

**AT OLD WESTBURY  
FACULTY SENATE “SPECIAL” MEETING**

**Friday, March 12, 2019**

**9:30 a.m to 11:00 a.m.**

**Location MPR B**

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

**Documents for this meeting and calendar of meetings are available at:**

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

**Roster of Senators Present:** Andrew Mattson (chair), Dana Tomlin (Secretary/treasurer), Maureen Dolan (parliamentarian), Peter Ikeler (Senator at Large), Bonnie Eannone (professional), Ana Martinez (professional), Ashley Alvarado (SGA), Laura Anker (FY), Roger Mayer (AC), Sara Williamson (MMF), Xavier Marechaux (AE), Lillian Nissen (BS), Lisa Payton(AS), Camille Jones (CP), Deepa Jani (EN), Zenaida Madurka (ML), Veronkia Dolar (PEL), Chris Hartman (PH), Lee Blackstone (SY), Eric Hagan (VA), Frank Sanacory (CAP), Jillian Croker (TLRC), Alireza Ebrahimi (FRRC).

**Roster of Senators Absent:** Laurette Morris (University Senator), Michael Kavic (at large rep to the EC ), Joseph Foy ( Senator At-Large), Manya Mascareno (Senator At-Large ), Kathleen Velsor (Senator At-Large), William Gillis (University Senator Alternate), Jon Kleinman (Professional), Taj Ford (SGA), Priscila Ortega (SGA), Roger Mayer (AC), Sara Williamson (MMF), Blindi Sternn (CE), Lina Gillic (EE), Jingyi Song (HP), Seojung Jung (PY), Christopher Hobson (ARPT), Patty Harris (LEC).

Visitors: Tom Delguidice, Lillian Park, Jacob Heller, Claudia Andrade, Minna Barrett

**Minutes**

- |  |           |
|--|-----------|
| 0. Meeting arrival and sign in   | 9:30 a.m. |
| I. Call to Order   | 9:35 a.m. |
| II. Chair's Report   |           |
| ○ Nominations are open and will be open until April 26 <sup>th</sup>   |           |
| ○ Thanks to the members of the faculty working group that helped the EC to come up with the proposals.   |           |
| ○ Nominations must close a week before the May 3 <sup>rd</sup> meeting to give people time to vote.  |           |
| ○ Senators stress to your departments that it is extremely important to come out to the meeting on May 3 <sup>rd</sup> and vote.   |           |
| ○ We have three decisions to make. Process: raise the questions, then 15 minutes of discussion going around, one minute each, nobody gets to speak twice until everyone has spoken. Vote by secret ballot. |           |
| III. <b>Decision I: Should Six Seats by all 'At Large' or allocated by School, "Structured"?</b>   |           |
| • Option one: all at large   |           |
| • option two: "structured" seats allocated by school   |           |

This is a senate vote. All senators can vote

Discussion:

- To keep it organized, first there will be discussion on decision one. After that vote, if there is an allocation then we do decision one. The motion on the floor, decision one.
- VA believes structured makes the most sense.

- All at large is a better decision in order to incorporate all faculty including the library. In a structured decision, there are people who get left out.
- We function as a whole faculty. All the schools contribute to each other and our interests are as one faculty and one college.
- Librarians and lecturers get left out without an at large position
- A percentage of faculty within each department has been broken down. From the office of institutional research,.
- The mission of this institution is Arts and Sciences and important for people not to lose sight of this.
- SOB position: Structured approach, as there is precedent, this is how we vote for committees.
- Because of the sheer size of School of Arts and Sciences, an At Large decision could skew everything towards all seats being filled with Arts and Science people.
- the entire faculty should be represented, tenure and untenured, diversity by age and race.

**Question called:** Two senators to volunteer to count. Roger Mayer & Veronkia Dolar

**Result: "Structured" wins.**

- **Structured: 17**
- **All at large: 6**
- **Abstain: 1**

#### IV. **Decision II: How should the six seats be allocated or "structured"?**

If Allocating Seats by School: Three options.

