

**STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
COLLEGE AT OLD WESTBURY
FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

**Friday, March 16, 2018
12:30 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.
Location S-100**

***** ALL MEMBERS OF THE CAMPUS COMMUNITY ARE WELCOME TO ATTEND. *****

Documents for this meeting are available at:

<https://sites.google.com/site/oldwestburyfacultysenate/archive>

Senators Present: Andrew Mattson (Chair), Maureen Keefe (Vice Chair, PEL), Jennie D'Ambroise (M&CS, Secretary/Treasurer), Laurette Morris (University Senator), Maureen Dolan (Parliamentarian, M&CIS), William Gillis (Senator At-Large, Alt. Univ. Senator), Peter Ikeler (Senator At-Large), Kathleen Velsor (Senator At-Large), Jon Kleinman (Professional), Alonzo McCollum (EOP, Professional), Ana Martinez (Professional), Evan Rufrano (SGA), Laura Anker (FYE), Minna Barrett (FYE), Jason Kaloudis (Library), Linval Frazer (AC), Yu Lei (MMF), Blidi Stemn (CE), Jasmine Mitchell (AS), Jillian Nissen (BS), Bright Emenike (CP), Deepa Jani (EN), Veronika Dolar (PEL), Seojung Jung (PY), Shijian Li (PH), Jacob Heller (SY), Frank Sanacory (CAP), Jill Crocker (TLRC), Ali Ebrahimi (FRRC)

Senators Absent: Joseph Foy (Senator At-Large), Manya Mascareno (Senator At-Large), Xavier Marechaux (AE), Andrew Hashey (EE), Jingyi Song (H&P), Fernando Guerrero (ML), Eric Hagan (VA), Chris Hobson (ARPT), Llana Barber (LEC), Zenaida Madurka (HLCC)

Non-Voting Members of the Senate Present: Patrick O'Sullivan (Provost), Wayne Edwards (VP Stud. Aff.), Len Davis (CFO), Calvin Butts (President)

Visitors: Joanne Spadaro, Bonnie Eannone, Curtis Velsor, Penny Chin, Chris Notaro, Evan Kobolakis, Duncan Quarless, Shalei Simms, Martha Livingston, Cynthia Anderson, Myong Hi Kim, Lorenz Neuwirth, Ashlee Lien, Omar Estrada Torres, Calvin Wu, Lenore Walsh, Brittany Villalta, Yumi Nicholson

MINUTES

I. Call to Order 12:36pm

II. Approval of Minutes of Feb 9, 2018

- The minutes are approved by voice vote pending the following changes:
 - In the UFS bullet points, in listing priorities, instead of the end of the summer it should be "end of previous summer". Also, they said no.
 - On p.1 VP of Institutional Advancement should be notated for Wayne Edwards' title.

III. FS Chair's Report

- **Shuttle Service & Transportation Advisory Board (TAB):** Acting Dean of Students Jeff Bolding (shuttle rider!) is reactivating the TAB to coordinate faculty and administration efforts to improve shuttle service and address commuter complaints regarding transportation issues. FS Secretary Jennie D'Ambroise has been updating him regarding previous faculty efforts to improve shuttle service. Thanks to both Professor Zhihong Shi and the Student Life Committee for their work to renew this effort.
- **Visit Cancelled:** President of the University Faculty Senate Dr. Gwen Kay's visit on March 13th was canceled due to snow. We may be able to reschedule this semester.
- **Agenda Items for April 5th Executive Committee Meeting with the President?** Currently on the agenda submitted to the Office of the President:
 - Zero net energy
 - Equalizing resources
 - Faculty consultation
 - Interim administrative positions
 - 360-Review process

This agenda can be edited. Please contact the Chair if you have items.

- **Strategic Plan Process Update:** The co-chairs of the SP Coordinating Committee (Barbera, Quarless, Mattson) will meet with Dr. Butts on April 5th to review the "final draft" of Strategic Plan submitted to the President for comment or approval. If the President has comments or requests changes before approval the co-chairs will have the opportunity for a written response. After the approval, the President proposes a public release of the Strategic Plan at a Presidential Town Hall meeting this semester.

