



THE General Body is a movement and coalition of Syracuse University students organizing for change in the administration. Our primary areas of focus are the lack of transparency and lack of support for diversity on campus. Some of the issues around which we are organizing include, but are not limited to, the mishandling of the closure of the Advocacy Center, the defunding of POSSE, the overriding of the Student Association's and the University Senate's resolution to divest from fossil fuels, inadequate mental health support, and the unsupportive and unsafe environment for students with marginalized identities.¹

Grievances

Transparency - On many occasions, the administration has not been transparent.

- 1. The university administration has not given advance communications about changes to university services and the reasons behind them. The administration does not respect governance groups on campus or the honest input of the larger campus community in general. There has been a pattern of closed-door decisions without large or diverse student representation. The top-level administration is not being sincere with its plans to strengthen student democracy and seems to be working in the opposite direction**
 - 1.1. Fast Forward, the framework for rapid university-wide change over the next year, is largely devoid of diverse student input.**
 - 1.1.1. Between the 7 Fast Forward Workgroups, there are a total of 93 seats at the table. Of these, only 11 are students.
 - 1.1.1.1. Of these, only 6 are undergraduates.
 - 1.1.1.2. Of these, none represent students in the School of Education, the College of Visual and Performing Arts, the School of Information Studies, the College of Engineering and Computer Science, or the College of Architecture.
 - 1.1.1.3. These students were handpicked by the administration.

¹Please note that this is a living document. In gathering this information, we knew we were limited by the information we had access to. Since we initially presented the document on November 3, 2014, we have heard from numerous other groups with further serious grievances and demands. When these relate to issues of diversity and transparency, we are working to include them.

1.2. All non-academic units and sections of the university have been asked to produce a report detailing how they would implement 10% and 20% cuts to their staff.

- 1.2.1. These requests started in August 2014 as part of the Operational Excellence component of Fast Forward and are ongoing for all areas. This report is also to include information on whether these changes can be made while still preserving the current service level to students, faculty, and staff.
- 1.2.2. There is considerable confusion over the nature of these cuts. It is widely seen as inevitable that these cuts will occur, and no public statements have been forthcoming about this potentiality. As students, we fear the closure or diminished capacity of the resource and service centers we use across campus.

1.3. The Advocacy Center

- 1.3.1. The closure of the Advocacy Center, which provided sexual assault survivor support, advocacy, education and prevention, was announced one business day beforehand surreptitiously in an email attachment over the summer on May 30, 2014. See appendix.^{A1}
 - 1.3.1.1. One Advocacy Center staff member was completely let go and not rehired by the university. She only received one business day's notice before clearing her desk. The other two employees were also given little to no notice.
- 1.3.2. 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.
- 1.3.3. We have not been told exactly who was involved in the process of closing the Advocacy Center. See appendix.^{A2}
 - 1.3.3.1. Contrary to statements from the administration, the student body does not know who was consulted in this decision. We do know that it was primarily top-level administrators making a crucial decision without consulting critical constituents.
 - 1.3.3.2. We also know that this model of dominance is similar to the stripping of agency from victims of sexual assault by perpetrators and the institutional structures that further shame and dehumanize the survivor and their needs.
- 1.3.4. The campus community still has not gotten a straightforward explanation for why the Center was closed.
 - 1.3.4.1. 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. See appendix.^{A3}
 - 1.3.4.2. Originally, the closure of the Advocacy Center was presented to students as a "consolidation of services," however, it is most likely that this decision was made for legal reasons, over the interpretation of Title IX, in an effort to maintain client confidentiality. However, many other universities and organizations, including Vera House, do not agree that this was the proper interpretation of Title IX. Furthermore, the White House has released information making it clear its new guidelines should

- not be interpreted as to shut down any centers such as the Advocacy Center². See appendix.^{A4}
- 1.3.5. The new structure of sexual assault services was not in place when the Advocacy Center was closed. This left numerous gaps in services, with no advocacy, no one who would meet with students away from the Counseling Center or off campus. This is outrageous considering that a primary reason given for its closure was to enable the best possible confidentiality for students seeking sexual assault services.
- 1.3.5.1. Furthermore, the services have continued to shift over time, with little and/or confusing communication from administration about the available services. This has left students confused about what services are available.
- 1.3.5.2. The campus community does not have easy access to aggregate data regarding sexual and relationship violence at SU, and thus is poorly informed on the state of gendered violence on campus.
- 1.3.5.2.1. We have become aware that although the administration is claiming that they now provide full advocacy and prompt attention for sexual assault survivors, recent survivor accounts prove something else—long waits, not being met away from the Counseling Center (its location being on Frat Row), and not providing actual advocacy services.
- 1.3.5.2.2. There are still many bathrooms around campus that have not received the new stickers explaining the changed services.³
- 1.3.6. The administration held two listening meetings over the summer, when the vast majority of students were not on campus.
- 1.3.6.1. Despite stressing the importance of hearing student concerns and attending listening meetings, the Chancellor has not been present for any of the three meetings that were held both over the summer and during the fall semester. See appendix.^{A5}
- 1.3.6.2. Chancellor Syverud’s comments concerning the Advocacy Center closure at the first Fast Forward Syracuse Town Hall were callous; the pain he mentions as an administrator is nothing compared to those affected by the decision. Also worth noting is the phrase “evaluate carefully.” A careful evaluation would have brought all parties involved into the discussion about how to address the “changing world” and its changing demands on universities in regards to sexual assault. See appendix.^{A6}
- 1.3.6.3. The administration has not apologized for either the closure of the Advocacy Center, or the process by which it was closed. Chancellor Syverud has even gone so far as to state that he “can never apologize” for it. See appendix.^{A7} This is in stark contrast to Syverud’s August 8, 2014 email to faculty and staff with the subject line, ‘Apology,’ sent out after creating minor changes to the parking permit policy and university travel policy. See appendix.^{A8}

²<http://www.localsyr.com/story/d/story/students-balk-at-sus-sexual-assault-services-reorg/40114/Gc7PHNb5bU-jhQoUJuGeoQ> June 24, 2014

³ The new stickers are incredibly confusing. Since every service comes under the heading of ‘privileged’ and ‘confidential,’ intended to apply to just the Counseling Center, it could appear that the services below that, such as DPS or Title IX coordinator, are also privileged and confidential.

- 1.3.6.4. We have further reason to fear that the administration may make major changes in the same manner in the future. Syverud has been asked, “Can you make a commitment to never close down a center like this, vital to students, again in this way without consent, without figuring out a replacement plan?” Syverud refused. See appendix.^{A9}

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

- 1.4.1. 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.
- 1.4.2. 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.

1.5. Divest SU

- 1.5.1. In March 2014 the Divest SU campaign sent a formal request for divestment from fossil fuels to the SU administration.
- 1.5.2. On April 29, 2013 the Syracuse University Student Association passed a resolution in support of fossil fuel divestment.
- 1.5.3. On April 16, 2014 the University Senate passed a similar resolution in support of fossil fuel divestment.
- 1.5.4. 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.
- 1.5.5. 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.

1.6. POSSE

- 1.6.1. Three years ago, a contract between the Posse Foundation, a leadership- and merit-based scholarship, and Syracuse University was signed, bringing 3 posses from Miami, Los Angeles and Atlanta for 5 years.
- 1.6.2. During the summer of 2014, the administration decided to change the contract without consulting or informing any Posse scholar about the new changes.
- 1.6.3. The changes had already been established months before informing any scholar or city office.
- 1.6.4. No justification was given to students for these changes.
- 1.6.5. POSSE budget cut informing process was highly flawed

1.6.5.1.1. “The way in which Posse scholars were informed of the budget cuts was insensitive. The new liaison that informed the Posse scholars from all Posses was unable to answer most of the questions that the scholars had. Some Posses knew about the cuts prior to the meeting, but others did not and were alarmed by the information shared. The way in which the information was shared strays away from one of Posse’s core values- family. The setting where the information was shared was not intimate; the meeting was held in the lobby of the life sciences building. There was a lot of confusion, no one knew what was truly going on. This was especially overwhelming for the Posse 3 scholars who were not only concerned about the future of Posse on campus, but also were adjusting to college and being away from their families.” —Student in the Posse Program, October 26, 2014.

1.7. 601 Tully Community Arts Center

- 1.7.1. Funding was suddenly cut to 601 Tully, a community-arts program which was originally created as an SU initiative to bring a community-teaching-arts space in one of the poorest areas of the country⁴. 601 Tully opened in 2011⁵. The university suddenly announced that it would not continue the yearly sum of \$200,000 which former Chancellor Nancy Cantor had earmarked for 601 Tully.
- 1.7.2. Those employed through 601 could keep their jobs only as long as University policy required, but would lose them immediately thereafter. The “last-minute decision” would eliminate two salaried positions, said Marion Wilson, director of 601 Tully and an associate professor of arts education. That means programs that students and community members depend on — including a summer camp for area youth — are in limbo.
- 1.7.3. 601 Tully procured hundreds of signatures and letters of support in defense of keeping 601 running, but to no avail.⁶

1.8. The new University Mission/Vision Statement.⁷⁸ See appendix.^{A11}

- 1.8.1. 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.
- 1.8.2. 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.
- 1.8.3. 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.
- 1.8.4. The phrase “We provide access to opportunity” has been deleted from the proposed Vision Statement⁹.

⁴ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Near_Westside,_Syracuse#cite_note-5

⁵ <http://www.saltdistrict.com/2011/06/601-tully-opens/>

⁶ <http://dailyorange.com/2014/04/in-flux-decrease-in-money-leaves-601-tullys-future-uncertain/>

⁷ <http://fastforward.syr.edu/strategic-plan/mission-and-vision-statements/>

⁸ See Proposed New Mission/Vision Statements in appendix.^{A11}

- 1.8.4.1. 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.
- 1.8.5. 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.””¹⁰
- 1.8.6. Includes less language about diversity than the previous iteration.
 - 1.8.6.1. 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.
 - 1.8.6.2. There is no reference to “community engagement” in the current proposed version. They have removed “public good” from the statements.
 - 1.8.6.2.1. 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.’
 - 1.8.6.2.2. 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.”¹¹
 - 1.8.6.2.3. We cannot step back from community engagement and commitment to the “public good.”

1.9. Socially Responsible Investment Committee

- 1.9.1. This committee involves three students - two undergraduates and one graduate. The committee has nine members total.
 - 1.9.1.1. While this is a better ratio than many groups, no one from Divest SU was asked (or allowed) to speak in front of the committee when divestment was discussed.
- 1.9.2. There is no variance on the membership of the committee - it must be the GSO and SA Presidents, and one additional undergrad appointed by the SA President.
- 1.9.3. No possibility currently exists to have more students in front of this committee, or on this committee.

