiving ongoing treatment with a Counseling Center therapist.” —Health Services website, accessed November 1, 2014.

As evidenced here, Syracuse University's Psychiatric Services have changed to a short-term model, which forces more students to have to look to the larger community for support with medications. There are few psychiatrists who accept insurance in the community, and even if one can pay out of pocket, there are long waits, and many local psychiatrists are not accepting patients. It is also a challenge getting off-campus to see these psychiatrists. This short-term psychiatric model is leading students to go without psychiatric care.

6.6. The Counseling Center must provide information about all options so that students are able to make informed decisions.¹¹ “I at first was not told about the option to go to the hospital, and then I was not told enough about it to make an informed decision.”

Administrative Response 11/7/14: In regards to mental health emergencies, the Counseling Center staff relies on hospitalization in cases where students are assessed as a potential risk to themselves or others and the student is not able to identify ways to make themselves safer. Counseling Center staff will only discuss hospitalization when the student is unable to identify other strategies for reducing possible risk level, and hospitalization is typically seen as the last option. In such cases, it is the expectation of Counseling Center staff to fully inform the student of what will occur at the hospital and why hospitalization is deemed necessary. In regards to

¹¹An undergrad student wrote, “I at first was not told about the option to go to the hospital, and then I was not told enough about it to make an informed decision.”

sexual violence, it is the expectation of Counseling Center staff to fully inform students what will occur at the hospital, to explain the student's rights and options regarding what will occur at the hospital, and in many cases, accompany the student to the hospital.

GB Response 11/9/14: Unfortunately, these policies have not been implemented, as is evident in the anecdotal evidence in our grievances. It is necessary that staff be (re)briefed NOW on the importance of making students fully aware of what hospitalization entails. These policies and procedures should be posted visibly, transparently, to people that require these services and the staff be held accountable for upholding these standards; currently, several students have reported not being briefed on what hospitalization entails. These incidences are dangerous and unacceptable. Failure to comply with these standards must result in additional training.

6.7. Non-Emergency medical transportation must be made available for mental as well as physical health appointments and services.¹²

6.7.1. immediately

Administrative Response 11/7/14: Emergency transportation is available for all emergent mental health and physical health concerns. By law, transportation for emergencies needs to be provided by an ambulance. If a student requires emergency transport, our ambulance will respond to the call and provide transportation. Non-emergency transport for both physical and mental health needs may be provided by either Medical Transport or the Dept of Public Safety depending on the individual situation.

- [Senior VP Reed Kantrowitz]

GB Response 11/9/14: While THE General Body appreciates the administration stating their policy, this is not reflective of the student experience with medical transport services. A commitment to address this discrepancy is necessary to meet the needs of the student body. Non-emergency transport is the issue at hand: in order to have access to counseling in the community, regular, consistent, and accessible transportation must be available for those with mental health concerns. It is not accurate that non-emergency transport is currently provided by Medical Transport, because several individuals have reported asking MTS for this transport to regular therapy appointments and being told it is unavailable for those with "non-medical needs". Noncompliance to these standards will result in review of position or termination depending on continuance and severity.

6.8. The Counseling Center must expand its full-time professional staff, its office hours, the length of counseling sessions, and the number of sessions offered to students.

6.8.1. by the start of the Fall 2015 semester

Administrative Response 11/7/14: The Counseling Center's accrediting agency (International Association of Counseling Services) requires a counselor to student ratio of 1:1,500, and recommends a ratio of 1:1,000. The Counseling Center is currently staffed by 17 full-time clinicians. Based on an enrollment figure of 21,000 students, the Counseling Center's staff to student ratio is 1:1,235. Although the staffing pattern falls within the accrediting agency's recommendations, given the high percentage of students utilizing the SU Counseling Center services, the office would benefit

¹² An undergrad student wrote, "I am sure that the school means no harm in the way it has mental health set up here. However, the way it is currently can absolutely cause harm. I am very lucky to still be here today and to be able to talk to you about this. I could not have been so lucky. I do not use my experience to guilt you, only to let you know of the absolute importance of this issue. Things need to change, and they must change as soon as possible. Thank you for reading this."

from increased staffing such that the office would meet the recommended 1:1,000 ratio. Increased staff size would allow for expanded office hours and greater number of sessions being offered to students. Current counseling sessions are typically 45-60 minutes, which is consistent with appointment lengths across contexts in which counseling is provided. Group counseling appointments typically last 90 minutes, which is again consistent with appointment lengths across all contexts in which group counseling is provided. We are working on a staffing and funding plan that will begin to address this issue.

- [Senior VP Reed Kantrowitz]

GB Response 11/9/14: According to the University, the enrollment of SU is 21,000 students, with 17 counselors in the Counseling Center. The ratio of SU students to counselors is 1:1,235. However, the Counseling Center serves both SU and ESF campuses, with a combined enrollment of 23,517 (with 1,650 undergraduates and 600 graduate students from ESF, according to the ESF welcome page at: <http://www.esf.edu/welcome/facts.htm>). With the same 17 counselors, the ratio goes up to 1:1,383. For a 1:1,000 ratio, between 6 and 7 counselors would need to be hired. For 23 counselors (the original 17 plus 6 new ones) the ratio would be 1:1,023; for 24 counselors (the original 17 plus 7 new ones) the ratio would be 1:980.