IV. President's Report

- Dr. Butts has received a report of faculty accomplishments over the last year. It was very good. The faculty is to be applauded for the work they do. Students are inspired by your teaching.
- Dr. Butts went to Cuba and got sick. Conditions are not good there. We signed a memorandum with Universidad de Matanzas for study abroad programs. A group of 6 OW students led by Prof Madurka participated in the study abroad program to Cuba in 2018. The symbolic significance is extremely important. We are not sure how many Cuban students can come here. Dr. Butts travelled with SUNY Board of Trustees Chairman and and 2-3 other presidents in the system. He is grateful to be part of this.
- There is a state grant program for multimedia improvements in the campus center. There is a commitment for 1 million to improve the studios. There is a review process by the state but Dr. Butts is confident this will happen. Faculty of American Studies and media communications developed the grant documents and they hosted the tour. Thanks to them.
- In NY state there is a 4.4 billion dollar deficit. The governor's proposal for SUNY was virtually flat. We need new labs, so this is not good news. Both houses are encouraging an effort that helps us, but expenses continue to rise and we are in a tough spot. Along with Dr. Butts, the Presidents of Stony Brook and Farmingdale went to visit Speaker Flanagan. Flanagan is supportive of our efforts to increase funding. The SUNY trustees may increase

fees and we may have to accept this given the budget situation. The UFS is also pressing the state.

- Other issues still on the table to-be-negotiated include: support for dreamers to get in-state tuition, restoration of cuts to EOP, and community college cuts.
- We must be more prudent in using our resources. We can and we will grow our enrollment. It is the only stability we have found in recent years. We are ahead in applications and acceptances for Fall 2018. We need to be mindful of where and how much we grow. There is demand on our resources but we need to stay committed to liberal arts. The Strategic Plan (SP) will be very important to determine where we grow and how fast we grow. The students are demanding more and more. We have a new forensic accounting degree, but we also need our core courses since they are important for well rounded students. We will keep these things in mind as we look at the SP. Woodlands residence halls is at capacity. There may be enough demand to grow beyond our 5 buildings. We may have to take a look at building some new dorms. We are a hybrid campus now. We have commuters and residential students.
- The end of the SP process is coming up. Dr. Butts is grateful to all who have participated.
- This semester there was overcrowding in our parking lots. This is a function of our class schedule and our parking lot. We need more space. Construction will start later this year.
- Middle States report is almost done, due Apr 1st. It must document assessment of non-academic units.
- The former chairman of American Express is coming to Long Island for the Executive Leadership Forum Wed April 18th 11:30am-2pm.
- Thanks to the faculty for high quality teaching. Make the students rise to you. Push the students, don't baby them. Love them with tough love in the classroom. Make them strive to do their very best. Students get a great value at OW financially but also by the quality of the faculty.
- Laure Morris comments that the state is increasingly pushing back against paying for utilities, so we need to work on being self-sufficient for buildings. Dr. Butts agrees but this requires initial investment. Morris says the new SUNY President is a big data person and she can be convinced. Dr. Butts has a meeting with her later today; he will keep that in mind. Minna Barrett comments we can apply for grants. We have a voice for the budget, and the way to do it is to write a resolution on the budget to be sent to other campuses and to the University Faculty Senate. It is up to us.

V. Provost's Report

- Wish all a restful spring break, and a productive one for those engaged in projects.
- We lost 3 days of classes due to storms. This is very significant. We have 2 days at the end of the semester and you will be notified. You must make up the work in your classes. That is the most crucial part.

VI. Point of Information (Maureen Dolan, Parliamentarian)

- The Chair had asked Parliamentarian to speak briefly about the role and responsibilities of the senators. Please see attached handout immediately following the minutes.
- The Parliamentarian called attention to the important statement on the authority of the Faculty, as empowered under Policies of the SUNY Board of Trustees, to legislate and act as a policy making body. Remember that senators are responsible for bringing issues and concerns to senate, and also should be reporting senate business back to constituencies.