1.10. Dean searches

- 1.10.1. Dean search committees are formed to hire new Deans when necessary.
 - 1.10.1.1. Currently we are in the process of (or will be soon) of hiring new Deans of Arts & Sciences, Education, Engineering, and the Library.
- 1.10.2. In general, the Provost (Eric Spina) names the members of the search committees based on recommendations from people under him, but who serves on these committees is ultimately his call.

⁹ <http://www.syr.edu/about/vision.html>

¹⁰ http://www.syr.edu/chancellor/selected_works/scholarship.html

¹¹ <http://onliteracy.org/uploadeddocs/SyracuseNYCSAP.pdf>

- 1.10.2.1. The Provost has already stated in an email to the GSO (in response to an email sent to him) that while he will give serious consideration to the names the GSO puts forward, he retains the right to pick whoever he thinks is most appropriate, even if they are not nominated by the GSO.
- 1.10.3. For Arts & Sciences, the GSO was asked for names, none of whom were picked. SA was not asked at all. Neither group was asked for representatives for Education. For Engineering, GSO was asked for a name, it is unknown if they were selected. SA was not asked. For the Library, no call for representatives has yet been sent (the committee is unformed as of writing).
- 1.10.3.1. In this manner, student representatives are not representative of the body they represent and have no connection to the governance group of their constituents, allowing administrators to isolate these student committee members.

1.11. Teaching Assistants are grossly underpaid.

- 1.11.1. 59% of TAs are paid below the living wage level for the Syracuse area. The current minimum of \$13,000 per year falls well below this living wage.

Diversity - The university is not a safe space for individuals with marginalized identities.

1. The university administration does not acknowledge, and contributes to, the generally hostile environment for marginalized students perpetrated by students, faculty, and staff.

- 1.1. In Fall 2013, signs on the grassy knoll for the Trans* Day of Remembrance were vandalized (torn down, stepped on, spat upon, and stolen).
 - 1.1.1. The administrative response to this was framed as “I’m sorry this happened to you” rather than acknowledging it as an attack on the larger campus community, or acknowledging the transphobic campus climate.
 - 1.1.2. Email from Eric Spina, Rebecca Reed Kantowitz, and Kal Aston urged students, faculty and staff to read the letter from Dr. Chase Catalano, Director of the LGBT Resource Center, and to engage in dialogue, rather than releasing their own letter on the violence faced by the trans* community.
 - 1.1.2.1. No formal dialogue was offered/held/initiated by senior administration
- 1.2. In Fall 2014, #itooamSU signs on the grassy knoll were also stolen.
 - 1.2.1. The administration never acknowledged this incident, nor how it plays into the larger campus culture of racism.
- 1.3. The Chancellor claimed at the Express Yourself Forum that he had spoken to students of all marginalized groups.
 - 1.3.1. However, he did not talk to LGBT Resource Center staff or volunteers at the Cultural Center’s Welcome; visited LGBT Resource Center later, didn’t walk in past the entryway and stayed for no more than 5 minutes.
 - 1.3.2. Students at the center no longer feel supported or valued by the Chancellor.
- 1.4. **When Students have grievances, they do not have a safe, anonymous place to go to resolve or address these.**
 - 1.4.1. A student writes, “There should be some way for students to list grievances to the school regularly. There are all sorts of issues on campus that you probably don’t know about that I’m sure I don’t know about either, and I only know about the issues with mental health because of personal experience. Students should have

some way to contact the main administration to let them know when there is an issue. Otherwise, it cannot be fixed.”

- 1.5. **We are concerned about a potential drop in diversity among the student population under Chancellor Kent Syverud. See appendix.**^{A12} Chancellor Nancy Cantor made increasing cultural and socioeconomic diversity a priority: “Since Cantor took office in 2004, undergraduate enrollment increased by 22 percent. And, following a concerted effort to recruit students in urban centers, the number of poor and minority students has also increased significantly. A decade ago, less than a fifth of Syracuse students were from minority groups and less than a fifth were eligible for Pell Grants—a proxy for the number of low-income students. Now, about a third of students are minorities and about a quarter are Pell-eligible.”¹² However, Chancellor Syverud is prioritizing an increase in U.S. News rankings. As an article in Inside Higher Ed on January 16, 2014 states, Syverud “plans to make changes to the recruitment and admissions practices at Syracuse after he takes office.” Interestingly, although SU’s vice president for enrollment, Don Saleh, said “the university is not likely to make major changes to its recruitment pushes in urban areas, but it may pick up its recruitment efforts in the South,” the administration quickly cut down on its POSSE participation including cutting its recruitment in the South, a program which primarily brings in high-achieving student leaders of color from disadvantaged socioeconomic backgrounds.¹³
- 1.5.1. Furthermore, Chancellor Syverud’s record on diversity is frighteningly abysmal. He is the former Dean of the law school at Washington University in St. Louis, which “admits the lowest percentage of low-income students of any college of its kind in America.”¹⁴
- 1.5.2. It is no secret that the university under Syverud’s leadership is looking to decrease need-based aid and increase merit-based aid, aid which “generally benefits students from wealthier households.”¹⁵
- 1.6. **Lack of diversity in faculty.**
- 1.6.1. In terms of diversity among faculty, with our own research via the Office of Institutional Research, we were able to determine that among the full-time instructional at SU from 2013-2014, approximately 22.6% are of color.¹⁶ However, this number may be even lower, because there are 38 instructors listed as “Non-resident alien.” If we remove those instructors from the “of color” equation, it drops to 19%. Additionally, there are 560 part-time and adjunct faculty that demographic statistics are not released. Of the full-time faculty in 2013-2014, only 37.1% are women. However, when it comes to lesser-paying secretarial positions, 90% are held by women.¹⁷
- 1.6.1.1. Additionally, University demographics are based on US Census model and information, which only includes 5 racial categories; this erases the racial identities of students, faculty, and staff who do not fall into any of these categories (i.e. Middle Eastern or Arab) by classifying them as “white.”

¹² <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/01/06/syracuse-after-refusing-play-rankings-game-may-care-again>

¹³ http://www.syracuse.com/news/index.ssf/2014/09/syracuse_university_protest_posse_students_funding_race.html

¹⁴ <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/09/23/syracuse-u-curbs-work-program-help-urban-youth-attend-college>

¹⁵ <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/09/23/syracuse-u-curbs-work-program-help-urban-youth-attend-college>

¹⁶ https://oir.syr.edu/_private/asp/FS_Report.asp

¹⁷ <https://oir.syr.edu/Reporting/StEnroll.asp>

- 1.7. **Chancellor Kent Syverud does not fully comprehend what marginalization and oppression are, as evidenced by his comments at Forum on Diversity.**
 - 1.7.1. “When discussing the topic of different identities on campus, Syverud asked the audience, “What does it mean to be normal at Syracuse University?” He said that while some identities are considered privileged, he has not met anybody in his time at SU whose identity is not complex. Syverud added that he heard many students during the forum talk about feeling ostracized because of their identity, something that should not be part of the culture at SU. “The way to address exclusion and loneliness is not to privilege one complex identity over another,” Syverud said.”—Daily Orange, October 2, 2014.
 - 1.7.1.1. This is problematic because it implies that all students stand on equal ground in terms of their identities; this not only erases the inequalities and struggles faced by people with marginalized identities, but also constructs privilege and oppression as individual issues rather than systemic ones.
 - 1.7.2. “I am proud of Syracuse University students for [having jobs, working]. It is not easy. It requires time management skills and occasional loss of sleep. But the results are obvious to anyone who spends time interacting with Syracuse students. Because of all they do, they stack up well against those at any school. They are getting prepared, across all their activities, including their work, to lead every part of our world.”—Email from Kent Syverud, October 26, 2014.
 - 1.7.2.1. Not only does this statement trivialize student work by presenting it as the “occasional loss of sleep” (while students often sacrifice more than just sleep to be employed) and as another form of career preparation (which begs the question, why are these forms of employment not as valued as other forms?), but it also ignores the fact that students work because tuition and living expenses are so burdensome; many students will lose work-study financial aid options if they do not have a campus job.
- 1.8. **Cultural centers are understaffed, and have disproportionately large numbers of graduate assistants.**
 - 1.8.1. LGBT Resource Center- 3 full-time staff members, 1 Graduate Assistant
 - 1.8.2. Disability Cultural Center- 1 full-time staff member, 1 Graduate Assistant
 - 1.8.3. Slutzker Center for International Services- 13 full-time staff members, no Graduate Assistants
 - 1.8.4. Office of Multicultural Affairs- 12 full-time staff members, 3 Graduate Assistants
 - 1.8.5. These offices and their staffs are extremely small for the amount of students they serve.
 - 1.8.6. Turn-over rate and availability of Grad Assistants does not alleviate problems associated with centers being understaffed.
 - 1.8.7. Due to lack of funding allocated to professional development not all senior staff members are able to oversee a variety of programs, specifically at the Office of Multicultural Affairs.
- 1.9. **Sexual assault survivors are marginalized on campus.**
 - 1.9.1. In the 2013-2014 academic year, Title IX coordinator Cynthia Maxwell-Curtin didn’t want Take Back the Night to happen on campus; she said that if students discussed their assaults at SU during the “speak out” portion of the event, those incidents would be reportable. If these assaults were reported, it would mean

taking away agency from survivors, which is precisely the opposite of what Take Back the Night is intended for; it is not seen as reportable by any other Title IX coordinators.

- 1.9.2. Furthermore, there are national and local histories to Take Back the Night; the sense of community fostered therein is a part of the healing process. The removal of Take Back the Night would have prioritized the needs of the institution over the needs of survivors.
- 1.9.3. Cynthia Maxwell-Curtin does not have sufficient sexual assault advocacy training.
- 1.9.4. Rape and sexual assault are widespread on campus (nationally, 1 in 4 college women are victims of rape or attempted rape¹⁸; statistics are less available for men or trans* folks), and not taken seriously by administration. The Chancellor has not attended any of the three listening meetings to hear directly from survivors.

2. Violent, derogatory language and a general misunderstanding of privilege are normalized in the student body; current measures are woefully ineffective.

- 2.1. Walking across campus, it is likely that one will hear slurs and other violent language.¹⁹
- 2.2. A common sentiment among students with privileged identities is that there is “plenty of diversity,” because there are “so many black people here.”
- 2.3. Majority of student body comes from wealthy and privileged backgrounds, and are unable to understand their advantages over others. This breeds a very disrespectful atmosphere.
- 2.4. Derogatory graffiti lines bathroom stall walls as well as bulletin boards in residence halls, targeting many marginalized groups
 - 2.4.1. RAs are without the institutional support to address this issue; when brought to their attention, rarely is anything done.
 - 2.4.2. RAs in Flint Hall (a primarily freshman dorm) created a board dedicated to graffiti, which resulted in violent language, “slut-shaming,” and the objectification and sexualization of various female members of the residence hall community.

