

**AT OLD WESTBURY
FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

**Friday, April 5, 2019
12:30 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.
Location NAB 1100**

***** 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>**

Minutes

Roster of Senators Present: Andrew Mattson (Chair), Dana Tomlin (Secretary/Treasurer), Laurette Morris (University Senator), Maureen Dolan (Parliamentarian/M&CIS)), Ana Martinez (Professional), Bonnie Eannone (Professional), Ashley Alvarado(SGA), Laure Anker (FY), Roger Mayer (AC), Sara Williamson (MMF),Xavier Marechaux (AE), Blidi Stemm (CE), Lina Gillic (EE), Jillian Nissen(BS), Camille Jones (CP), Deepa Jani (EN), Veronika Dolar (EN), Svetlana Jovic (PY), Chris Hartman (PH), Lee Blackstone (SY), Eric Hagan (VA), Frank Sanacory (CAP), Jillian Crocker (TLRC), Alireza Ebrahimi (FRRC)

Roster of Senators Absent: Michael Kavic (Senator at Large, At Large Rep to the EC), Joseph Foy (Senator at Large), Peter Ikeler (Senator at Large), Manya Mascareno (Senator at Large), Kathleen Velsor (Senator at Large), Runi Mukherji (University Senator Alternate), Jon Kleinman (Professional), Tag Ford (SGA), Priscila Ortega(SGA), Lisa Payton (AE), Jingyi Song (HP), Zenaida Madurka (ML), Christopher Hobson (ARPT), Patty Harris (LEC),

Visitors: Helidon Gjergji, Cris Notaro, Jacob Heller, Martha Livingston, Claudia Marin Andrade, Shalei Simms

- | | |
|---|------------|
| 0. Meeting arrival and sign in | 12:20 p.m. |
| I. Call to Order | 12:30 p.m. |
| | |
| II. Approval of Minutes for February 15 th | |
| Sarah Williamson, added to minutes as present | |
| Motion to approve minutes has been approved with amendment | |
| III. Chair's report | |
| - We as in the ad hoc committee for student evaluations did a brief survey. | |
| - Survey went out, results are in. Brief presentation of summary is indeed the chairs report. Asks Jacob Heller to report | |
| - Asked if members of the committee are present. Everyone has an attachment of the summary in their email. It was also displayed on the screen in the room: Ad hoc Faculty Administrative committee on the Blue experience | |
| - Jacob Heller spoke: concocted a survey based on faculty senate and them, survey to see how faculty liked blue. Collaborative effort. The survey ran from March 12 th through the 25 th and was sent to all faculty including adjuncts | |
| - 61 individuals responded, 17% response rate which is good for an online survey. | |

- Distribution of the types of faculty responding was visible on question 37, three-way split, adjunct: 18, tenure track: 18 and tenured: 20, with a couple of visiting and lecturers.
- Not a random sample. We should not generalize from it. Just to inform the discussion.
- Tentative plans to speak to SGA leadership who are very interested in a student evaluation process where students have access, this report is purely descriptive.
- Some analysis needs to be done of this report.
- Not representative, some weird patterns. In number 35, the most frequent 1st choice of respondents is: students should not have access to student evaluations. This survey only tells you about the 61 people who responded but not the faculty as a whole
- For folks not familiar with evaluations history here, the historical pattern was that evaluations were available for everyone in the library, but not for the last 10 years.
- One of the things he's interested in is home-grown data, regarding the different biases that everyone knows exists. Gender biases or what have you.
- Research states that students who learn the most tend to rate their professors worse in student evaluations. We should be aware of things like this in how we use student evaluations.
- Basically, it was divided into two. Questions were divided into three groups. There is disagreement, a topic worth discussing. Only 17% participated so other input would be helpful.
- First two pages have quantitative stuff, then later on you can read the rest on the last few pages. Hard to say how written comments align with quantitative responses.
- Question: what were the challenges, privacy issues and concerns?
- He would like to propose focus groups going further, to find out what their real concerns are and also involve students as opposed to an anonymous survey.
- Comment from the floor: these are complicated questions. Students may not need to have access to all of the data but maybe some, ton of written feedback which is great. Plugging TLRC conference.