- Given the time-sensitive matter recently brought to the Senate, today's comments now focus on procedural basics, as summarized in Supplement to Point of Information. Please refer to handout. During debate and possible action related to resolution on time-sensitive matter, options for voting are available to Senate, as explained in the handout.

VII. ARPT Report from former Chair (Kathleen O'Connor-Bater)

- see handout attached below
- ARPT is the last vestige of democracy composed of people from all departments. You are only eligible if not being evaluated and the evaluation is objective. If you are not being evaluated seek nomination to ARPT. A question is asked: If you have written letter for a candidate may you serve on ARPT? Yes, just step off of that one case. Faculty comments that junior faculty should be aware that they can step outside their department to ask about the process.

VIII. Old Business

A. IT Governance Committee (Jill Crocker)

- We will have a new managed print service. SUNY is in contract with Xerox for network based printing to print to whatever printer is closest to you. This changes printing budgeting on campus. This is estimated for Fall 2018 pending SUNY approval.
- SUNY workplace is a social networking tool by Facebook. It is up and running, and adopted by SUNY although not many are currently using it. You will receive an email with more info.
- Three finalists for software choices for Active Learning Spaces will be scheduled and you will get an email for faculty input.
- Meaningful consultation with faculty has come up in IT Governance in addition to other areas. Students should have representative on IT Governance. Evan Kobolakis states that the President of SGA is appointed to IT Governance.
- We need to work on the details of what meaningful consultation looks like.
- Ashlee Lien says thanks for the active learning spaces info. Lack of meaningful consultation of faculty around selection of materials is crucial. Consultation has seemingly occurred although not in a meaningful way. Who will be consulted and will the suggestions be taken? The Executive Committee should consider this. Also, consultation for other issues such as parking etc..
- Ali Ebrahimi states we need to invest in classrooms. Some of the resources are lacking, and we need meaningful consultation. We need to update our hardware.
- Joanne Spodaro is on TLRC and is a librarian. She reemphasizes that the library totally supports what Prof. Lien said. There is more consultation needed with the library. There are 7 classrooms being put into the library, but where was the consultation? Who decides allocation of library space? There is a need for more classrooms but walk around campus on Fridays and you will see empty classrooms. We have classrooms. We looked at changes in schedule. We did not use a Friday schedule because the campus relies on adjunct faculty and that is a good reason. Bear in mind that librarians work 5 days a week. Faculty don't want to come to campus 5 days a week. Some librarians have 2 full time jobs, and one librarian has 3 jobs. We need to deal with consultation.

- Len Davis comments that at the last IT Governance Committee there was discussion that we would have a meeting including all stakeholders. We will not do it until that discussion takes place.