3. Microaggressions and macroaggressions are common and make for an unsafe learning environment.

- 3.1. Microaggressions and macroaggressions are symptoms of a larger system of oppression, inequity and power that need to be addressed.
- 3.2. Stop Bias aggregate data are not accessible to students.
- 3.3. Overt and covert oppressions exist within classroom settings and amongst the Syracuse University community.
- 3.4. Instances of covert oppressions are referred to as microaggressions. Instances of overt oppressions are referred to as macroaggressions.
- 3.5. In the recent past (within the last year), students have said and experienced the following (taken from Syracuse University Microaggressions,²⁰ a Facebook page started by an SU student):

¹⁸ <http://www.oneinfourusa.org/statistics.php>

¹⁹ “According to many friends and floormates, it is quite possible that when these are said, they are meant in a “humorous” way.” Student 10.20.2014. However, this language is intimidating, derogatory, and violent no matter its intended meaning.

²⁰ <https://www.facebook.com/SUmicroaggressions>

- 3.5.1. “When anthropology and religion classes conveniently leave out the LGBT community because 'it's simpler to just address the majority'. (dealing with heteronormativity, erasing experiences of gender and sexual diversity).
- 3.5.2. “Stumbling across sororities who want to raise money to 'cure' autism. My neurology does not need a cure.” (able-bodied privilege and neurotypical privilege, Western savior complex, treating autism—and subsequently, people with disabilities—as a disease)
- 3.5.3. “When there are no gender neutral bathrooms/showers so you are forced to use a gendered one and feel uncomfortable every second you are in there.” (institutional discrimination based on the gender binary, discriminatory against and harmful to trans* and gender nonconforming/genderqueer people)
- 3.5.4. “When the Chancellor sends out an email discussing how nice it is that so many students are working. Excuse me, I work to pay off this tuition and room and board which has become increasingly difficult to do without financial aid, by the way” (assumption that work is voluntary for students and not a means of survival, also assumes that most students are middle-upper class and work because they want to, not because they *need* to).
- 3.5.5. “My professor told me that one of the more appealing parts of my documentary is that my friend who's featured in it speaks with an 'exotic accent'.” (ethnocentrism—the professor places themselves as the norm, and everything else is the “other”; in this instance, the friend’s “exotic accent” only serves the purpose of supposedly enhancing the quality and entertainment value of the student’s documentary).
- 3.5.6. “When a white guy walks on the South bus saying "Remember that Rosa Parks thing? I'll sit to the front of the bus since it's Black Appreciation Month." Then proceeds to sit and laugh with friends” (a testament to how disconnected white students are to the experiences and histories of students of color—disregarded and trivialized Black History Month by calling it Black Appreciation Month instead).

4. Not all faculty or staff attend or participate in diversity trainings.

- 4.1. The administration has not protected the student body from these classroom aggressions by requiring diversity trainings; “academic freedom” is often used as an excuse. But this mitigates the student’s academic right to learn safely.
- 4.2. That faculty with tenure can not be obligated to undergo such trainings is also detrimental to the student body; classroom aggressions are thus allowed to continue and grow.

5. Senior administrative staff have not undergone adequate diversity trainings.

- 5.1. Administration, especially senior administrators, must understand the populations and communities of students they serve in order to provide needed programs, dialogues, and support.
- 5.2. Senior administrators have not gone through C.A.R.E. (Conversations Around Race and Ethnicity) or S.P.S.S (Safer People, Safer Spaces) trainings.
- 5.3. If the senior administration cannot set an example, this leaves all faculty and students not obligated to care by proxy. If they don’t set the example for the wider community, why should everyone else care?

6. **The university creates a hostile environment for students, faculty and staff with disabilities.**
 - 6.1. Recently the university hired Sasaki Associates to build a website for the Fast Forward Syracuse initiative which was inaccessible to people with disabilities (the problem was corrected eventually).
 - 6.2. The problems with basic disability compliance with the Americans with Disability Act at SU are too numerous to list. A few recent incidents should however suffice to highlight the urgency of the problem:
 - 6.2.1. A faculty member who uses a wheelchair was told he couldn't park next to his assigned classroom.
 - 6.2.2. A contractor working on renovations at Falk College told a member of the faculty that bringing an auditorium up to ADA code would not be part of the construction because "it's too expensive".
 - 6.2.3. Significant events are routinely staged without real time captioning or sign language interpretation and without consideration for accessible facilities.
 - 6.2.4. While small groups of faculty and staff have been urging the university to hire an experienced, full time ADA Coordinator **for over ten years now**, the university continues to treat disability access as an afterthought, which violates federal and state laws as well as our own campus ethos of inclusion.
 - 6.2.4.1. The university only has an interim ADA coordinator, who has a full-time job as Title IX coordinator. This is not adequate.
 - 6.2.5. Interpreting services are unavailable through the university, and are expensive. Additionally, the university will only pay for ASL interpreting services if the organizers of the event can prove that a deaf person will be in attendance, rendering many events inaccessible; that person must email the Office of Disability Services, placing the burden on the already-marginalized individual.
 - 6.2.6. Students with learning disabilities must approach professors individually in order to request accessibility. This requires the student to make themselves visible to others and compromises their privacy. Faculty have very little guidance from Disability Services, and often have difficulty accessing structural support.
 - 6.2.7. Events or trips off campus activities organized by offices, programs, classes, student and campus organizations exclude people with mobility impairments due to utilizing inaccessible vehicles.
 - 6.2.8. No enforcement to require course pertinent digital material (books, articles, movies) to be made accessible for people with sensory impairments. Instead, students need to go through The Office of Disability Services to make the class material accessible.
 - 6.2.9. Students with intellectual disabilities taking classes at Syracuse University through On Campus are routinely excluded from campus events and activities due to restricted transportation to and from Syracuse University and are excluded from living in the dormitories due to their non-matriculated, part-time status.
 - 6.2.10. The accessibility of academic, administrative, and dormitory buildings leaves much to be desired.
 - 6.2.10.1. Many dorm rooms and bathrooms are not accessible above the ground floor; students with disabilities should be integrated into all aspects of student living.
 - 6.2.10.2. Many buildings and classrooms around campus are partially or completely inaccessible (i.e.: Bursar's Office, Financial Aid Office, and offices on Ostrom Avenue).

7. There are too few accessible gender-neutral bathrooms on campus.

- 7.1. “In December 2012, SU alumna and then-student Erin Carhart conducted a study of gender-neutral bathrooms on campus. Of the 137 bathrooms in 17 of the most-trafficked buildings, only eight restrooms were single-occupancy and gender-neutral. The University Senate’s Committee on LGBT Concerns plans on discussing the lack of gender-neutral bathrooms when the committee meets on Wednesday.”²¹—Daily Orange, October 8, 2014
- 7.1.1. The lack of gender neutral bathrooms creates intense anxiety for students who are either trans*, non-binary, gender non-conforming, genderqueer, etc.
- 7.1.2. Not only would bathrooms benefit the LGBTQI community, but also parents with children, and persons with disabilities; this is not just an issue from a small faction of the SU community.
- 7.1.3. Risks not only include psychological harm (anxiety, depression from using the bathroom for sex assigned to you at birth), but also physical harm, including UTIs if forced to “hold it,” or possible physical or sexual assault, which affects the trans* community disproportionately, especially trans* women.

8. Students with marginalized identities have experienced discrimination by DPS.

- 8.1. It is unclear as to which administrative entities oversee DPS conduct; as DPS is intended to be a resource for reporting discrimination, this prevents students with such experiences from speaking out.
- 8.2. There are no clear and readily available form cases for students to access in terms of reporting harassment by the recognized state executive body.
- 8.2.1. Thus there is a lack of sufficient data to support such claims that DPS is negatively and disproportionately targeting students of marginalized identities.
- 8.3. The campus community was not consulted on the new DPS cameras.
- 8.4. That the cameras can be turned off is problematic, considering negative student experiences with DPS.

9. Students in need of mental health support are not given necessary resources.

- 9.1. The Counseling Center provides short term therapy. Although Counseling Center Director Cory Wallack claimed on June 23, 2014 (at the first Listening Meeting about the closure of the Advocacy Center) that the Counseling Center does not operate on a short-term model, this is anecdotally known among students, as well as made clear in the Counseling Center’s website: “Students are seen for confidential individual counseling, on a short-term basis, to discuss concerns related to personal, educational, relationship, family, substance abuse, and other social or emotional problems. The number of sessions is based on the student's need and the therapist's judgment. Students who would benefit from ongoing counseling will be assisted in finding an appropriate therapist in the community.”—The Counseling Center website, accessed October 29, 2014.
- 9.1.1. The short term nature of the therapy is prohibitive for some to even consider, as they would prefer to establish a long-term connection with a therapist.
- 9.1.1.1. The other longer-term option, the Psychological Health Services Center, is largely staffed by student trainees. This is something not all are open to, for various reasons.
- 9.1.1.1.1. “For me, as an older grad student, I want to be seen by someone who has years of experience as a therapist, not someone who is

²¹ <http://dailyorange.com/2014/10/su-should-install-gender-neutral-bathrooms/>

still in training. But I don't want to go the Counseling Center because I have heard so many stories of people being turned away, and anyway, I don't want to just have short-term therapy. I need a long-term relationship while I am navigating life at SU."—Student, October 27, 2014.

- 9.2. There is not enough staff at the Counseling Center to fully serve the entire student body.
 - 9.2.1. Students have reported not being able to find counselors who reflect their identities (racial, gender, sexual, etc.), and are thus uncomfortable seeking services.
- 9.3. Many students have had poor experiences with Counseling Center therapists.
 - 9.3.1. A student was given homework by a Counseling Center therapist that she was not actually consulted about whether that was the work she herself wanted to focus on.
- 9.4. Numerous loopholes and barriers prevent students from being able to access needed mental health services.
 - 9.4.1. There are obstacles to accessing psychiatric care.
 - 9.4.1.1. See testimony of Sherie Ramsgard, Psychiatric nurse, formerly employed in Health Services to provide psychiatric care to SU/ESF students, in appendix.^{A13}
 - 9.4.1.2. Students could not get their psychiatric medications renewed because of this lack of direct access to Psychiatric Services because they were denied access to the Counseling Center, the gatekeeper to Psychiatric Services. See appendix.^{A14}
 - 9.4.1.2.1. "...last year I used to be able to walk into Health Services while having a panic attack or having problems with my medication and I would be able to see a psychiatrist immediately. I went into Health Services about a week ago having a bad panic attack and I asked if I could talk to somebody. The response was that since the psychiatry department had moved to the Counseling Center and the staff had been reduced, I couldn't talk to anyone and I would have to wait 3 weeks to make an appointment to speak with somebody."—Student, October 14, 2014. See appendix.^{A15}
- 9.5. There is talk that Psychiatric Services are in danger of being cut, partly due to the administration's fears of liability. In order to even get to see a psychiatrist via Health Services, they recently changed the protocol. Originally, a new client could be referred by a nurse at Health Services. Then it was changed so that one must first go through the Counseling Center in order to be seen by a psychiatrist. This places an extra burden and time-delay on those services.
 - 9.5.1. There is currently only one psychiatrist at Health Services. A student writes, "Even if a student is already a patient of the psychiatrist, it's typically a three week wait to see them. The psychiatrist can only see patients for 30 minute appointments and only to check up on medications and prescribe other medications."
 - 9.5.2. The 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 extremely 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.²²