IV. President's Report

- Thanks Tom Delgiudice for a great conference on the crisis in Central America. Had 60 minutes lined up... but did not work out.
- Congratulated Lorenz Neuwirth of Psychology department and Neuroscience Research Institute at SUNY Old Westbury as "Carol Ann Paul Educator of the Year".
- Also congratulated Jacqueline Emery for summer stipend award by the National Endowment for the Humanities, prep for her new book.
- State legislature has agreed to a new budget. There is little difference in this budget than the one before. Funding for campuses is basically flat.
- Increases funding for Excelsior
- Dream Act that extends NYS financial aid to DACA signed into law
- Funds will also be provided to cover this year's costs stemming from UUP pay increases.
- We are challenged by being able to attract faculty due to high cost of living.
- Looking to add housing for faculty on campus as an added incentive, but he has received opposition due to cost.
- We are focusing even more than ever on retention
- Promoting the need for new science building, we want to add 40k sq. ft. to existing building. We are already speaking money, in the middle of \$3.7 Mil design phase.
- Planning to re-do Duane Jones Recital Hall, completely change everything from seats to flooring.
- He was in the new library, and will get training on how to use the new technology in that building.

- Middle States is doing well. Self-design study will be sent in a few days; set to begin next fall. April 30th visit by Dr. Sean McKittrick, vice president of Middle States.
- The search process for new president is moving forward. There was a College Council meeting early this morning, and Faculty Senate Chair will bring you up to date. Input of faculty is needed and required by SUNY, we want to make sure this process moves forward with highest level of integrity.
- We cannot do this without the help of the faculty.
- What he does not want is what happened 20 years ago, with no input from the faculty, and it came from the top down. Doesn't want that to happen again.

V. Provost Report

- Asked Jacob Heller to report. Jacob has 2 things.
- He did make a promise at steering meeting that updates will be made at every meeting possible, Margaret, he and Anthony have been working on the road map for the process that will begin in the fall. 120 people - faculty and staff and students will be involved. Steering committee of 26 people has been identified
- Every working group is chaired by 2 people, at least one is a faculty member.
- Steering committee will be inviting on April 30th faculty and staff to come and meet. Then more parts of the draft of the self-study design will go forward
- Question from the floor: should I make myself available? H311 will accommodate 30 people to talk to the Middle States liaison. Faculty staff and students are welcome. They encourage students to participate.
- This meeting will take place 1:00 to 2:30pm for faculty and students to meet.
- Second item: Academic schedule... available for students to register now
- Ad Astra Platinum Analytics, a company that analyzes live-student registration data, to give us information based on student demand versus faculty demand.
- This year we were not able to add Ad Astra data in as effectively as planned, but better data usage for spring of 2020 is projected.
- Department chairs should have already submitted their spring 2020 schedules to Academic Affairs.
- Goal is to start much earlier and have streamlined submission process
- Moving towards development of year-long academic schedule.
- Ad Astra data is coming in now. Can chairs change their schedules based on it?
- Two components... 5 years of registration history to use to predict, and platinum data of currently registered students which won't be available till late in September after add/drop period
- Idea of spring 2020 schedule, we want to give students the chance to place accordingly. It also looks at currently enrolled students and will be available after period is ended and will be available in fall.
- He will be meeting with anyone who schedules classes to make sure everyone can agree with the dates. Want to make sure everyone can agree with the dates for submissions in the fall. Goal is to have it go live in spring, so they can be prepared for fall 2020
- There will be much less opportunity to modify schedule again and again, he would like to talk to deans and chairs to see how it would work.
- Ad Astra does forecasting for the next semester, best estimate for enrollment needs. They do give us some information about the breakdown of components. Email him with questions.