B. Parking Lot Project (Len Davis, Ray Maggiore)

- L. Davis reports that he and R. Maggiore will provide a long term parking project update including all the steps up to the present and where we are now. R. Maggiore brings up the previously emailed documents on the projector screen. R. Maggiore deals with capital planning not facilities. Capital planning is part of Business and Finance. The map shows the facilities master plan that a committee formed in 2010, with a full report available in 2012 in the library. For the past 3 years we have talked about this plan, and it is used for planning and budgeting. For pedestrian flow and new buildings, they are all centered around a new campus green. The new lot was planned for 150 spaces on current basketball courts. Another lot was planned that did not come to fruition (map shows other location, over near new housing marked on map). One of the central themes of the master plan is that the campus green will be made to reinforce a perimeter line and a new gateway to the central green. This therefore will create a new pedestrian level at the Science Building and another new academic building. This plan is shown in a 3D rendering. The new lot is shown in 3D with the new lot over near Ring Road. In 2016 a parking study found there was a 308 parking space deficit that we needed to fulfill. The student union is the best place for the new lot, behind the dorms, and for connection to the Clark Center and the Natural Science Building. This was discussed in capital planning and posted on the capital planning webpage. In 2017 unexpected needs arose since up to 400 cars were parked out of designated spaces during high traffic days. The parking permit fees were refunded and shuttle services were used. There was a transfer of strategic funding from recently closed finances from the recent academic building. For the student union parking lot there are phases. Phase 1a will begin the process. Phase 1b is resurfacing of existing lots. Phase 2a is to cut the road from the exit from the existing main parking lot into this lot. Phase 2b is the road to the Clark Center. Trees are currently marked which are beyond the currently proposed area. In the map the runoff area is shown into a wooded area where it naturally infiltrates. Water will run under pedestrian walkways and will filter through soils. The short environmental form was used because of scope of project – no impact was found. The project was found to be in compliance with environmental conservation laws.
- Faculty asks whether there are there alternatives? Yes but they are cost prohibitive. The proposed project will cost about \$10K per parking space. A multistory parking structure would take more time and is cost prohibitive. We are considering new changes mindfully as to environmental impact. The map shows campus space v open space. We are not on top of an aquifer, we are miles from one.
- Faculty asks why the project for 150 spaces under DASNY did not come to fruition? R. Maggiore is not sure he will look into it. Faculty asks in the 2016 study, where it was found that by 2021 we will have a 308 deficit, what is the FTE in that projection? R. Maggiore responds it is a 4500 head count.
- Faculty asks how does the project propose to control accumulation of pathogens in the sump? Sumps are costly for vector control and they require toxic chemicals. Now we are taking away managed natural drainage system in order to install man-made drainage where special ground area was previously declared. The land was previously special ground protection area. Is there vector control? It is an expense, and it is biologically toxic. R. Maggiore points to the report saying the report

indicates no environmental impact. Faculty comments more hardscape increases pollution, R. Maggiore says yes regrettably. Faculty comments water quality is protected by every open space we have. Every time we take a space that was previously protected we dip into a space that is protecting us. R. Maggiore comments that this is a stop gap allowing not to collect water but to pass water through.

- Faculty asks about the sump, is it open? R. Maggiore says it is not a sump. R. Maggiore says it will look similar to what it looks now but a bit built up. R. Maggiore points to the map showing 6-7 feet in topographical change. A visitor comments that the grading shows removing all vegetation in this area, so no, it will not look like it looks now. The problem with sumps is they gradually seal up and do eventually retain water. R. Maggiore says the SEAF shows little environmental impact. What is the alternative? We can use green technologies. The current proposed plan is old style engineering.
- Student asks what percent of this is already developed? About 20% such as the tennis and basket ball court. Student asks can you guarantee this will happen? Is there a timeline that is guaranteed? There is no absolute guarantee. Has there been a soil testing? Yes, it is in the SEAF. What were the findings? What type of soil? It is in the SEAF.
- Chair A. Mattson points out there is a comment period by March 29 to the state funds. In depth long term comments need to be made to the contact provided to the campus via email by March 29th.
- Faculty comments that removing the naturally existing biological filter and replacing it with concrete can push water through. What about bio filters? What about green designs? Another faculty comments that serious alternative green solutions are being raised here, what about the meaningful input of faculty? L. Davis responds there are many ways to do this. We had outside consultants that looked at everything. Now we need your suggestions. We will have the comments given to the construction fund. They will investigate them.

C. Parking Lot Resolution (Current & Former FS Chairs)

- How did we come to this point? The wooded glen habitat will become a paved parking lot. In 2013 we sat down as a campus together, as a community, and put together a reasonable master plan that is environmentally well designed. This is the plan R. Maggiore showed earlier that we came up with as a community. Both lots contained 150 spaces. This was the master plan built based on a number of enrollment for 5700 students for 2023. The new design shows pink as new parking lot (on the projector, map provided). There is no green space with this new plan and there is a sump and the habitat has trees. We tagged the trees. Look at these pictures of the trees. They are beautiful pictures.
- Chair A. Mattson points to the Parking Lot Resolution that is provided in the packet. There is a lengthy preamble.
- Note from the Parliamentarian: When agenda and meeting documents were distributed earlier in the week, Senators were advised by the Secretary to read through all the materials prior to today's meeting.
- Dr. Butts says the proposal was made by the campus to expand the parking. The state of NY in terms of SUNY has to approve this. There comes a time when challenges and comments are made. That is going to be presented to the state construction fund. Based on that they will say whether they will go forward with

what is proposed or whether they will seek some other solution. The President will have to weigh in at some point.