- 9.6. Students are regularly turned away from the Counseling Center. The reasons for this are not always articulated by the Counseling Center staff, but it seems it can be because the students are either deemed *not desperate enough* for help, or *too desperate*. These students then look for support in the larger community, often waiting for months to see a therapist, because many clinics and therapists are unavailable. In addition, many students cannot afford to see an outside therapist. In many cases, this leads to students giving up the search entirely. This forces students to go without the important support a therapist can provide.
 - 9.6.1. “The only reason I was seen by a counselor within two weeks was because I was given a special status as ‘semi-urgent’ and took precedence over many other students including one of my friends who was told it would take four weeks, and she still hasn’t seen anyone. If you want to be seen with any sort of immediacy, the counseling center has to perceive you as potentially being some sort of danger to yourself or others. And the only way I got to see an experienced counselor, not a student in training was also because of my special status.” —Student, October 24, 2014.
 - 9.6.2. “They really try to push you into group therapy even if it might not be helpful for you. I’m like, I’m here for social anxiety, why would that be good for me?”—Other student October 24, 2014.
 - 9.6.3. Students on campus have completely varied experiences re: the Counseling Center/Psychiatric services, and there’s a widespread sense of confusion and misinformation. This is also a transparency issue.
 - 9.6.4. Non-emergency medical transport is needed for mental health care, because counseling center does not see students long-term and directs students to inaccessible locations for mental health care. Currently, Medical Transport Services only brings students downtown/elsewhere for “medical” appointments. See appendix.^{A16}
 - 9.6.4.1. That mental health is not seen as important as physical health, or even as a medical issue, is deeply problematic on a college campus.

10. Health Services in general is disconnected from the student body. Students are often mistreated by the staff members who receive students coming with health-related problems.

- 10.1. “I once went to the health services because my contacts were hurting my eyes and my eyes were all swollen. When I went to the health services, the lady at the counter was openly mocking me (in a nasty way, not a personable way). She obviously told me no one could see me at first but then I requested harder so a nurse came to see me. But while I waited with my friend, the lady and a nurse openly, loudly started laughing at me, not with me, and started making jokes about how “stupid” the students are for having such minor problems.” (says a sophomore) - These receptionists are there to work for the students, the fact that they can behave this outrageously indicates that they may not have gone through sufficient professional trainings.”—Student, October 27, 2014 See appendix.¹⁷

²² “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.

- 11. In terms of seeking support for sexual assault services**, while the Counseling Center now claims it will provide unlimited sessions of support for any student who has experienced sexual assault, whether recently or anytime in the past, on campus or off, we do not believe the Counseling Center and the SRVR Team as of now can accommodate the amount of students who are survivors who might need this support. For instance, in the 2013-2014 school year, multiple students seeking counseling from the Counseling Center for trauma from prior sexual assaults were turned away, and told to seek help from local services. The waits for these services were many months; consequently they did not get the care they needed.
- 11.1. TAs and student employees are considered responsible employees, but are not trained in reporting sexual assaults if students talk to them. In addition, the university does not consider TAs to be employees for purposes of policies like workers' compensation insurance when they are not directly engaged in teaching duties. Yet student employees are expected to report all such cases regardless of whether they are "on university time" or not.
- 11.1.1. While we have been told that the new Sexual and Relationship Violence Response Team will fast-track any student in need of advocacy, and will meet the survivor at locations on campus rather than at The Counseling Center, members of the Chancellor's Workgroup on Sexual Violence Prevention, Education and Advocacy have recently heard from assault survivors who recently sought help and advocacy who are experiencing wait times of multiple weeks, not getting advocacy services, and were told they would not be able to meet anywhere besides the Counseling Center.
- 11.1.2. Additionally, the sense of community that characterized the Advocacy Center is absent at the Counseling Center, which takes a clinical approach to clients. This sense of community, for some, is an important part of healing. Until this sense of community can be restored, survivors will not be receiving the best possible care at Syracuse University.
- 12. On this campus, international students are only provided with one center that is specifically designed for their needs, the Slutzker Center of International Service, and it is inadequate.**
- 12.1. The staff often makes overgeneralizations of international students and lumps them all together as one homogenous group.
- 12.1.1. Eg. Saying "international students would not go near the LGBT Resource Center" The staff is often condescending and belittling in tone and attitude Eg. Talking slowly/loudly, specifically towards certain groups of people with certain accents.
- 12.2. There is an assumption that international students are ignorant about U.S. culture, as if they are all disconnected from mainstream Western influences.
- 12.2.1. Eg. At the International Student Orientation for new students, The Slutzker Center of International Services gives the students simplified pamphlets and booklets on U.S. culture.

Needs and Solutions

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

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

Signed immediately

- 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:**
 - 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.*
- 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*
- 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.
 - 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*
- 1.6. An official statement from administration promising that all recommendations and initiatives made by the Chancellor's Workgroup on Sexual Violence, Prevention, and Advocacy will be implemented, and in the timeline the Workgroup proposes.**
- 1.6.1. The SVPA 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.**
 - 1.6.3. *by the end of the Fall 2014 semester*
- 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*
- 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. The same ratio must also be true of the Fast Forward Steering Committee.
 - 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*

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*

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.*

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

1.11.1. *immediately*

2. The student body demands that faculty, staff, students, and administrators 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 demands:

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*

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. **Syracuse University must 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*

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*

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*

- 2.5. Conversations Around Race and Ethnicity (CARE)/Safer People Safer Spaces (SPSS) trainings for all senior administrators, as well as ongoing diversity training.²³**
- 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
- 2.6. Mandatory CARE and SPSS trainings for DPS, Conduct Board Members, Academic Advisers, Department Chairs, Faculty, Elected Student Association representatives, RAs, and executive boards of RSOs.**
- 2.6.1. *by the end of the Spring 2015 semester*
- 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*
- 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*
- 2.9. Commitment to hire more faculty of color.**
- 2.10. Commitment to recruit more students of color representative of U.S. demographics.**
- 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:
- 2.11.3. **We would like all first year students to take an online Diversity Training course during the summer before they come to Syracuse.**
- 2.11.4. 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.
- 2.11.5. *for Summer 2015*
- 2.11.5.1. **Creation of a mandatory university-wide curriculum requirement.**
- 2.11.5.1.1. *by the start of the Fall 2015 semester*
- 2.11.5.1.2. Students could fulfill this requirement through coursework from a pre-approved list of courses from specific departments such as

²³ 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.

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.

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

2.11.5.1.4. 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 on the new students that Syracuse University is a safe space for students of all backgrounds.

2.11.5.1.5. by the start of Fall 2015 semester

2.11.5.2. Expansion of the Intergroup Dialogue Program

2.11.5.2.1. in terms of funding, number of facilitators, number of sections per semester.

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

2.11.5.2.3. 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.

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

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

2.11.5.2.6. by the start of the Fall 2015 semester

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

2.12. Student center that houses the LGBT, 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.

2.13. Revise “No place for hate” to include “No place for silence” and encourage empowered bystanders.²⁴

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

²⁴ 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.

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

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*

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*

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) and specifically in regards to what constitutes a request to end/ shut down a private house or apartment social event.

- 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).
- 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.).
 - 2.17.3.1. There is no official document for the joint collaborative effort that can be accessed for the relationship between DPS and SPD, especially in regards to ending social events on and off campus.
- 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.
- 2.17.5. *By the end of the Spring 2015 semester*

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*

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*

2.20. Commitment to being a world-wide 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.²⁵
- 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*
- 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*
- 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*
- 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*
 - 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

²⁵ <http://web.mit.edu/surveys/casatips/develop.html>; http://web.mit.edu/surveys/casatips/CASA_2014_Student_Final.pdf
 THE General Body Grievances, Needs and Solutions, and Appendix November 9, 2014 24

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)

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

2.24.3.1. *by the start of the ADA Coordinator position*

2.24.3.2. \$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.

2.24.3.3. *by the start of the spring 2015 semester*

2.24.3.4. \$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.

2.24.3.5. *by the start of the fall 2015 semster*

2.24.3.6. 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.

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

2.24.4. 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.

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

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*

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.

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

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.²⁶
- 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, 2013.²⁷
 - 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*

6. Better mental health services and support.

- 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*
- 6.3. There must be more than one psychiatrist on campus. If 1 in 4 students have mental health issues, and there are 20,000 students on campus, this means there is one psychiatrist serving 5,000 students. This is unacceptable.
 - 6.3.1. *At least one more psychiatrist must be hired by December 1, 2014*
- 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.
- 6.5. Psychiatrists must see students on an ongoing basis, rather than short-term.
- 6.6. The Counseling Center must provide information about all options so that students are able to make informed decisions.²⁸ "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."
- 6.7. Emergency medical transportation must be made available for mental as well as physical health emergencies.²⁹
 - 6.7.1. *immediately*

²⁶See, official AAUP statement here: <http://suaaup.org/>

²⁷<http://sumagazine.syr.edu/2013fall-winter/features/cantor.html>

²⁸An 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."

²⁹An 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."

- 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*
 - 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.
 - 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.
 - 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*
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.
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*
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*

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.

A1. Kent Syverud's May 30, 2014 email to students, faculty and staff:

Dear Orange Friends:

A couple of weeks ago I shared with you some changes and new initiatives, and said I was working on additional changes in other areas.

I attach a memo describing the remaining changes that are being made, and describing some new things that are happening at the University. I do not expect to announce any more such changes for the remainder of the summer.

Thank you again for your dedication and commitment to Syracuse University and for all you do to make this such a great place to be.

Memo available at: <http://syr.edu/news/5-30-14-ChancellorMemo.pdf>

A2. In a private email dated July 4, 2014, responding to questions from a concerned student who had come away from the first Listening Meeting with many questions, Senior Vice President and Dean of Student Affairs at SU Rebecca Reed Kantowitz wrote that, "We carefully reviewed the impact of this change on the Center staff and many whom work closely with victims of sexual violence." However, the Center staff, those who work most closely with victims of sexual violence at SU, were not consulted beforehand.

A3. 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 Kantowitz wrote that, "**Liability was not the reason we made this change.** We have been operating in a legal manner."