1. 2 SAS, 1 SOB, 1 SOE, 2 At-Large
2. 3 SAS, 1 SOB, 1 SOE, 1 At-Large
3. 4 SAS, 1 SOB, 1 SOE, 0 At-Large

Discussion:

- What happens if two of the options were very close? Then we would do a runoff and vote again to see if we have a winner.
- Discussion for at large versus not at large, motion on the floor and was later withdrawn.
- At least one at large was suggested. To help represent library. The library and first year would not be represented without an at large.
- Sociology position: at large is the way to go as we cannot designate a spot just for the library simply because of its size.
- Should Ballot be printed with voting by slots, school seats?
- The slots are that the ballot would be divided by school and then at large and we would be putting names in by category/school?
- People with the highest votes should win. However, others say option one gives the most flexibility.
- The at large positions should be able to be allotted for anyone no matter what school this will include the library but is not limited to those who are not already in schools.
- There are 6 seats. Top 2 in Arts and sciences get two seats, top vote getters in education and business get one seat each, last two top vote getters get the two 'at large' seats.
- **Motion to call the question, Seconded.** Vote for categories/slots listed on the paper ballot or no categories printed on ballot.
  - **Result: Ballot will not list school for voting by "category" or slot.**
    - **Yes for "category" ballots: 8,**

- **No for voting by “category”: 14**
- **Abstain: 2**
- Ballots will list nominee names, but not divided by school seats.
- **Proposal for library to be included in school of Arts and Sciences if the at large does not make the cut**
  - Motion to include librarians as SAS or at large, Seconded.
  - Question called: Have librarians run as SAS if there are no possible at large positions.
  - **Result: 16 in favor 2 opposed 2 abstentions. Librarians would be counted as SAS if there are no at large seats.**

#### V. **Decision III: How to run the election?**

- We need to decide how to run the election before we decide on seat allocation.
- In person voting on the 3<sup>rd</sup> of May and absentee ballot to faculty senate office right up until 12pm on May 3<sup>rd</sup>
- Name will be checked off to make sure you are an eligible voter
- Another way is absentee is to vote via email
- All ballots will be counted at the meeting including paper/email absentee ballots
- Counted by a small group representing each school.

Question Called: If Allocating Seats by School: Three options.

Option One: 2 SAS, 1 SOB, 1 SOE, 2 At-Large

Option Two: 3 SAS, 1 SOB, 1 SOE, 1 At-Large

Option Three: 4 SAS, 1 SOB, 1 SOE, 0 At-Large

- **Results: top two options are 1 & 3**
  - **Option 1: 9 votes**
  - **Option 3: 8 votes**
- We need to vote again, Runoff: 1 or 3 are the options
- Faculty member calls for reopening of discussion. Chair opposes because we are short on time.
- **Results of runoff between option 1 & 3: Winner - Option 1 [2 SAS, 1 SOB, 1SOE, 2 At-Large]**
  - **Option 1: 13 votes**
  - **Option 3: 11 votes**

Discussion: Absentee and email voting is only for those who cannot attend, you should be able to hear each candidate speak at the meeting before voting if possible

#### **Proposal: Allocate seats for tenured and untenured?**

Discussion:

- Should at least 2 of the 6 people be guaranteed to be untenured faculty?
- Non tenure track faculty can run, they would count as untenured
- The most important thing is diversity so extra categories is setting up barriers s there is opposition to this.
- Motion to create at least 2 slots for non-tenured faculty on the ballot.
  - Question called, Second.
  - **Result: Motion does not pass. Seats will not be allocated by tenure status.**

- **Yes: 8**
- **No: 14**

## VI. Adjournment

## **Process for Electing Faculty Representatives to Presidential Search Committee**

### **Background**

The Presidential Search Committee to be convened by the Old Westbury College Council will include, per SUNY guidelines, six members of the college's full-time faculty elected by secret ballot, as well as the campus governance leader (CGL) ex officio. Any full-time faculty member is eligible for nomination and election to the Presidential Search Committee. The College Council Chair has tasked our CGL, the Faculty Senate Chair, with expediting the process for electing the faculty representatives to the Presidential Search Committee. Under Faculty Bylaws, the Faculty Senate functions as the deliberative body responsible for organizing and carrying out the business of the Faculty. Consistent with our values and principles, the current election process to be approved by the Senate should be equitable, transparent and responsive to the time-sensitive nature of the task. In view of the College Council deadline of early May, the latest date that Faculty Senate could reasonably conduct election and certify results would appear to be the Senate meeting scheduled for May 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Our faculty governance structure exists at the level of the College. We operate as one campus governance body. Our current governance structure was established in 1991, in consultation with a SUNY Visitation Team that included the UFS President. Article X of the Policies of the SUNY Board of Trustees empowers campus faculty to create and approve their own Bylaws for campus governance, in accordance with standards and practices of the University Faculty Senate. (UFS is established under Article VII of the Policies as the official agency through which the University Faculty engage in governance of the University).

