

A&S Senate
Tentative Agenda
October 23, 2017

3:30-3:45 (Darren Chase)

1. Welcome, remarks
 - a. Forthcoming proposal from Dean Kopp on combining CAS departments early next semester
2. Review of minutes
3. Statement of commitment to policies of promotion & continuing appointment
4. 7 Years of PTC data, visualized

3:45-4:00 (Marie Huffman)

1. Curriculum Committee Annual Report
 - a. Highlights
2. Credit-bearing PE courses
 - . discussion

4:00-4:15 (Sacha Kopp)

1. Report

4:15-4:50 Open discussion

A&S Senate
September 18, 2017
Minutes

I. Approval of agenda: Approved.

II. Approval of minutes from April 17, 2017

III. President's Report (D. Chase)

- Welcome to the first meeting of the 2017/2018 Arts and Sciences Senate. I want to affirm our commitment to shared faculty governance. Together we'll work to meaningfully support our colleagues and students and further our scholarship and academic initiatives and the success of our departments and programs. The A&S Senate Constitution states the Arts and Sciences Senate seeks to represent the interests of the humanities and fine arts, social and behavioral sciences, and natural sciences. As these disciplines are interwoven so is the research, teaching and learning of our students,

faculty and librarians. Our constitution establishes that our rules and policies govern the academic functions of the College of Arts and Sciences, SoMAS, the University Libraries and the School of Journalism. I am looking forward to working together this academic year and I welcome your ideas, suggestions and contributions to our agenda.

- I have an appeal for service on A&S Senate Committees. I have included in the agenda I shared with you a link to a document that has highlighted the vacancies in the committees. I am counting on you to work with me to identify people that want to participate in shared faculty governance. Of particular urgency are the vacancies in the PTC-S. Both vacancies are from the Humanities and Fine Arts and they also do not have a Chair. I'll be meeting with the members of that committee in the next couple of weeks and hopefully we'll have that committee seated and ready to work. Please encourage your colleagues to participate.
- Now we'll hear a report from Dean Kopp. There was an agenda that went out Friday that included an error. Dean Kopp did not prepare a report as you see on the current agenda on information on demographics and numbers of non-renewals and open searches and recent hires. The A&S Executive Committee had requested that late Friday. Just so there is no confusion that was not part of the report he prepared.

IV. Report on the College Budget (S. Kopp)

- I prepared a handout which I hope you will pass along for me so that everyone has a record.
- This is the first meeting of the Arts and Sciences Senate this semester and I want to welcome you all from your summer and I hope it was productive. There have been a lot of changes and challenges over the last few months. I'll just mention a few things that are changes. We have twelve new faculty arrive this year, most of them here in the Fall Semester but some will be arriving in January and another four next year. We had twenty-two faculty promoted over the course of this academic year including 6 colleagues who have been promoted to SUNY Distinguished Professor or Distinguished Service Professor. I applaud all of our colleagues who earned promotions this year. We had the recruitment of two Endowed Professors in this last cycle. Paul Kelton joins us as the inaugural Chair holder of the Robert David Lion Gardiner Endowed Chair in American History and soon Arindam Chakrabarti will join us in the Department of Philosophy as the inaugural holder of the Mattoo Endowed Chair. We named six colleagues as the title of Sr. Lecturer this last cycle.
- We continue to make progress on Diversity and representation of our faculty. About 32% of our tenured faculty are women. That number is 44% amongst our Assistant Professors. One-third of this year's recruits were from underrepresented minorities.
- We've had some staffing changes in the office. Kane Gillespie has been recruited over to the Provost's Office to serve as the Director of Assessment that is part of our accreditation process. Kane had been with us in the Dean's Office for thirteen years. Peter Stephens moved back to his role in curriculum to serve now as Associate Dean for Academic Programs as well as continuing on with Facilities and Deb Dwyer joined us in the Dean's Office to serve as Assistant Dean for Strategic Planning and Research.