A4. "SU Administrators believe the Counseling Center is a "privileged" space that can protect student privacy. Reed Kantowitz says the old advocacy center was a "confidential" space, that didn't offer the same protections, prompting complaints from students. Advocates at Vera House interpret the rules differently."The White House report that came out in April said specifically...victim advocates on college campuses should be considered confidential. They don't have the full privilege if someone is going to court, but that is not what students were talking about," said Randi Bregman, who runs Vera House, an advocacy center in the city of Syracuse for sexual violence victims." In April, as SU was finalizing its changes, the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault released a report outlining some clarifications. The report says schools should be clear about who can maintain a victim's confidence and when policies might force them to override a confidentiality request to pursue attackers. The goal is to help students make informed decisions. The report states: "New guidance from the Department of Education also makes clear that on-campus counselors and advocates - like those who work or volunteer in sexual assault centers, victim advocacy offices, women's and health centers, as well as licensed and pastoral counselors - can talk to a survivor in confidence. In recent years, some schools have indicated that some of these counselors and advocates cannot maintain confidentiality. This new guidance clarifies that they can."

<http://www.localsyr.com/story/d/story/students-balk-at-sus-sexual-assault-services-reorg/40114/Gc7PHNb5bU-jhQoUJuGeoQ> June 24, 2014

A5. The Chancellor was not in attendance though he claimed at the September 22, 2014 Fast Forward Syracuse Town Hall, "What I can say is that the change having been made it's **important to listen to students** about what aspects of the Advocacy Center and what needs it **served...In terms of process, I think the process will be better going forward.**" Furthermore, prior to the second Listening Meeting he told the Graduate Student Organization President that he would be there "if at all possible." Rather than being there, he sent a campus-wide email less than forty-five minutes before the meeting began, and no reason at all was given for his absence.

Additionally, on September 17, 2014, when asked if he would be at the third Listening Meeting, Syverud can be seen on video saying, "I hope to." Rebecca Reed Kantowitz then mentioned that the workgroup was calling the meeting; she said that if the Workgroup wanted the Chancellor to be there, he would. In fact, the Workgroup did want him there. He was not there, and no mention of his absence was given, nor an accounting for why he was not.

A6. Chancellor Syverud's comments concerning the Advocacy Center closure at the Fast Forward Syracuse Town Hall on September 22, 2014 were callous when he said, "It is the case that in a very changing world, when demands on universities about how sexual assault is responded to, **it is necessary for us to evaluate carefully how we need to change the response to that, and as painful as that is,** my responsibility as Chancellor is to not avoid challenges." While that may work well for a bureaucratic way of looking at the world, when he uses the word "painful," we might want to think about who is *actually* feeling pain from the administration's actions with regards to its process of, and the removal of necessary services for sexual assault survivors. The pain he mentions as an administrator is nothing compared to those affected by the decision. Also worth noting is the phrase "evaluate carefully." A careful evaluation would have brought all parties involved into the discussion about how to address the "changing world" and its changing demands on universities in regards to sexual assault.

A7. At the Fast Forward Syracuse Town Hall held on September 22, 2014, the Chancellor, when asked if he would apologize for closing the Advocacy Center 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."

A8.

From: Chancellor Kent Syverud <chancellor@syr.edu>
Date: Fri, Aug 8, 2014 at 11:11 AM
Subject: Apology
To:



August 8, 2014

Dear Faculty (including Emeriti Faculty) and Staff Colleagues:

I am writing to take responsibility for, and to apologize to you about, two recent matters that have generated discussion and some consternation on campus.

The first issue regards parking permits for Emeriti faculty. In June, with my approval, the annual rate charged to Emeriti faculty for a parking permit was increased significantly -- more than double last year's rate. We did this without consultation or communication of any context about why the increase was necessary, and without much explanation of increases for all faculty and staff. Separately, the parking permits delivered to Emeriti faculty were incorrectly printed with a notice that limited parking to two hours at a time. This two-hour limit was a mistake and is not being enforced.

The second issue is in regard to recent [changes](#) in the University's travel policy. These changes have generated considerable discussion among faculty and staff, as certain aspects were unclear, particularly those relevant to sponsored program-supported travel. There was lack of clarity in the new policy (and the reasons for it), and key stakeholders should have been consulted before the policy was finalized and announced. We will be developing a clearer and more sensible travel policy including careful consideration of travel related to sponsored programs. Until that time, the new policy will not be in effect.

I learned a lot from this experience. The manner in which these matters were decided and communicated does not represent the best practices that I aspire to. I take responsibility for this and I apologize to our faculty and staff. In particular, I want our Emeriti faculty to know we especially value and honor this distinguished group and all they have done and continue to do for our University. Many thanks for your patience with us as we get these policies and communications straightened out.

Sincerely,

Chancellor Kent Syverud

A9. On youtube: "[Chancellor Syverud receives a petition during SU's #Rally4Consent.](#)"

A10. The Board of Trustees in the summer of 2012 asked the Provost to assess our tenure and promotion processes and report back about potential improvements. In response, the University Senate formed an ad hoc committee on promotion policies. This group researched various policies at other universities and concluded that Syracuse University does not treat promotion like other institutions do.

At the time, tenure and promotion looked differently - tenure is reviewed by a committee of the University Senate, the Deans, and the Provost, and the recommendations from this process go to the trustees for approval. However, promotion was handled internally within each school and college, with some oversight from a University Senate committee. No central administration or Dean involvement occurred.

The ad hoc committee determined that SU should change its policies to mirror that of other institutions: tenure and promotion should follow similar paths, changing promotions to allow for input and reversal of negative outcomes (being denied tenure/promotion) by the Deans and Provost. The University Senate rejected the proposal by the ad hoc committee at its November 6, 2013 meeting. The committee refused to continue the meeting, and the University Senate failed to hand off the work to another committee until March 2014. At that point, the Appointment and Promotions Committee and the Academic Affairs Committee met and wrote a separate policy creating a Faculty Status Resolution committee which would take appeals from the college level promotions committees. This group would work with the Provost in making the final recommendations to the trustees. This policy was recommended by the University Senate to the trustees at the University Senate's April 16, 2014 meeting.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B_B3HUNnn-e8ZFpNV19MNEFoZE0/view

https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B_B3HUNnn-e8OW55TIRER3E0X2s/view

https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B_B3HUNnn-e8VVkzZm1tZVByMEU/view?usp=sharing

https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B_B3HUNnn-e8Y3JpYW1WWXIVTDQ/view

A11. Mission/Vision Statements:

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

Current Mission/Vision Statement OUR VISION

Syracuse University is driven by its vision, Scholarship in Action—a commitment to forging bold, imaginative, reciprocal, and sustained engagements with our many constituent communities, local as well as global. SU is a public good, an anchor institution positioned to play an integral role in today's knowledge-based, global society by leveraging a precious commodity—intellectual capital—with partners from all sectors of the economy: public, private, and non-profit. Each partner brings its strengths to the table, where collectively we address the most pressing problems facing our community. In doing so, we invariably find that the challenges we face locally resonate globally.

We understand that this represents an expansive definition of the role of a university, but as the Kellogg Commission has observed, it is incumbent upon universities today "to reshape our historic agreement with the American people so that it fits the times that are emerging instead of the times that have passed." Today, in a world in which knowledge is paramount, we believe that we best fulfill our role as an anchor institution in our community when:

- We educate fully informed and committed citizens;
- We provide access to opportunity;
- We strengthen democratic institutions;
- We create innovation that matters, and we share knowledge generously;
- We inform and engage public opinion and debate; and
- We cultivate and sustain public intellectuals.

Serving the public good in these ways pervades our daily decision making and connects us not just with our immediate community, but with communities throughout the world. These outward-looking engagements both optimize education and yield new forms of scholarship and new scholarly arrangements, propelling us forward as an academic institution. They allow us not only to create innovations that matter, but to test our notions of who is a scholar and what scholarship is.

Roots of the Vision

Scholarship in Action captures a vital, historical strength of the Central New York region and the City of Syracuse, as well as the University. Our region has a treasured history of social innovation, having played a key role in abolitionism and the women’s rights movement. Even those ideas—revolutionary in their own times—found inspiration locally in the indigenous culture of the Haudenosaunee people, whose matriarchal society thrived in the region before the arrival of Europeans and whose form of government inspired our nation’s founders.

The process of adopting Scholarship in Action as our vision was organic as well. Chancellor Nancy Cantor dedicated her inaugural year to the theme “University as Public Good: Exploring the Soul of Syracuse.” All of SU’s stakeholders were invited to share their reflections on our strengths and aspirations for our future—from students, faculty and staff members to alumni to friends of the University to members of the local, regional, and global communities. The many activities of that reflective year revealed profound thoughts and feelings, from which two very clear messages were distilled: (1) universities today must connect more tangibly with their communities and (2) Syracuse University, in particular, is remarkably well positioned to do so. Scholarship in Action is a faithful translation of these messages, a bona fide expression of the identity to which the Syracuse University community aspires.

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

CHANCELLOR CANTOR'S WHITE PAPER ON SCHOLARSHIP IN ACTION

Below is Chancellor Cantor's white paper articulating the Scholarship in Action vision, which was issued in April 2005.

Scholarship in Action: Investing in the Creative Campus

Overview

As we think about where we want Syracuse University to be five to 10 years from now, we should continue to focus-and extend upon-our many strengths, such as Maxwell and Newhouse. We will promote our reputation-nationally and internationally-as a university where excellence is connected to ideas, problems, and professions in the world-a place where excellence is tested in the marketplace.

Our great strength as a University is based on the interactive and collaborative nature of many of our programs, where faculty and students learn, discover, and create through deep engagement and exchanges with practitioners and communities throughout the world. We see this clearly in the work of our journalists, artists and architects, experts on government and public affairs, or technology and information studies. So, as we build selectively on traditions of excellence in the College of Arts and Sciences, the focus should be on scholarly areas in the humanities and sciences that also connect to the world, such as Religion and Society, or Environmental Systems. When we build excellence in our professional schools it should be done in a disciplined and focused way, connecting our emerging strengths in areas such as business, law, and engineering, to our highly visible strengths such as communications and public affairs. These truly interdisciplinary areas will resonate with real societal needs providing rich opportunities for new approaches and ideas-creating contexts that act as catalysts for transformational discovery.

Syracuse University is a place where creative exchanges occur easily across disciplines and colleges. 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." Our newest interdisciplinary programs, such as the Bandier Entertainment Industries Program or Goldring Arts Journalism Program, and our cross-campus Renée Crown Honors Program and Soling Program, have this profile of breaking new ground, as professors, students, and practitioners intersect on and off campus.

Discovery and learning at Syracuse must have no physical boundaries as we test ideas in the marketplace, be it through community geography or social entrepreneurship, technology commercialization and school reform, or immersions on Theatre Row or Wall Street, and partnerships with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) abroad or the Indigenous nations at home in Central New York. We have significant precedents for scholarship-in-action in all of our professional schools and in University-wide internship programs. We will now take our traditions even further, aggressively connecting to the world through active engagement with community, industry, practitioners, governments, and the professions, at home and abroad.