VI. Old Business

A. Science Building Update (Ray Maggiore)

- Starting back in 2011, facilities master plan was created by Capital Plan committee chaired by Tom Delgiudice.
- Science building and expansion of parking lot were in the works.
- We had a target of 5k head count and have met those targets, so we are on track but we have run out of space
- In 2016 we did a planning study to help fund the STEM design; steering committee for State University Construction Fund.
- Project listed by the Construction Fund in 2016; they studied the building and its contents, and the programs in the building, and arrived at a program for the addition.
- They came up with a 40,000 sq. ft. addition. We had a program for 107,000 sq. ft. but that was not feasible although it did include Mathematics, Information Technology and Computing.
- Question from a senator: So the planned STEM addition will be limited to existing science programs, and not include math, engineering or technology?
- Yes, for the dollars available, it made sense to stay with the core programs that are already in the science building.
- We changed the funds approach rather than renovating the existing building
- In August 2018, we went back to look at the program again, to look at their stats, and where we were keeping on track with our enrollment.
- Checked in again with committee. Things checked out, academic support space, classroom support space, research space, we are meeting goals in these areas.
- Changes in committee, 3 additional people were added.
- Concept study with visioning session.
- We didn't start with what the building was going to look like, but did an exercise with different rooms, and worked with architects to decide what we wanted for our space.
- The addition would be in line with the Chancellor's directive for zero net-energy building. Deep energy retrofit. Entire building would be LEEDs silver.
- Envisioning a new corridor entry building. We have expanded the parking but we plan to expand more. Campus corridor and pedestrian path
- Three concepts were evaluated. Produce a cube, wrap existing building, a repeat of what we have as building shape, or a courtyard between existing and new addition.
- Wrap was good, but very introverted building.
- Courtyard scheme is what was chosen and what helps us keep up with campus green. A useful space where outdoor labs can be held.
- Allows for mixing and collaborative spaces
- We are working now and in schematic design, which will look at detailed program for each room.
- State has given us a limit, we are not to exceed that square footage, including green roof and research labs. Design is less than half way done.
- Question from Maureen Dolan: Are there plans to implement passive solar or solar PV on site, which might bump us up to LEEDs gold or platinum?
- Ray responded yes, plan is to include solar.
- Many questions pertaining to preliminary design
- Faculty asked how many classrooms can be completely blacked out?

Special Announcement. Dr. Butts just learned that Leticia German has died in an automobile accident, on Clinton Avenue. She is from Albany. Her mom is 35-year State University employee. This is a tragic loss and he wanted all to know...

- B. CAP resolution: Combined B.S./M.A.T. in Bio. Adolescence Ed.
 - 5 year program, the opportunity to offer as one single unit. They already offer the two individually, demand is the same as before but may make us more competitive if offered as a pair.
 - Motion on the floor to open up for discussion and questions
 - Motion was seconded and approved: 24 in favor 0 opposed 0 abstentions
- C. CAP resolution: Storing program reviews/assessment reports
 - At Feb. 15 meeting this was also introduced. Not a program proposal, but right now we have departmental Five-Year reviews every 5 to 7 years for each of our degrees. Right now, these reviews go from department to CAP.
 - While this process goes on, institutional research holds onto a copy. They asked that they be a reference and that they hold onto departmental reports, electronic copies. They already receive a copy but they want to be able to keep it.
 - Motion on the floor to open up for discussion.
 - Laura Anker seconded motion. It was approved to open for discussion.
 - Comments from Senators, worries about the issue of electronic documents. Worry whether stuff will be easily accessible going forward.
 - This resolution is just limited to whether institutional research will have a copy and treat them as a copy. It's already a library in their email files, but now it can be official.
 - As the Faculty Senate, we should have our own library, our own archives.
 - Some Senators commented on the much larger Senate office in old Academic Village. It was a suite of rooms and included storage for current and historical documents, reports and Senate archives. Faculty could wander in browse through the archives, learning the history of governance.
 - Archive and repository can be talked about at a later date. This is a very specific resolution, no additional information.
 - Vote please?
 - All in favor: 24 in favor 0 opposed 0 abstentions

VII. New Business

A. Presidential Search Process

- Andy called attention to the SUNY guidelines for conducting a Presidential Search. Distributed electronically and included as part of today's packet
- Encourage members of the faculty to check out the guidelines.
- College Council is setting up search committee, description of composition of search committee per SUNY guidelines.
- College Council emphasized that they want this committee formalized soon. 3 names for president candidates will go forward to the Chancellor's office. Per SUNY requirement, the Search Committee will include six full-time faculty. Open nomination process to give people enough time to nominate and a secret ballot
- Anyone can nominate themselves or someone else, full time teaching faculty member
- Then we have to have an election
- On behalf of EC, Maureen Dolan prepared a handout for today's discussion, Process for Electing Faculty Representatives to Presidential Search Committee. (attached to minutes)
- The last time our faculty was asked to elect representatives to a Presidential Search was two decades ago. The Chair of the College Council came to the

Senate, under an even tighter time-frame than we now have. That election took place at a special meeting of the senate. Any faculty member was eligible to be nominated. Nominees presented themselves at the special meeting, then there was a vote.