6.9. The Counseling Center must clarify its policies regarding how they make their decisions about who they agree to see, and who they send out into the community.

Administrative Response 11/7/14: Decisions regarding who to see as opposed to who to refer to the community are based upon a variety of factors unique to each individual, including severity of reasons for seeking counseling, need for specialized care, and access to health insurance and transportation. The Counseling Center will work to provide greater clarity and consistency regarding how these decisions are made.

[Senior VP Reed Kantrowitz]

GB Response 11/9/14: How does the Counseling Center intend to provide better clarity and consistency regarding how these decisions are made? Will it be on the website, in email, a chart?

The Counseling Center must work to make sure that it can meet the needs of nearly all students. It is often extremely difficult to see a therapist off-campus, as evidenced by the many anecdotes indicating the challenges involved in this. This goes along with hiring seven new therapists, as stated above.

Additionally, we have become aware from an RA that The Counseling Center has a policy around not believing the suicidal ideation of a student when they are intoxicated, which is resulting in students who consistently express suicidal desires when intoxicated to be unable to get care. You can see, we hope, that the situation with The Counseling Center, and the clarity and non-clarity around it needs to be explained and clarified as soon as possible. These are truly life and death matters. This is no place for obfuscation or saving face.

We want to see the records which show the median wait time for students to initially see counselors face to face at The Counseling Center. We want to see the numbers for those who are turned away based on the number of those who make initial contact with The Counseling Center.

6.10. If a student is sent out into the community, the Counseling Center must follow up to make sure that student has found adequate support within one month.

Administrative Response 11/7/14: In many circumstances, Counseling Center staff arrange

follow-up meetings and/or phone consultations with students who have been referred into the community to insure that the student's needs have been met.

- [Senior VP Reed Kantrowitz]

GB Response 11/9/14: The acknowledgment that in many circumstances, the Counseling Center staff arrange follow-up meetings and/or phone consultations with students who have been referred into the community is simply not sufficient to ensure the welfare of *all* SU/ESF students. This is because you are claiming this is done in *many* circumstances, but this is inconsistent with the qualitative evidence we have received.

Additionally, we ask that, for every three counselors, there be one case manager hired, to act essentially as a mental health advocate. The role of this case manager would be to ensure continuity of services for students at SU and ESF going from the Counseling Center to psychiatric and counseling services within the community. The case manager would be charged with facilitating continuous support of high-quality psychiatry and psychotherapy, through ensuring a robust fit between these relationships and the students' insurance, financial, and transportation needs. As soon as a student enters the counseling center, the case manager will begin working to find the proper fit for mental health services within the services available in the community.

6.11. A workgroup established to look at mental health concerns and necessary structural changes in the campus mental health system.

6.11.1. Beginning immediately

Administrative Response 11/7/14: Leadership in Health & Wellness in the Division of Student Affairs is committed to reviewing and seeking input on how to best provide services to students.

GB Response 11/9/14: We ask that students be represented in this workgroup by the same percentage laid out in section 1.8.6 for Fast Forward committees: 1/3 of the group must be composed of students, and 2/3 of those students must be undergraduates. We also ask that action on this be taken immediately. We are glad to hear that there is a commitment to reviewing services and seeking input, but ask for a concrete commitment that Leadership in Health and Wellness will begin to reach out to students immediately to form this workgroup.

7. A safe, supportive space for international students on this campus, and their voices must be included in discussion.

- 7.1. It must be understood that not holding US citizenship does not mean international students are not also members of this community and do not suffer from systems of oppression.
- 7.2. More diversity in the staff of The Slutzker Center of International Services, and hire people who have experiences in marginalization.
- 7.3. Including international students in diversity training programs.
- 7.4. Eg. Not referring to a broad "We" when professors address students in classroom.

Administrative Response 11/7/14: We are committed to supporting our international students and greatly value their presence on campus as an integral and integrated part of our community. We will continue to look for ways to enhance the international student experience within this community of difference and beyond across the entire student body.

GB Response 11/9/14: We ask that the administration commit to concrete steps for reaching out to hire new people at this office, beginning in the Spring semester of 2015, and ask that international students be engaged in the same diversity and inclusion trainings outlined in section 2.5.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: The Strategic Planning process includes “Enhancing Internationalization” as one of the seven workgroups, and these issues are squarely in the charge for that body (whose membership will be enhanced). The relevant work to be done in the University Strategic Planning process will then feed into specific plans for supporting and ensuring the success of our international students.