To reach our goals, we will make transformational investments in three areas:

- **Faculty excellence and scholarly distinction.** The academic reputation of the University and the quality of the education we can offer is defined by the quality of our faculty. We recommend setting up eight to 10 thematic clusters within and across colleges to play on faculty strengths. This would involve identifying or hiring star or rising-star faculty members and colleagues who can collaborate in work of intellectual richness and potential for future impact. This work should offer possibilities for synergy both within the University and outside in partnership with others, and should have promise for substantial, long-term external funding. This effort will require superb doctoral/professional students, able to excel at the interfaces of the disciplines.
- **Access initiatives for enterprising students.** We want to attract excellent students with bold and diverse interests who will seize and build upon SU's interdisciplinary and engagement opportunities to "color outside the lines." To do this, we will offer access initiatives and a range of strategically developed recruitment tools. We want to enhance our ability to attract and enable students from all socio-economic and cultural spheres to come to Syracuse and experience the creative campus on and off the "Hill." By doing so, we aim to expand and further institutionalize the inclusive policy interwoven throughout SU's history.

- **Engagement with the world-downtown, nationally, and globally.** We need to be engaged with the world and the pressing concerns of the day, including the different voices pushing to be heard and the different practitioners in the fields and industries in which our faculty have roots, our students have ambitions, and our friends and alumni have connections. To do this we are reaching out-in a disciplined and programmatic manner-beyond our "Hill," renovating and leasing spaces, establishing programs and sustained presences in downtown Syracuse, New York City, Washington, D.C., and Los Angeles. We are raising our profile in the great cities of the world, from London to Beijing. From these centers of activity we will strategically connect to other locations around the world-underlining the global nature of "local" issues and industries, and the emerging opportunities for collaboration in areas of mutual strength and potential. These physical and programmatic presences will demonstrate Syracuse University's commitment to scholarship-in-action, integrating discovery, learning, and public engagement.

Proposed Mission/Vision Statement

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

Accessed November 1, 2014.

Vision and Mission Statements

The request for feedback and comments on the candidate Vision and Mission statements ended on October 1.

The statements below will be improved based upon input from the Syracuse University community and then submitted to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees for approval at their November meeting. Thank you for your comments and suggestions on the draft Vision and Mission statements. --The Strategic Plan Steering Committee

Vision Statement

Syracuse University is a student-focused global research University renowned for academic rigor, richly diverse learning experiences, and a spirit of discovery.

Mission Statement

As a University large enough to attract and engage the best scholars in the world yet small enough to support a personalized student experience, we:

- Integrate arts and sciences education with applied and professional programs
- Advance global study, experiential learning, interdisciplinary scholarship, and innovation
- Support faculty-student collaboration in creative endeavors and in research that addresses emerging challenges and needs
- Foster a respectful and inclusive learning environment for all.

A12. Diversity statistics

Converted from information available at The Office of Institutional Research.

<https://oir.syr.edu/Reporting/StEnroll.asp> Accessed November 1, 2014.

Syracuse University Student Body	Fall 2005	Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014
American Indian/Alaska Native	77	116	138	145	148	127	129	119	122	131
Asian				1390	1465	1527	1514	1425	1416	1354
Asian/Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	942	1118	1289							
Black/African American	1053	1142	1252	1287	1389	1495	1532	1596	1635	1656
Hispanic/Latino	741	792	891	999	1136	1335	1544	1689	1839	1855
Native Hawaiian/Oth Pac Island				32	36	27	24	17	13	19
White	11656	11444	11232	10855	10676	11118	11285	11482	11366	11258
Two or more races				125	211	229	337	442	465	494
Non-Resident Alien	1702	1813	1981	2111	2233	2575	2861	3065	3431	3989
Unknown	2563	2657	2301	2422	2344	1974	1603	1194	980	736
Total	18734	19082	19084	19366	19638	20407	20829	21029	21267	21492
	Fall 2005	Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.411%	0.608%	0.723%	0.749%	0.754%	0.622%	0.619%	0.566%	0.574%	0.610%
Asian				7.178%	7.460%	7.483%	7.269%	6.776%	6.658%	6.300%
Asian/Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	5.028%	5.859%	6.754%							
Black/African American	5.621%	5.985%	6.560%	6.646%	7.073%	7.326%	7.355%	7.590%	7.688%	7.705%
Hispanic/Latino	3.955%	4.151%	4.669%	5.159%	5.785%	6.542%	7.413%	8.032%	8.647%	8.631%
Native Hawaiian/Oth Pac Island				0.165%	0.183%	0.132%	0.115%	0.081%	0.061%	0.088%
White	62.218%	59.973%	58.856%	56.052%	54.364%	54.481%	54.179%	54.601%	53.444%	52.382%
Two or more races				0.645%	1.074%	1.122%	1.618%	2.102%	2.186%	2.299%
Non-Resident Alien	9.085%	9.501%	10.380%	10.901%	11.371%	12.618%	13.736%	14.575%	16.133%	18.560%
Unknown	13.681%	13.924%	12.057%	12.506%	11.936%	9.673%	7.696%	5.678%	4.608%	3.425%

A13. “It is so important for Psychiatry to be on campus, that is why they hired me and the psychiatrist 2 years ago, but they really didn’t have a clear picture of how they wanted it to work and we were just thrown into accepting everyone and we couldn’t handle the demand. I thought we were all working to figure it out together, but in April something changed... [they] had meetings without me ... and when they did involve me in meetings they were changing focus of taking and keeping and treating the students with higher risk cases, chronic conditions as they called them, and saying we need to send those students right to community and do brief psychiatry, like the counseling services and just see acute cases for 6 or less sessions and move them into community. I fought this saying the most vulnerable, with more issues, chronic or not, should be treated by us in a coordinated fashion with other services on campus, not dumped into community where we don’t know what is going on. Not to mention that there are few places to send people in the community that are any good. You get the transportation of getting to appointments and possibly financial cost of having to pay more for services and the likelihood of students continuing care is low to none.

I also was balking at a lot of their other rules, like not emailing students. Really, that is how students communicate and you could play phone tag all day with someone otherwise. They were concerned about my prescribing practices and relationships with patients. They felt I was carelessly giving everyone Xanax and they felt I got too involved in trying to help students. Oh, and the fact that I disagreed and proved my point to the Medical Director and Health Service Director probably didn’t help. All these concerns on their part, and my not following their directions, lead them to suspending me until they could look into all these things further. No verbal warning, never a written warning, and past two performance evals were very good. I was involved in several committees campus wide, I was doing training on the campus and in the community for others, and I had excellent relationships with all my peers and colleagues and Rebecca Reed Kantowitz and someone from HR, along with the two guys I pissed off in Health Services brought me in and told me to leave without even telling me why. It took me three weeks before I was able to get even a vague idea of what they were concerned about. They would not tell me where the concern came from, they did not allow me to talk or defend myself, they

just said we'll be in touch. Which, by the way, they never were. I tried calling and talking to several people in the days after that and they were not getting back to me and they were not giving me any info. That is why I decided to resign.

My thoughts on it all are the new Chancellor sees Psych. Services as a liability, he's a lawyer, he doesn't want troubled students under his university's care. I had a student OD right before all this went down, she made it through and I was providing her excellent care and she and her mother thanked me for the care, but my supervisors believed because I gave her the meds, I was reckless. I was seeing her 2 times week and checking in by email. I was begging counseling center to see her as they previously told her she was chronic and needed to find someone in community & she couldn't, so I was left holding her best I could as a favor to Student Assistance, and I believe this was one of the situations they were trying to use against. They just posted my job and it took them 9 months to find me. Took them 12 months to replace Dr. Betsy. Very slow, system heavy process to get competent new clinicians. I wrote what Psychiatry at health services was about on the HS website last year. They have since changed it since my departure and it clearly states they are now a short term service for crisis and prevention of hospitalization. Even more stupidly it says this is due to increase demand for services. Since when do you decrease services when there is an increased demand, ridiculous. There, you got it out of me. Stupid people are influencing decisions being made and getting rid of those who make sense and really want to help the students. Staff are afraid to speak up, after all those staff were let go within the first few months of new chancellor. They are worried about themselves and not the students. The chancellor is worried about getting out of debt and preventing other problems. I thought HS leadership really wanted to make positive changes when I came on 2 years ago and that is what Tom Wolfe had started and under his direction it seemed we were, but once he left it all fell apart. HS leadership was stagnant, all the employees don't respect or like the leadership, but don't want to rock the boat... I kept all that data on my computer at work and they would not let me have access to it when I was leaving. I had really good stats. Unfortunately, my memory sucks and any friends I had are not friends anymore who could get the info. Ben Domingo, the Director of Health Services has it all now and he is one I was feeding it to and thinking I was justifying why we needed to be there. I want to say myself and Dr. Armenta had about 1000 student visits the past year (2 Semesters) and the average time each student was seen was 6-7, so that's about 150 students each, 300 total between 2 providers."

—September 19, 2014, note from Psychiatric Nurse Sherie Ramsgard, formerly employed via Health Services at SU to provide psychiatric care of students.

"I was seeing [a student frequently] because I knew she was worsening and the Counseling Center refused to see her as she had an existing history. I saw her as a favor for Student Assistance until she could find someone in the community, but after [several] months, she couldn't find anyone and I was still only one seeing her. I urged her to take a [Medical Leave of Absence], but she had already done that and didn't want to. Problems here:

#1 – she was on a MLOA from previous semester and Counseling Center approved her coming back, but wouldn't see her.

#2 – She thought she was going to be seen by CC upon return and was told they were not going to see her, they didn't tell her that at the prescreening.

#3 – I only saw her as the Director of Student Affairs asked me to personally.

Which leads me to the liability concern right when new Chancellor was taking over. ...

Question is, does the college want to hold and support these students within the campus and try and prevent suicide or do they want to send them to community where they don't know what care they are getting and have no control over it. Seems if the new chancellor was about doing what is right for the students, which is what he said in the beginning, he should be picking option one of caring for these students on campus.

Oh, and feel free to say some of the patients are reaching out to me, having found me on google search, for my new practice and getting care they are use to. Appropriate mental health care is possible if it is a priority.”—October 31, 2014, note from Psychiatric Nurse Sherie Ramsgard, formerly employed via Health Services at SU to provide psychiatric care of students.

A14. “I used to see the psychiatric nurse, Sherie Ramsgard at Health Services. I received an email from her saying she was leaving Health Services. Several weeks later, I got an email from Health Services saying that now my psychiatric care would be taken care of via their one remaining psychiatric doctor at Health Services. However, when I called on Oct. 27th to try to make an appointment with her, I was told that she is not taking patients, that instead I would have to make an appointment with the Counseling Center and see a counselor there, or they would send me out into the community. I said that what about my prescription, which Sherie had prescribed, which I needed refilled. They said I could see a regular practitioner there, but not the psychiatrist, which is not good, because I needed to see someone who specializes in psychiatric medication. I kept saying I don’t need counseling, and when I asked her what if the Counseling Center can’t see me, or can’t see me for a while, she didn’t know what to say. I said that they had told me before I would be automatically transferred to seeing the one psychiatrist on staff, and she said, “Well, that was at the beginning of the semester.” So now I am not seeing anyone. How hard would it have been for them to send another email explaining that I no longer had access to the school psychiatrist?” —Student, October 27, 2014.

