

SUNY/ COLLEGE AT OLD WESTBURY
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Friday, October 17, 2003
12:30-2:50 pm

Present: K. Velsor, E. Linger, R.J. Edelson, M. Dolan, L. Cox, R. Brown, J. Conforti, C. Franco, I. Ahmed, A. Barbera, C. Mirra, S. Pryor, K. Wu, C. Sawyer, C. Hobson, M. Keefe, H. Lewittes, G. Snedeker, S. O'Connor, C. Bernard, C. Ottenheimer

Visitors: W. Lupardo, P. O'Sullivan, G. Seidman, R. Welton, P. Smith, V. Clarke, R. Gonzalez

I. Minutes approved as corrected.

II. Report of the Chair:

- a. There is one campus-wide vacancy in the CAP. There are also more resignations from other campus-wide committees.
- b. We need a discussion of how to find people for positions, whether by appointment or by campus-wide nominations and elections.
- c. Lots of cooperative activities – planting on campus today.
- d. Town meeting well attended and upbeat, with good student participation, and faculty were there to respond when necessary.
- e. Responses to the appeal letter – received 3 categories of reasons for why faculty did not want to serve not serve: 1) They are on other committees already; 2) They have to have another job; and 3) They felt intimidated by their Department Chairperson not to participate in campus-wide committees because they are junior faculty.

Discussion:

C. Hobson: Some depts. have a policy of not encouraging jr. faculty to participate.

S. Pryor – Shocked at such a departmental policy because ARPT includes service on committees as criterion for tenure.

M. Dolan – Despite stated, service in Senate or on the committees is NOT recognized in the same way for tenure or salary increases. Other criteria such as publishing is more recognized – the choice of dedication has not been rewarded by promotion or merit increases and that sends a terrible message to the faculty we are trying to train as leaders.

K. Bernard – Is there some reason for not having jr. faculty serve on both CAP and the Faculty Senate?

J. Conforte – Agrees that argument that dept policy to discourage service is outrageous. Service IS considered important. Think the minutes should include not only the individuals present at the Senate, but also state which departments are absent.

P. Sullivan - concurs that it should be in the minutes that nobody from _ [named] program attended.

S. Pryor – AVP should inquire why not there.

H. Lewittes – Some feel they accomplish more in the committees, or in campus-wide activities, but feel particular frustration in the Faculty Senate over the inability to have our viewpoints listened to seriously.

G. Snedeker. – Outside body is to make recommendations which may or may not be followed – we have no veto power. We need to look at more than just the Senate. Thinks we have achieved some impact.

Point of info. – All committees except the faculty awards committee require both jr and sr faculty members, correct? For example, ARPT includes both jr and sr representatives.

Motion made and seconded and passed to list not only those present but also those departments not present. Vote: for 13, opposed 0, abstain 3.

Announcements: Candidates for the position of VP for student affairs are coming to campus and the committee is scheduling meetings beginning next week. All faculty are welcome to go to meet each of the 4 candidates– faculty can go to any of the meetings.

III. Report of the Academic Vice President (Dr. Cox)

- a. Memo sent regarding office hours, asking they be posted on doors. Received many complaints about testing and got the idea that both faculty and students confused. Decision to suspend special testing in the disabilities office until procedures are resolved.
- b. Letters of tenure and promotion – apology to faculty – has been told the letters have been signed.
- c. Supplies – we have the allocation from SUNY and can now send in purchase requests.
- d. Sabbaticals – repeat that we will follow the same procedure mentioned earlier – only full-year sabbaticals at half salary will be awarded.
- e. On the 3 vs 4 credits and scheduling: The consensus of Blue Ribbon Committee is to keep the 4-credits but to change the weekly organization to M-Th and T-Fr classes beginning in September. We may be asking to extend the hour of teaching from 8am and have more courses in evenings. Some programs currently do not offer any evening courses.
- f. We aim to be a full-service university.
- g. Grants of \$500 for travel for faculty presenting papers are being offered until the money runs out.

Discussion:

G. Snedeker – Interesting about the switch in schedule and wonders how it will affect students.

- Temporary suspension of testing at the OSSD office is ok, but the departments may not be able to handle some problems, e.g., truly special needs (such as needing special machine or someone to write out answers) -- can be decided by faculty. Some students also might need a person as writer or reader.

S. Pryor - Change of schedule: Is this common at other institutions on the island? Many students work Fri, Sat, and Sun.

P. Sullivan – The subcommittee made recommendation after considering many configurations and concerns.

S. Pryor - 3-day period for employment is an important point for many of our students, since this is a working college.

_____ - There exists the M-Th, T-F norm in the CUNY colleges, where the majority of students also are employed. Student Life thought this schedule would promote more student activities, although some will have to go to work on Wed.