- Please now open attention to the parking resolution – please read it. Faculty asks who put the proposal to the state without consulting us? Dr. Butts responds saying the plan was brought to him subjected to environmental review and the traffic study. Dr. Butts knew the plan was going to the state. Dr. Butts did not know the depth to which the plan was not acceptable to a number of people on the campus. Dr. Butts says not everyone had an opportunity to reflect on this in this way. The plans were available on the website. Faculty asks, the master plan? No the traffic study and the parking lot. Faculty asks whether a resolution has greater impact than an individual comment from faculty?
- M. Dolan, Parliamentarian, says that the Senate has choices about how to move forward (see handout, Supplement to Point of Information). The preamble of the Parking Lot Resolution could be submitted to the construction fund, as Comments from members of the EC and concerned faculty, if action on resolution is postponed. Or we could vote on approval of resolution which would then be entered into the record. In that case, preamble and resolution would be submitted as Comments to the state from the Faculty Senate.
- Former Chair K. Velsor says that the master plan was on the website but the drawing from the engineering land survey is dated 1-30-18. The changes in the parking lot is recent since the first of this year. The former chair states the previous plan was to do an environmental study. R. Maggiore says outside people handled this.
- Dr. Butts comments that there are challenges. He is willing to accept responsibility for conversations that could or should have happened. This is happening because of our growth challenges. We need to make a decision based on a situation. We made a decision and we are held responsible for the process. The process is long but it is probably right. If you embrace the right process and take it through we might not have enough time to bring to fruition.
- M. Dolan, Parliamentarian, points out A. Mattson as Chair can exercise discretion as to whether to proceed to vote on the resolution or not. He can ask for a Sense of the Senate to determine if senators are prepared to vote.
- Faculty comments that this resolution is not the same as making a decision because we were not included in decision-making and we do not have that power. There is not representative faculty involved in decision-making. Expediency makes things more complicated because it makes a situation happen in a crunch with no consultation. Note the Strategic Plan had a good outcome because there was no expediency and time was taken to do it right. Who made the decision that the master plan would be ditched and changed?
- E. Rufrano thanks the authors for composing the resolution but moves to postpone it. Is there a second motion? Evan feels he would do better justice to the students bringing it to them. There is no second.
- Faculty comments she does not think there is a parking crisis. There was at the beginning of the semester due to the golf tournament. We opened more spaces and it is tight but we are not in an emergency. Faculty comments that she should have said that the crisis is not so severe that we needed to push so fast. Faculty apologizes for not speaking up more to say there is no crisis.
- Faculty comments that resources are constrained. The master plan is a far view plan. If you do have to plan for this, does the resolution preclude original plan? No the resolution does not preclude the original plan. The original plan will cut trees

too. No, the resolution does not preclude this. The previous plan is more environmental.

- Faculty comments that tabling the resolution will delay it until after the comment period has closed for the parking lot. UUP chapter President comments that she hears on weekly basis about the ongoing struggles from folks on campus with parking. Faculty comments that parking is a matter of safety and students are crying because they cannot find parking.
- Senator calls the question for immediate vote with awareness that we would be voting on the resolution to be submitted during the comment process. This does not stop anything from happening. It expresses a sentiment for the comment period. Are we prepared to cast a vote on the resolution? 15 in favor, 1 against, 4 abstain
- The Secretary states that untenured faculty are concerned and want to vote with ballot. We have provided ballots. The Parliamentarian notes that the right to request paper ballot is provided in the bylaws. A ballot vote is conducted on the resolution: 15 in favor, 3 vote no, and 3 abstain. The preamble and resolution will be sent to state construction fund from Faculty Senate, prior to 3/29 deadline for comments.