A15. “... the changes at the health center that the new Chancellor has made have affected me negatively. I suffer from panic disorder with agoraphobia, and last year I used to be able to walk into Health Services while having a panic attack or having problems with my medication and I would be able to see a psychiatrist immediately. I went into Health Services about a week ago having a bad panic attack and I asked if I could talk to somebody. The response was that since the psychiatry department had moved to the Counseling Center and the staff had been reduced, I couldn't talk to anyone and I would have to wait 3 weeks to make an appointment to speak with somebody. Obviously that was of zero help to me, and while I can manage my panic adequately on my own, it makes me nervous if I am having problems with medication or develop depression again because I don't think I would be able to wait 3 weeks to even see somebody.”—Student, October 14, 2014.

A16. “Because I have been turned away from the Counseling Center, being told they do not see students for more than 4 weeks (despite obvious discrepancies in this policy because several of my friends have had different experiences), I was told I had to see a therapist downtown to get help. Last year, two years after being told this and being afraid to follow up, I tried seeing one person on the list they gave me, who I was uncomfortable with. I stopped going and by that time in the year, everyone else on the list was fully booked with other patients. This year, I have started to see someone else on the list, but it is impossible for me to get there. I went to Non-Emergency Medical Transport to get transportation to my weekly appointments, but the woman told me, “We only take students to medical appointments, we don’t really do that stuff.” To me, this is a very clear message from the university saying that my mental health is not important or relevant the way that physical health evidently is and that I do not deserve mental health care, seeing as the university provides neither adequate mental health services nor the means to access them elsewhere.” —Student, October 25, 2014.

“Despite being a low-risk patient at the counseling center, I could have probably still benefitted from counseling when the school year was over. But because it was summer and I wasn't registered in classes, even though I was living right off-campus, I could no longer go to the counseling center. Paying for therapy outside of counseling was an issue, so I left their office with a pile of information about free or cheap therapy. But I still didn't call. It was hard enough to get me into therapy—going through that

process again seemed unbearable. I haven't been to counseling since, even though I probably should. I was actually expecting/hoping my counselor would call me at the beginning of the semester to see if I wanted to reschedule, but she didn't. If she had, I would have definitely benefitted for counseling all semester. I understand I am responsible for my own mental health, but I think the counseling center should recognize how hard it is to reach out for mental health care, and start following up consistently with its patients.”—Student, October 28, 2014.

A17. "I went to the health services with acute back pain. I literally could not stand on my feet. My back felt like it was being stabbed and I thought my life was over. I went to the health services to try my best to share my health issue and requested to see someone, or receive some help, any help at all. The woman at the counter started acting like I was probably just kidding. "If you will let me speak, I was about to tell you that we are about to close, everyone is booked, you can't see anybody. I can't help you." I said, "I am in serious need of help." She interrupted and said, "Can you let me finish, please?" (in this really mean tone). I could not deal with her utter insolent impudence, and said, "Have you never spoken to someone who is in terrible pain? Have you never felt pain? Do you have any idea what it's like to feel this way?" She started saying things under her breath including, "wow", etc. In the end, this nice nurse told me she will have SUA take me to Crouse ER (it was so serious, Crouse had to prescribe me some serious pain medications). But tell me this, if you are not a doctor and you don't know how to treat someone, but if you are working at a health service center, isn't the least of what you can do is know how to speak to a student in pain? Isn't that their job? I'm not saying you have to soothe me with your words when I am in pain (although that would be nice), but whatever happened to normal professionalism?" (says another sophomore). This again, indicates that Health Services staff members have not gone through sufficient training to understand that students cannot be treated with insolence. We don't pay hundreds of dollars for "Health Fee" to be treated this way.”—Student, October 25, 2014.

A18. Affirmative Consent Policy

Daily Orange Editorial in favor of Yes Means Yes for New York State
<http://dailyorange.com/2014/10/new-york-should-pass-yes-means-yes-law/>

Yes Means Yes law
<http://www.autostraddle.com/california-passes-affirmative-consent-bill-rape-apologists-retreat-into-fantasy-252946/>

Yes Means Yes policies at colleges (features Girl Code)
http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/09/08/college-consent-sexual-assault_n_5748218.html?&ncid=tweetlnkushpmg00000056

Wording of California State Law: Affirmative Consent
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201320140SB967

History of this type of policy. <http://powderroom.jezebel.com/over-20-years-ago-antioch-college-was-pilloried-nation-1642728042>

List of more coverage of the history of consent laws/policies:
<http://antiochcollege.org/campus-life/residence-life/health-safety/sexual-offense-prevention-policy>

Yes Means Yes
<http://yesmeansyesblog.wordpress.com/>

A sample sexual assault prevention policy, found here
<http://www.antiochcollege.org/sites/default/files/pdf/student-handbook.pdf#page=42>

ANTIOCH COLLEGE SEXUAL OFFENSE PREVENTION POLICY (SOPP)

PREFACE

In 1991, a group of Womyn of Antioch began a campaign to promote a culture free of sexual violence at Antioch College. Through this effort, a document was created which became known as the Sexual Offense prevention Policy (SOPP). The SOPP is Antioch College's formal attempt at ending sexual violence while fostering a campus culture of positive, consensual sexuality.

POLICY

The Sexual Offense prevention Policy (SOPP) is a campus-wide policy of Antioch College. All sexual interactions at Antioch College must be consensual. Consent means verbally asking and verbally giving or denying consent for all levels of sexual behavior. Non-consensual sexual behavior, verbal and sexual harassment are not tolerated at Antioch College.

All Students and full-time College employees are required to sign a statement that they have read and understand the expectations of this policy. Overnight visitors and part-time staff must be adequately briefed on the policy by the area or person hosting or supervising them. In addition, the Sexual Offense Prevention Policy will be utilized at designated events at the discretion of the Office of Community Life and Community Government.

Antioch College strongly encourages students, faculty, staff and visitors to report any violations of local, state, and federal law or conduct deemed inappropriate under this policy, to the Dean of Community Life, or when appropriate, to law enforcement officials. This policy is a supplement to local, state and federal laws and is intended to operate in conjunction with other existing Antioch College policies. All Antioch College faculty and staff will be expected to understand and support the policy.⁷

CONSENT

Consent is defined as the act of willingly and verbally agreeing to engage in specific sexual conduct. The following are clarifying points:

- Consent must be obtained each and every time there is sexual activity.
- All parties must have a clear and accurate understanding of the sexual activity.
- The person who initiates sexual conduct is responsible for verbally asking for the "consent" of the individual(s) involved.
- The person with whom sexual conduct is initiated must verbally express "consent" or lack of "consent"
- Each new level of sexual activity requires consent.
- Use of agreed upon forms of communication such as gestures or safe words is acceptable but must be discussed and verbally agreed to by all parties before sexual activity occurs.
- Consent is required regardless of the parties' relationship, prior sexual history, or current activity (e.g. grinding on the dancefloor is not consent for further sexual activity).
- In order for "consent" to be valid, all parties must have unimpaired judgment and a shared understanding of the nature of the act to which they are consenting, including the use of safer sex practices.
- A person cannot give consent while sleeping.
- Silence conveys a lack of consent.

- At any and all times when time consent is withdrawn or not explicitly agreed to, the sexual activity must stop immediately.
- All parties must disclose personal risk factors and known STIs.

VIOLATIONS OF POLICY

The SOPP is violated whenever there is an incident of non-consensual sexual conduct on the Antioch College campus, during an Antioch College sanctioned event, or between two Antioch College students, regardless of location. This may include but is not limited to:

- Sexually based gestures
- Sexually based touching
- Sexually based penetration of a body opening by any means, including but not limited to vaginal penetration, anal penetration, and oral sex. Penetration, however slight, includes the insertion of objects or body parts.
- Sexually based stalking
- Sexually based forms of non-consensual communication, whether verbal, written, via telephone, or through electronic or social media.⁸
- Failure to disclose STIs and other personal risk factors.
- Failure to use safer sex practices unless otherwise agreed upon verbally.
- Harassment of any kind based on sexuality, gender identity or gender expression.

Non-consensual conduct that is not sexually based is a violation of the Honor Code and should be referred to Community Standards Board as such.

Education: Antioch College believes that education is key to understanding and utilizing the Sexual Offense Prevention Policy. The College is therefore committed to offering education and training activities through the Office of Community Life at least twice a year, and during Orientation of incoming students every Fall term. These educational offerings will vary based on the needs and desires of the Community, the resources available, and specific events that require response. In addition to orienting students, the Office of Community Life will also orient faculty, staff, visitors and guests of the College as part of the SOPP educational curriculum. Statistical information including numbers and types of complaints will be made available to the Community and to the general public as an ongoing part of campus security reporting, in compliance with the Clery Act.

Support: Antioch College is committed to offering support to survivors of sexual violence. This support is provided through the Counseling office and linkages to local resources through the Office of Community Life. Support includes immediate response and advocacy for survivors, individual counseling, linkages to health services and advocacy. Options will be reviewed including criminal, civil and SOPP complaint process. Services are also available to those seeking support who have been involved in a sexual violence situation but are not the survivor. See Addendum A for Emergency Procedures and Community Resources.

SOPP Complaints: Any Community member or visitor may file a complaint with the Chair of the Community Standards Board when an alleged violation has occurred. To ensure confidentiality, the individual who makes a formal complaint is referred to as the Primary Witness. The person against whom the complaint has been filed is referred to as the Respondent. The Dean of Community Life and Chair of Community Standards Board are responsible for discussing available options with both the Primary Witness and the Respondent, including those of the Antioch Community as well as other options.

Violations of Policy: If a complaint involves a non-community member, the Dean of Community Life shall also discuss options available to ensure the safety of the individual and the College community. If the Primary Witness, Respondent or the Dean is concerned about the safety of the parties involved, the Dean of Community Life is responsible for addressing the safety of all community members.

Levels of Complaints: There are four levels of complaints that can be filed. Person(s) wishing to remain anonymous fill out the complaint form, do not sign the form, and submit it to the Chair of Community Standards Board. Persons who are willing to sign the complaint can indicate that they want the remedies to be informal or formal. The Dean of Community Life and the Chair of the Community Standards Board hear all formal complaints involving a Community Member as Respondent. Third party complaints may be filed by anyone other than the Primary Witness or Respondent regarding an SOPP violation.