C. Sawyer – still can have 3 working days, but wonder about the transportation – now by public transportation it is almost impossible for students to arrive by 9:15, so there is a question of the possibility of 8 am classes.

- K. Bernard – many students DO work on Friday – (could not have lab in Teacher Ed on Friday because so many do work.
- R. Welton – schedule would suggest possibilities for Saturday classes.
- H. Lewettes – there are as many schedules as there are students – generally the TIME rather than the day is most important to achieve a 5-day campus culture.
- E. Linger – question on the time blocks – Is it workable to add another course with classes running from 8 am to 10:30 pm (thus leaving at 10:45-11pm?)
- M. Dolan – We could squeeze more of the market for those who can take a class at 8am, then go into work a little late.
- _____ - Common hour – needs to be rethought. Many have cultural events, but here, thus far, it seems to be primarily disruptive without achieving the desired cultural events and participation.
- S. Pryor – Suggestion that each program take responsibility for one Common Hour's program.
- Dr. Cox: Enthusiastic about the faculty and students – publicly say that Faculty doing a great job.

Motion: The sense of the Senate is general agreement with the proposal of the recommendation to change class schedule to a M-Th, T-F schedule. 16 yes.

Motion was withdrawn as formal motion.

Discussion – CAP committee is waiting to hear from the President's office regarding recommendations of the CAP. There is some question about the line of order of the CAP committee and the Presidential task force. Three members of the CAP are present at the Senate meeting.

IV. Discussion on elections

Call for nominations for Vice Chair and for Senator-at-large.

M. Dolan - raised the idea that this is the 3rd time of the Senate has not been able to find someone to serve as Vice-Chair. Maybe we should re-visit the selection of Senate Chair (possibly change it to a 2-year term) or think of some way to select candidates rather than depend on the goodwill of someone willing to serve.

S. O'Connor was nominated to serve as Senator-at-Large, but the nomination now must go to the Nominations Committee. to be elected by the faculty as a whole. (Nomination is to replace Jill Edelson who is now serving under the new by-laws committee as Parliamentarian, and to replace Minna Barrett who is now on sabbatical).

Conclusion: We need nominations for two Senate-at-large positions to represent non-departmental members and for a Vice Chair and for a member of the CAP committee.

V. OW Foundation Report (Rich Brown).

- a. Support to the foundation is an emotional rather than an intellectual commitment – and the foundation's officers are trying to build that commitment.
- b. Current year's goal is to raise \$500,000. On 9-30-03 we had \$114, 482 in bank, compared with \$72, 053 a year earlier.
- c. The foundation authorized \$25,000 for faulty research grants. 28 aps were received and the Academic Review Committee is reviewing them.
- d. President's Office reception introduced many to the college to expand reach into the community (Nov 2).

- e. On Nov 19 Taste of LI – thanks to those who have committed – expect to net \$65-75,000 (from an expected gross of \$100,000).
- f. Stables – several people would like to resurrect this equestrian center for children and other needs (e.g., horses for therapy for children) – and the foundation is using that leverage from the community to aim for a \$1 million restoration project.
- g. Foundation board has ten openings – needs people who willing to commit to give or get \$2500 per year.

Discussion: Where is the million coming from for the Stable Restoration?

Answer: SUNY is not spending a dime – all funds from private sources. This is important also to keep control of the grounds, rather than allowing eager businesses to lease and take control of the area. To that end, we are also trying to register it as a Historical Site.

VI. UUP Report on Salary Disparity (C. Franco)

- a. Analysis for data to identify the magnitude of the problem. Union and the administration agreed to use the 1% discretionary fund to cover the problem, but there is never enough to cover the \$100,000 necessary to address the inequalities over a four-year period. Other schools have similar problems – some more successful than others in using the 1% and there is some additional funding “found” or available at SUNY Purchase.
- b. Stony Brook found \$2 million and wanted to address only women, minorities and academic jobs. Disparity however, is part of a larger issue of budget requests that, unfortunately, are based on a formula but not on the needs.
- c. The larger issue is that we are seriously under-funded. This year our goal is to encourage the trustees to send a budget request based on the needs as sent from each campus President.
- d. Crisis action plan – 1) letter writing to trustees (asking for enough money to actually fund the campus); 2) visit legislators in our districts (Oct 24, 27, 30th).
- e. UUP also will send thanks for support of language for no layoffs and enlist the support of key leaders to pressure the trustees to become accountable to SUNY.
- f. November (no date yet) – there will be open hearings on the SUNY budget. We can attend and give some testimony.
- g. Based on our enrollment we will get 19 million but need 25 million to meet basic needs.
- h. During the CW Post strike the media showed that the ave. salary of SUNY Stony Brook is Assistant Prof 62,900, Associate 76,400, and Full 102,600 -- with the lowest of the 4 area campuses studied being Hofstra where an Assistant Prof earns 56,300, and an Associate 73,200 in the larger regional picture.
- i. Trustees and the Legislature differ over out-of-state tuition rates.