- Much discussion followed regarding how to conduct the nominations and election of faculty to the Presidential Search.
- Should it happen at a senate meeting? Is any faculty member able to vote?
- We need to decide on Composition of the 6 representatives: selected at large or according to an agreed-upon allocation of slots, such as for schools?
- When Presidential Search Committee was last constituted in 1999, there were no schools or deans at Old Westbury. No provost either, just an academic vice president. We also did not have departments, but were organized solely through academic programs. Wow!
- On college-wide committees, due to large size of school of arts and sciences, they usually get 2 or 3 reps, and education and business have fewer reps. Proportionately, the 6 faculty for Search would be 2 reps for arts and science, 1 education, 1 business, and 2 at large. The last time we were all elected "at large", since schools did not exist at the time.
- It is our hope that people who end up on Search represent not only different schools, but also our values, diversity, social justice, the place that we are.
- What is the best way to do it? Designate slots or all at large, no matter what?
- Comments regarding equal representation by faculty in each school. But not all schools meet as a group. Maybe schools can nominate their own representative, and then go forward to senate for a full vote.
- If election of reps is at large, a small school may get left out of the process.
- Comment from the floor: Arts and science is 6 times bigger than education, and 4 times larger than business.
- Comment: every school should decide their own process; voting process shouldn't be dictated by senate.
- But this would not align with requirements of SUNY governance.
- The parliamentarian referred to our governance structure as one body, one faculty. As empowered by Policies of the SUNY Board of Trustees, our governance operates under bylaws approved by and for the college. Our Faculty Senate Chair is recognized by SUNY as campus governance leader.
- A visitor commented: these procedures are quite relevant and appropriate. The last search ended with faculty not having any say, even though we undertook process in good faith, the president was imposed on the college.
- Are there any guarantees that what happened last time won't happen again?
- Lots of faculty protested back then. Even though we followed SUNY search procedures, the faculty had no say in outcome.
- The Chair reiterated that we have a mandate to provide the College Council with 6 names. The proposal in handout is a specific request as to *how* to position these six. How do we choose? At large or by school? We also need to decide how and when they will be voted
- Much more discussion back and forth.
- Point of Information: the duration of Search will be about a year to a year and a half, but could take longer. Typical in such situations for an interim president to be appointed until Search ends with new president. T
- Per SUNY guidelines, three final candidates are recommended by the Search Committee to Chancellor for final selection.
- All faculty should be involved in voting. Nominations are open to all faculty.
- We should articulate our values and our goals.

- Suggestion: a working group meets with EC next week to come up with a process. Next senate meeting is on the 3rd of May. Are people open to coming back before then? (yes!)
- Do we want electoral college system to again choose our President?
- **Point of Order:** In view of the time (nearing 2:30pm), the Parliamentarian asks for a motion from the floor to extend the discussion for 15 minutes. Motion is seconded and approved.
- Discussion continues. Issues of representation, equity and inclusion... school of education and business. Two at large would allow for inclusivity.
- Maureen referred to information in the handout. College Council Chair came in person to Senate 20 years ago. SUNY recognizes the role of senate in this matter. It was seen as a compromise to have special meeting of the Senate at which any member of the faculty would be granted voting rights. We already have precedent in amending voting criteria. If election occurs at a Special FS meeting, hopefully people will care and will want to participate.
- First who is going to vote and who do we vote for? All faculty should be involved in the vote, not just senators. Can voting be done by ballot, online?
- If full faculty online voting, Vote should be informed by discussion. Comments that we should meet again but not extend the election deadline, there are only three weeks left in April. Also, nominees should submit bios.
- Chair summarizes options: nominations open? Full faculty or senate? Online and in meeting? Paper ballots? At large per 2 SAS, 1 SOB, 1 SOE, 2 at large
- 4/26 meeting to vote
- Entire meeting on 12th or 19th? Dedicated to this...extended senate meeting. Can we meet before the 26th?
- Issue not resolved today, so can we vote on having another meeting? Next meeting on the 12th...9:30am. Assuming we have a quorum...
- Who wants to be on the working group with EC??? Volunteers: Laura Anker, Ali Ebrahimi, Xavier Marechaux, Sara Williamson, Roger Mayer
- All in all, agreement to have Special FS meeting on April 12th at 9:30 to 11am so as not to conflict with the TLRC conference. The working group with EC will come up with plan of action to put the voting procedure into motion. At the Special April 12th meeting, senators will vote on the procedure that is offered, and the vote for faculty reps will be settled at the May 3rd meeting.