### **➤ Issue One: Structuring the Allocation of Six Faculty Representatives**

For context: the college has approximately 180 FT faculty across three schools (SAS, SOB and SOE), with additional faculty in FY, SPS and the Library. On a proportionate basis, SAS comprises about 75.6% of FT faculty, SOB about 15% and SOE about 9.4%. On a strictly proportionate basis, given 6 available slots, SAS would be allotted 4.54 out of 6 slots, SOB would be allotted 0.9 slot (rounded to 1) and SOE would be allotted 0.56 slot (rounded to 1). With only six slots on Presidential Search available to faculty, a strictly proportionate allocation is not feasible.

For those who might argue that election for all six representatives should be At-Large, this approach would allow the *possibility* that faculty from smaller schools (SOB and SOE) could be completely shut out by the much larger SAS, thus precluding broad representation of perspectives and experiences. For those who might argue that SAS should have, at minimum, 4 of 6 slots (with 1 each to SOB and SOE), this approach would eliminate from consideration any faculty affiliated with the Library, FY or SPS. A more equitable approach would appear to be a modified proportionate approach that includes a provision for at-large representative.

- **Decision One:** Choose 1 of the following Options for allocating slots on Presidential Search Committee
  - A) All Six (6) Faculty elected At-Large
  - B) 2 SAS, 1 SOB, 1 SOE, 2 At-Large
  - C) 3 SAS, 1 SOB, 1 SOE, 1 At-Large
  - D) 4 SAS, 1 SOB, 1 SOE, 0 At-Large

➤ **Issue Two: How to Elect the Six Faculty Representatives**

The election of faculty to the Presidential Search Committee is a relatively rare and very serious matter for governance. In the past three decades, only one precedent exists (1998-99) for such an election. Unlike the annual nominations/elections process for committees - conducted over several months according to procedures described in Faculty Bylaws, which in turn have been vetted with Senate and approved by the Faculty - the current process must be expedited under a time constraint originating outside faculty governance.

Any full-time faculty member is eligible for nomination and election to the Presidential Search Committee. Our faculty governance structure exists at the level of the College. We operate as one campus governance body. It is expected that any faculty member elected to the Presidential Search will be an effective advocate for the College and its mission and values. The existing organization through Schools (since early 2000's) is an *administrative* not a governance construct. Although faculty in smaller schools (SOE and SOB) may tend to operate as one unit at the School level, faculty in the much larger SAS tend to operate at the department level. Faculty in SAS are not constrained in nominating or voting for faculty from their own department. Faculty with other affiliations (e.g., FY, SPS and the Library) would be eligible for nomination to an At-Large slot.

Faculty in smaller schools may argue that their school(s) alone should nominate and elect a representative, if allotted a specific slot on Presidential Search Committee. Some have cited school-specific voting for some governance committees. However, in the annual election cycle for (10) committees and Senators At-Large, school-specific voting exists for three committees and Senators At-Large. (In past Bylaws revisions, the approval of such voting was for varied purposes.) In the current situation, the good-will of faculty in each school should be balanced with the expectation that faculty elected to Presidential Search will represent the Faculty of the College – not simply a specific school or department.

For possible consideration: If allotted a specific slot on Presidential Search Committee, faculty in SOB and SOE may potentially vet nominees and decide on a single candidate to forward to the Faculty Senate for election to designated school slot. Any additional nominations from SOE or SOE (beyond the candidate potentially agreed upon by school faculty in a fair and transparent process) could be considered for At-Large slot.

Governance throughout SUNY operates by direct participation in meetings, debate, policy-making and voting. You need to show up. This model of in-person (not virtual) participation extends from SUNY Board of Trustees and College Councils to the SUNY Senate and campus Faculty Senates. In the current situation of Presidential Search, some may argue that online voting is simpler. But it would also seem reasonable to consider the governance model of SUNY leadership, and the absolute requirement of integrity in our process. One person, one vote. Secret ballot. The election must be expedited and validated without possibility of technical glitches.

- **Decision Two:** Choose 1 of the following Options for Voting
  - A) **Election at May 3<sup>rd</sup> Special Meeting of Faculty Senate by secret ballot (paper ballot):** All FT faculty in attendance 5/3 will be able to vote in person by secret ballot. Provision for absentee voting by paper ballot: nominations could close 4/25, with ballots prepared by 4/26. Faculty could pick up absentee ballot in Senate Office (4/26-5/2). **Ballot box** possibly also located in Senate Office.
  - B) **Election at May 3<sup>rd</sup> Special Meeting of the Faculty Senate by secret ballot (paper ballot):**  
Combined with provision for alternative/absentee voting online? How would this be accomplished?
  - C) **Election by Online voting only?** (Any back-up provision?)