Remedies: Remedies are determined, in part, by the level of the complaint filed. Persons may file a complaint but choose to pursue no remedy. Remedies are developed, whenever possible, with the intent to increase educational awareness for all parties involved. Anonymous complaints are shared with the Chair of Community Standards Board who, in consultation with the Dean of Community Life, determines if any action can be taken. Actions may include offering additional training for a specific group and/or issuing a campus wide alert. Informal complaint remedies are developed with the Primary Witness. These include education and support activities. Informal complaints do not involve disciplinary action for the Respondent. The decision to file an informal complaint does not preclude the filing of a formal complaint at a later time if a satisfactory remedy cannot be implemented. Formal complaints filed against a Community Member involve the Primary Witness and Respondent appearing each at a separate hearing with the Dean of Community Life and the Chair of the Community Standards Board. The remedies may include support and educational activities for either or both parties, and disciplinary action for the respondent who is found to have violated the Policy. Third Party complaints are reviewed by the Chair of the Community Standards Board and shared with the Dean of Community Life to determine if further action can be taken. The Primary Witness in a third party complaint may choose whether or not to participate in the complaint. Support and services are offered regardless of their decision. Multiple third party complaints about the same incident and/or Respondent are given stronger consideration and may warrant a stronger response, depending on the nature of the allegation. See Appendix D for information regarding Complaints.

REMEDIES AND OPTIONS

The Hearing Board may determine an appropriate remedy for the offense.

Suggested remedies include, but are not limited to the following:

- Mediation (Available only for non-physical complaints)
- Restitution
- Mandatory STI testing and report to Primary Witness
- Attendance at Alcoholics Anonymous or other substance abuse programs⁴⁰
- Limit or no Access to Primary Witness
- Limited Access to any Campus Areas and Co-op jobs
- Banning from any or all campus areas and Co-op jobs
- Mandatory sexual offense therapy
- Mandatory substance abuse therapy
- Community service
- Loss of on-campus housing
- Suspension or Expulsion
- Other remedies as determined appropriate based on violation and circumstances

CONFIDENTIALITY

Community members including students, staff, faculty and administration, must respect confidentiality in matters relating to the Sexual Offense Prevention Policy. If confidentiality is violated, the Dean of Community Life or any other party involved, may make a complaint about the violation to the Community Standards Board, which may sanction the parties involved. The accusation of the commission of a sexual offense under this policy without following the appropriate procedures is a violation of community standards. Any evidence used to reach a decision in the context of a hearing is confidential unless there is an appeal. All records of the hearing process shall be turned over to the Antioch College attorneys.

- Loss of on-campus housing
- Suspension or Expulsion

ADDENDUM A: EMERGENCY PROCEDURES

The Dean of Community Life works closely with Resident Life Managers, Counseling and Security to provide immediate response for those in an emergency situation.

If You Have Been Sexually Violated:

- Find a safe environment away from your attacker (it need only be temporary). When possible, ask a trusted person to stay with you and assist you with getting help.
- To obtain immediate medical care or contact the police, phone 911 for emergency services. (To provide proof of a criminal offense, evidence must be preserved. Do not use the toilet, bathe, brush your teeth or change clothing prior to a medical/legal exam.)
- Contact the On Call Phone (937-471-0517) or the Dean of Community Life (937-471-0506) or Security (937-251-4005)
- The Dean of Community Life, Resident Life Manager or Security will provide immediate assistance with safety issues such as relocation to a safe place.¹
- Community Life staff will support you throughout the emergency situation. They will work with you to advocate for your needs, assist you with filing a criminal, civil and/or SOPP complaint (if desired), and connect you with healthcare and counseling services.
- Obtaining help through the Community Life staff is voluntary.
- All services will remain confidential.
- Services and linkages to additional resources may be requested at any point after an incident of sexual violence has occurred.

ADDENDUM C: EDUCATIONAL CURRICULUM

The Dean of Community Life is responsible for creating an educational plan at the start of each year.

The plan should include goals within the following areas:

- Orientation to the Sexual Offence prevention Policy
- Training
- Staff Development
- Community Outreach Educational programs³

Orientation will be provided to new students. The SOPP will be reviewed and examined, in small groups when possible, to ensure each individual's comprehension of the policy. Interactive approaches such as skits, speakers, videos and discussion may be used to educate students on topics such as safer sex practices, incorporating the SOPP into relationships, respect for self and others, unimpaired judgment, how to ask for consent and ways to say no. Resident Life Managers will facilitate at least one hall meeting discussion per term to review the SOPP with RA's and students. An overview of the SOPP will also be provided to campus visitors, prospective students on overnight visits and guest performers/presenters. The Counselor or outside consultant/certified safe sex educator will provide

training to the community each term. Programs should include topics that will enhance understanding, maintain knowledge, and provide awareness on to effectively use the SOPP. The Office of Community Life is responsible for maintaining an account of educational programming and assessing its effectiveness.

Possible topics include:

- Self-defense
- Understanding and Using the SOPP
- Intimate relationship Violence
- Having Fun while Using Safer Sex Practices
- Ways to prevent Sexual Assault
- Safety on Co-op and how to Access Resources
- Alcohol, Drugs and Sex
- Sex and respect for Self and Others
- How to say “NO” (Assertiveness Training)
- Using SOPP in Casual and Long term Relationships

Other important topics include sexuality in the GLBT populations, gender issues and the intersection of racism and sexism. The Office of Community Life will remain current on issues that are pertinent to the SOPP. The Community Life Staff will pursue development of their skills

through attendance at training functions, educational programs and conferences and consultation.

The Office of Community Life will provide public information and maintain statistics on the number and types of complaints received each year through our Campus Security reporting process and compliance with the Clery Act.⁴

ADDENDUM D: COMPLAINT PROCEDURES

The office of Community Life and the Community Standards Board are responsible for responding to complaints alleging a violation of the SOPP.

Complaint Process:

- Complaint Forms are available at Counseling Office, Office of Community Life Resident Advisor’s Office and from Resident Life Manager Office as well as at publicized locations on campus where students can remain anonymous, and online.
- You may file a complaint independently or with the assistance of staff.
- Complaints should be submitted to the Chair of Community Standards Board. This may be done in person, anonymously, or with assistance of a third party person. Chair of Community Standards Board is located in the Office of Community Life.
- The Chair of the Community Standards Board reviews all complaints and will forward a copy to the Dean of Community Life.
- The Chair of the Community Standards Board and the Dean of Community Life will work together on anonymous complaints to determine what further action should be taken.
- The Dean of Community Life will respond to informal, formal and third party complaints by contacting the person who filed the complaint. Issues of personal safety and health will be addressed, then the complaint will be reviewed and possible remedies discussed.
- The Dean of Community Life, together with the Chair of the community Standards Board will hear all formal complaints. The Chair of the Community Standards Board is charged with contacting the Primary Witness and the Respondent to schedule separate meetings within five days of receiving a formal complaint.

ADDENDUM E: HEARING BOARD PROCEDURES

The Dean of Community Life and Chair of the Community Standards Board respond to formal complaints that involve a member of the student community as Respondent. If the respondent is not a student but connected to the College as faculty, staff, adjunct or visiting instructor, the case may be

referred for follow-up to the appropriate person. If the respondent is a non-community member, the Dean of Community Life will refer the case through the proper authorities. The following procedures are based on legal and ethical practices and are subject to change as new rulings, findings and legislation occur.⁴⁵

Constitution and Operations of Hearing Board

- The Dean of Community Life and Chair of Community Standards Board, as well as one designee chosen by the Primary Witness, and one designee chosen by the Respondent will constitute the Hearing Board. Designees can be chosen from the following possibilities:
 - Academic advisor
 - Co-op advisor
 - Resident Life Manager
 - Member of Community Standards Board
 - College Chaplain
 - Member of the Village Mediation Program ?
- All sessions of the hearing Board are closed, not publicized, confidential and called as soon as possible following a formal complaint.
- In the event that a formal complaint also involves criminal charges, the Hearing Board may choose to hold hearings to ascertain Primary Witness and Community Safety, or opt to postpone hearing until after resolution of those charges. The potential outcome of any court case is not to be considered by the hearing Board in its deliberation process.
- The Hearing Board reserves the right to refuse to hear a complaint or to discontinue a hearing with just cause.
- Antioch College may have an attorney present for any or all portions of the process in order to ensure compliance with College policies and any applicable laws.
- All records are maintained in confidence and submitted to the College attorney. The Hearing Board deliberation notes are included in this packet along with all evidence submitted and the audiotapes of the testimony.

Chair of Community Standards Board Duties and Responsibilities

- The Chair of the Community Standards Board serves as the coordinator of the process and chairs the hearing process. This includes introducing all persons, asking each Primary Witness, respondent and witness if they understand the nature of the process, and reminding all participants to observe confidentiality.
- The Chair of the Community Standards Board prepares a written report, and helps to collect all materials to be sent to College attorney in collaboration with the Dean of Community Life.
- The Chair of the Community Standards Board may act with the Dean of Community Life to notify the Primary Witness and respondent of determined remedies.
- The Chair of the Community Standards Board is charged with maintaining a fair and efficient application of the SOPP during all hearing Board processes.⁶

Evidence and Testimony

- The Hearing Board will hear testimony from the Primary Witness, any witness of the Primary witness, Respondent, and any witness for the respondent. Additionally, any evidentiary materials submitted by the parties will be reviewed.
- Testimony from the Primary Witness, respondent and witnesses are scheduled at different times to ensure safety. Only the testifying person, members of the Hearing Board and the College attorney are permitted in session. Persons who are testifying may bring a support person who will remain in a room nearby.
- All testimony is audio-taped. All testimony tapes are made available to be heard by the other party in the presence of the Chair of the Community Standards Board who maintains custody of the tapes.

- Both the Primary Witness and the Respondent are asked to testify a final time to allow response to the audio taped testimony, to solicit suggestions or remedies, and to clarify any remaining questions.
- In addition, specific information relevant to the alleged violation(s) and persons who can relate first-hand knowledge of the situation may be asked to testify. These persons have the right of refusal.
- Up to two character witness can be called for each party.
- The Hearing Board is not restricted to the rules of legal evidence.
- All persons who appear before the Hearing Board agree to keep the process confidential and sign agreements stating they agree to be truthful in their testimony and to not release any information.
- Only Hearing Board members ask questions of the witnesses.
- A Preponderance of Evidence supporting the complaint is necessary in order for the Hearing Board to find a violation of the Policy has occurred.

Remedy

- The Hearing Board will determine that the policy has been violated or has not been violated
- The Hearing Board will deliberate based upon the evidence heard and determine a remedy for the respondent, Primary Witness or both.
- The Hearing Board may ask the Primary Witness to offer remedy suggestions.
- Once a determination is made the Chair of the Community Standards Board will write the Hearing Board report. The Dean of Community Life is responsible for ensuring the community is aware of any offenses that are determined to have been committed. The Dean of Community Life is responsible for ensuring the remedy is followed. Decisions 7 must be rendered and written reports must be submitted to the Primary Witness and Respondent within 48 hours of the completion of the hearings by the Chair of the Community Standards Board.

Appeal Process

- The Respondent and the Primary Witness have a right to appeal the Hearing Board's decision.
- Appeals must be in writing within 72 hours of the decision.
- The Dean of Community Life reviews and decides all appeals.
- The Dean of Community Life decision is final.