Question by K Velsor: Where did SUNY Purchase “find 400,000” and SB “find” 2,000,000?

Discussion:

M. Dolan: Funding issues also concern internal allocations priorities. When we stack up our administrative salaries compared to other campuses, the OW admin is far above average and the faculty is far below salaries of the other campuses.

Question: G. Seidman: How can new faculty member come in at a higher salary level than the salary of a full professor here for 25 years?

Answer: This is an issue that UUP is looking into – one can go to the library to see the salaries, which are part of the public record. There have been 28% increases in some admin salaries compared to faculty increases, which are far less.

VII. Report from the OSSD (Office for Services for Students with Disabilities) by Bill Lupardo

- a. 3 resolutions were passed over the years and show a positive response from the administration.
- b. 3 or 4 positive changes: 1) OSSD office shifted from Student Affairs to Academic Affairs (for tutoring, monitoring of tests, acquiring and maintaining technical equipment; 2) OSSD does have a new and much better, more accessible area. Some have complained to the public that some students do not wish to be recognized as "disabled"; response that it would be a mistake to closet them or give in to a prejudice and should offer counseling on this issue; 3) acquired some technology with help of Tom and the Technology committee.; 4) OSSD now has a fulltime secretary.
- c. A continuing problem is under-staffing of the office. 125-130 disabled students that use the office and there is only one professional. Therefore, OSSD makes two recommendations:
 - 1) That an assistant coordinator line be created (had one in 2001-02 but when she terminated that line was not replaced). The proposal is motivated because we are required by law to provide ADEQUATE services.
 - 2) That the tech support person be changed from a part-time temporary line to a permanent fulltime line – equipment requires training and maintenance.

Discussion:– Bill Lupardo thanks to faculty & the Faculty Senate and the Committee with George Snedeker and clarifies issues on some disturbing feedback from students and faculty regarding the way that monitoring or proctoring of exams took place.

Motion passed to extend the time for 15 minutes to allow for discussion and completing the agenda, Bill Lupardo continuing discussion of how to have the support to proctor 150 exam (compared to the original 5 or 6 per semester).

Old business:

a. Statewide assessment (H. Lewittes)

The GenEd Committee met today and voted for Maureen to represent us to vote against the statewide assessment testing at the SUNY Senate, voting on the following grounds:

- 1) standardized system interferes with academic standards of profs;
- 2) Assumes a system-wide curriculum which undermines academic integrity of each;
- 3) campus assessment plan has been approved and is in the 2nd yr of implementation;
- 4) Have adopted the SUNY learning Outcomes program;
- 5) System-wide assessment inappropriate and funds for implementing a new statewide testing program would be better spent on enhancing undergraduate education;
- 6) Question on how will the data be used? Why are we doing it? SUNY might use it in unfair discussions to academic vice presidents, e.g., "your campus does not measure up";
- 7) Other attempts led to LOWERing the standards of statewide testing because its implementation was a fiasco.

Motion that Maureen has full Faculty Senate backing to oppose the statewide assessment when representing us.

Discussion:

- A. Barbera: Question on flexibility about implementation – we already have a certain level of departmental standardized testing in math and English departments. We don't want to create more testing.
- C. Sawyer, on who makes the tests, how they would work on our campus or how that can add any value to the testing we already do.

M. Dolan – will be not only discussion but a vote at the Statewide Senate – seems to be some unraveling between the Provost and the Academic Standards Cttee of the Board of Trustees. There is a push for “Raw data [that] should be made publicly available” on the various academic areas.

C. Hobson – Part of a longer effort by trustees to get control over the academic curricula. As matter of governance procedures on campus – matter should have gone to the Gen-Ed and the CAP and the Assessment Cttee before going to the Fac Senate.

Motion passed that Maureen Dolan empower represent us to vote against the statewide assessment testing at the SUNY Statewide Senate. Vote 14 for, 0 opposed and 2 abstentions (one Maureen who felt it inappropriate for the representative)

Old Business

Lab fees – A report will be added onto the minutes for the discussion next meeting. Consensus that we need to continue the discussion on lab fees. It will be on agenda for next meeting.

New business – agenda item – Caroline to report later on the Land Use meeting.

Meeting of October 17 adjourned.