IX. New Business

- A. Institutional Advancement (Wayne Edwards) -- postponed

X. Call to Senators: Other New Business

- A. Resolution on the Conduct of Senate Meetings (Jacob Heller) – resolution has been entered into the record so that we may revisit it at another meeting.

XII. Adjournment at 2:37pm

To: Faculty Senate
Attn: Andrew Mattson/Jennie D'Ambroise

From: Kathleen O'Connor-Bater,
Chair ARPT 2016-2017

Re/Summary Report of Academic Affairs' Decisions

ARPT REPORT

During the AY 2016-2017, ARPT had 42 files of candidates scheduled for review. Of these 42, one submitted the resignation prior to the ARPT review and two resigned subsequently to the ARPT vote and are therefore not included in the Memorandum on ARPT/Administrative Decisions issued by Academic Affairs. Of the thirty-nine remaining candidates, the thirty-seven were unanimously supported by their sponsoring departments with ARPT votes unanimously supporting the Department recommendation, though the term of the reappointment vote was divided between the 2-year or the 3-year reappointment in 5 cases, for which Academic Affairs decided on a 2-Year reappointment in all but one case, in which the decision for the 3-year reappointment was issued. In one case, the Department vote was unanimously in favor of reappointment, but with the recommended term divided with 11 favoring the 2-year reappointment and 3 voting for one year. The decision from Academic Affairs was for 2 years.

The breakdown of the reappointment categories and terms, as well as the tenure and promotion decisions are discussed below.

First and Second reappointment: There were eleven candidates whose files ARPT reviewed for the first reappointment; and eight for the second reappointment.

One Year to Tenure Review Reappointment: Eight candidates were reviewed for the One-Year-to-Tenure Review Reappointment with all eight recommended unanimously by their Departments and voted unanimously in favor of the reappointment by ARPT.

Tenure and Promotion: ARPT reviewed nine files for Tenure of which eight files for Tenure and Promotion to Associate and one, who had been hired at the Associate Professor rank, for tenure only. One faculty member was recommended for Promotion to Associate Professor with a 2-year Reappointment leading to the Tenure Review instead of the One-Year-to-Tenure Review Reappointment.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen O'Connor-Bater

Supplement to Point of Information
Prepared by Parliamentarian (Maureen Dolan)
Faculty Senate Meeting of March 16, 2018

Some Procedural Basics re. Debate and Action on Resolution dealing with Time-Sensitive Matter

- Resolutions are usually introduced to the Senate under New Business, then acted upon in a subsequent meeting. For resolutions dealing with time-sensitive matter(s), the Chair has discretion to allow debate and action in a single session, consistent with faculty governance precedence and University Faculty Senate standards and practices.
 - After a resolution has been read into the record, and assuming it has been seconded, the floor is open to debate. The Chair is responsible for conducting debate, during which Senators argue “For or Against” a resolution. The Chair may rule tangential commentary “out of order”.
-

The Chair has discretion in procedural matters of debate, including but not limited to:

- Recognizing sequence of Senators to speak (e.g., in order of hands raised)
- Recognizing non-Senators to speak, assuming that a Senator yields time
- Possibly limiting the allotted time per speaker, especially when many in queue
- Asking for informal “Sense of the Senate” to determine if unanimous consent is feasible

Note: Speakers raising “Point of Information” or “Point of Order” may have the floor out of sequence.

Some Options available to Senate in consideration of resolution on time-sensitive matter:

- Vote on approval of resolution (Yes, No, Abstain) – by voice, hand or paper ballot
- Vote to continue debate at a Special Meeting of the Senate (prior to 3/29 deadline for comments)
- Vote to refer to Executive Committee (for action related to 3/29 deadline for comments)
- Vote to postpone Senate action on resolution to a subsequent Senate meeting (after the 3/29 deadline for comments)

Note: Any amendments, ancillary or substitute resolutions are normally acted upon prior to main resolution.