8. Complete the search for an Asian/Asian American Studies Minor Director.

- 8.1. The Director should be qualified with regard to his or her academic concentration and expertise with an emphasis on Asian American Studies, not just Asian Studies.
- 8.2. The Director should be committed full-time to the advancement of the Asian/Asian American Studies Minor.
- 8.3. The Director should hold a tenure-track faculty position within the University in addition to the Director position.
- 8.4. Involve interested students, faculty, and staff in the search for the Asian/Asian American Studies Minor.

8.4.1. by the end of the Spring 2015 semester

Administrative Response 11/7/14: Needs and directions for all academic units are being determined in the strategic planning process, which is being conducted at the University-level this year and will be done in the schools and colleges early in the 2015-16 academic year.

GB Response 11/9/14: We understand that this is a time-bound decision-making process but ask for a written commitment from the university that interested students, faculty, and staff will be engaged in the search process at that time. We also need confirmation that the search will be within the parameters of 8.1-8.3. We believe this is in the university's best interest as the Asian-American studies minor--and the presence on campus of a tenure-track Asian-American studies professor--will attract students doing work in Asian-American studies and enrich academic life and reputation of the university.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: As stated, this will be addressed via the school and college phase of the strategic planning process in the 2015-16 academic year.

9. Add “Hate Speech (speech that attacks a person or group on the basis of attributes such as gender, ethnic origin, religion, race, disability, or sexual orientation)” to the student code of conduct as words that are prohibited on this campus.

- 9.1. Currently, the Student Code of Conduct states: Harassment, whether physical or verbal, oral or written, which is beyond the bounds of protected free speech, directed at a specific individual(s) easily constructed as “fighting words,” and likely to cause immediate breach of the peace.
- 9.2. *immediately*

Administrative Response 11/7/14: We believe that the current language of the current Student Code of Conduct, as well as the University’s Code of Ethical Conduct, provides sufficient direction of speech as conduct that violates University’s policies.

GB Response: 11/9/14: We are concerned that the existing language is not sufficient, and feel strongly that in light of the Hanna Strong incident and the prevalence of hateful micro- and macro-aggressive behavior on campus (as detailed in section 3 of this document), this language would show a commitment on the part of the university to preventing hate speech.

Meeting Notes from 11/10/14 with Rebecca Reed Kantrowitz, Bea Gonzalez, Eric Spina and TGB:

We want actual consequences for using words against people. They don't include that.

RRK: I can commit to having that reevaluated by Pam Peters, director of SRR, like to bring it to the univ conduct board. Diverse group of students, have them vet that, best practice research. We are always looking at code of conduct.

With new incidences highlighted importance of why it needs to be in there. Current policy gets used against those who have been oppressed.

Danielle: One woman called a derogatory word but she got punished for calling the girl a b when she was called a cultural racial slur. Current policy is so ambiguous so those students end up being the ones who get the consequence. Hopefully I can hold my temper and not respond, but what protection do I have if not?

Molly: How often get called faggot.

Administrative Response 11/12/14: We commit to continuing to review the Student Code of Conduct.

Appendix

Working Definitions

Diversity - the condition of having or being composed of differing elements; *especially* : the inclusion of different types of people (across categories of race, nationality, sexuality, gender identity, ability, documentation status, socioeconomic class, etc.) in a group or organization.

Marginalization - the process whereby something or someone is pushed to the edge of a group and accorded lesser importance. This is predominantly a social phenomenon by which a minority or subgroup is excluded, and their needs or desires ignored.

Minority or Marginalized Group - any group that is socially defined as different from the dominant group in society, is at a power disadvantage, receives less than its proportionate share of scarce resources due to its power disadvantage, and finds its differential treatment justified in terms of socially defined differences.

Institutional Oppression - the systematic mistreatment of people within a social identity group, supported and enforced by the society and its institutions, solely based on the person's membership in the social identity group.

Intersectional - the idea that systems of oppression are interlocking, affect one another, and cannot be separated, creating different relationship and power dynamics for all persons

Microaggression - subtle, often daily instances (such as actions, comments, physical movements) where systems of oppression are reinforced and perpetuated. Microaggressions are often accidental and well-intentioned by the people who inflict them, but nonetheless still belittle, alienate, and harm students who already face marginalization. The person targeted with covert oppression may not even realize that an oppressive act has occurred until after the fact, nor be aware of who committed the act.

Major and/or Significant - anything that affects the student body, at the discretion of student body representatives.

Transparency - accessible information about changes prior to finalization and implementation, student involvement and consultation in the decision-making and change process, diverse student representation at the table and respect for the will of governing bodies such as the Student Association, Graduate Student Organization and the University Senate in addition to the larger student and faculty bodies.

Tokenize - To make a member of a marginalized and/or oppressed group a spokesperson for that entire group, usually for the benefit of a larger, more privileged group.

Oppression - a relationship between groups or people in which a dominant group benefits from the systematic abuse, exploitation, and injustice directed toward a subordinate group.

Privilege - a power imbalance in which neither physical force nor the use of law is the main mechanism of oppression; a system of advantages afforded based on identity categories and group membership; privilege is often invisible to those who have it.