VIII. Nominations for Faculty Governance Elections (item not covered due to lack of time)

IX. Announcements

X. Adjournment at 2:45pm.

Process for Electing Faculty Representatives to Presidential Search Committee

Background/Rationale

In its nearly three decades of existence, our Faculty Senate has dealt only once before, in 1998-1999, with the election of faculty to a Presidential Search. At that time, the Chair of the College Council came to the Senate, and addressed the Senate as the governance body elected to represent each department and the Faculty at-large. Understanding the Senate's function as the deliberative body for organizing and carrying out the business of the Faculty, the College Council Chair expected that Senate could expedite an election process in tight time frame.

Old Westbury's current governance structure was established in 1991 (in consultation with a SUNY visitation team that included UFS President), to help improve the effectiveness and accountability of campus governance. Although a large proportion of OW faculty may have been actively engaged in governance in the early years of the college, by the 1980's, declining attendance at faculty meetings led a former President to call repeatedly for a Quorum; this resulted in adjournment of Full Faculty meetings due to insufficient attendance. The low rate of participation at meetings of the Faculty, which disrupted governance years ago and led to establishment of a representative form of governance, has unfortunately persisted over the decades.

Our campus governance leader, the Faculty Senate Chair, has now been tasked by current Chair of the College Council with expediting a process to elect six faculty to a Presidential Search Committee. Consistent with our values and principles, the process approved by the Senate should be equitable, transparent, and responsive to the time-sensitive nature of the task. Mindful that Full Faculty meetings have a decades-long history of poor attendance, yet committed to the idea that any member of the full-time faculty should be eligible to participate in the election process, the Executive Committee proposes a process that is fair, effective and inclusive.

Faculty Bylaws allow for the granting of Senate voting privileges, in special instances, to persons other than full-time faculty (Article V, section B.12). The Senate also regularly grants voting rights to (3) members of SGA and (3) professional staff; the University Faculty Senate and some other SUNY campuses have an even broader treatment of voting privileges in the Senate. Our Bylaws also allow for calling Special Meetings or Emergency Meetings, as needed or appropriate. There is precedent at Old Westbury for amending voting criteria, as needed or appropriate, at Special Meetings or under special circumstances (ranging from February 1997 Special Meeting to deal with a serious matter involving senior administration, to September 2017 amendment to voting criteria to deal with sudden vacancy in the position of Faculty Senate Chair).

Therefore, in view of precedent, the following process is proposed by the Executive Committee:

- The Faculty Senate Chair will notify all faculty of pending Presidential Search and invite faculty nominations (recommending 2 SAS reps, 1 SOB, 1 SOE, and 2 At-Large faculty representatives).
- **Special/Expanded Meeting of the Faculty Senate will be called for April 26, 2019.** At this meeting, candidates for (6) faculty slots on Presidential Search will be given time to speak about their background and interest in serving on Search Committee. Additional nominations will be solicited from the floor.
- **Faculty Senate voting privileges will be extended for one day only** (April 26), expanded to include any member of the faculty in attendance at the Special/Expanded Special Meeting who requests a ballot. No full-time faculty member who wishes to participate in the process will be excluded. Voting for the (6) faculty reps to Presidential Search will be by secret ballot. (Provisions for absentee ballots?)
- **Additional Special Meetings or Town-Hall** meetings may be called by the Senate (consistent with precedent) to gather input and discuss issues of concern to the faculty and the broader community, as relates to the Presidential Search and the future of the college.