- Kathleen Wilson is in her final year as Director of the Humanities Institute and was very clear in the beginning that she only wanted to serve one term. We will start the process of seeking nominations and consider possible successors to Kathleen.
- We have a forthcoming proposal to create the Center for Social Justice, Inequality, and Policy. In some sense it is the successor of a center that existed under Michael Zweig for many years but a much broader group of faculty from History, Women and Gender Studies, Africana Studies, Philosophy and other units on campus came together to create a broader concept center. As that concept center becomes more evolved I will bring it back to this body a specific proposal to create a Type III center. There are two other centers inaugurated recently. One was the Center for Nuclear Science thanks to a donation of \$5 Mil from an individual and another \$1 mil from SUNY. This Center will bring a lot of faculty effort across the campus as well as across the international community. Thanks to another donation we had a possibility of creating another center, the Center for Hellenic Studies will be housed in the Humanities Building.
- Another process that I'll bring to your attention for this body would be the administrative merger of three of our current departments, the Hispanic Languages, European Languages, Literatures and Cultures and Cultural Studies and Comparative Literature. This was something we announced earlier in the year. Discussions are going one with the three faculties and try to set up governance by-laws for the combined umbrella department. Once those are developed, I will come back to this body with a specific proposal, again consistent with the by-laws of the A&S Senate, and ask for feedback of the Senate.
- Earlier this year we set, up in consultation with the chairs, a clarifying document on faculty workload. There are no changes to the stated workloads for faculty in terms of teaching but I wanted to clarify for all that the stated workloads are for research active faculty and as a research institution we value the teaching contributions as well the service and research contributions of our faculty. For faculty who are not research active we require a certain equitable amount of service across all the missions of the departments.
- We have a number of faculty searches going on for next academic year. These are searches across some of our critical areas of the College both in terms of programs of excellence and programs requiring student instruction.
- There will be a town hall meeting later in October. We can address issues of strategic planning and budget across the college.
- Budget: The table on page 4 is a breakdown of all of our expenses. It shows you that a lot of the money we spend is on faculty, both tenured, tenure track and lecturers as well as adjuncts. We have categories of staff - either technical staff or instructional because they are the audio engineer in the Music Department, lab technicians in some of our science departments, computer technicians in the behavioral social sciences, etc. We meet a fair amount of obligations of our instruction through our staff as well as we have administrative staff across all of our departments. There's a larger number here than in previous years for research, start-up and other than personnel type expenses. When I arrived we were in a rather desperate straight to try to fund start-up and research expenses across the departments. It had been just that moment when the Vice

President for Research Office announced that they would not be funding start-up packages anymore and it was up to the colleges to start funding those kind of endeavor. We have now made it to the point where we can fund about \$2.8 Mil per year. That's still a very small number compared to a college our size at a research intensive university. TA lines from the Graduate School is a separate allocation made to the college. It's about \$10.7 Mil to support all of our programs and because this number has been chipped away in the last couple of years, the College has started to fund some number of TA lines so as to not see some of our graduate programs diminish. This particularly hits this College hard because we have so many programs without external grant funding and we need the ability to support students through 4, 5 and sometime more years. A relatively small number for us is the OTPS number that's Other Than Personnel Services. That's the money we spend on paper, photocopiers, and telephones, etc. We transfer off of our books about \$1.8 Mil to outside entities like BNL for joint appointments or philanthropy for things like endowed positions. CSI is contractual salary increases that is anticipated. Some of the pressures I think we are going to be facing in the next couple of years are the need to harness more resources for the research enterprise across all of our disciplines. The fact that we have this likelihood of a contract that will call for 2% increases that we know of, the \$1.5 Mil that we have spoken about but if enacted the contract could actually have three years of 2%. We also have this need to bring down our budget by \$3.5 Mil because of the President's mandate that we cannot have a deficit budget going forward. There is no one solution that I see working for us in the future. We are going to have to be working on revenues and the departments have been very successful at building up revenues in summer and winter and in some cases masters. We are going to have to be looking at efficiencies where we can find them. We are going to have to continue looking at how to prioritize. As I look at all of our programs and all of them rightly feeling like they are under resourced, I run out clever ideas of how do we make competitive properly resourced programs when we're trying to tend to all of them. I call on us to be part of an active conversation over the course of this next year on how do we prioritize and how do we decide which are our most important programs to continue to support vigorously. Page 5 unfortunately was copied in black and white and I will have to share electronically with you a version of this because this is a colorful page with lots of number in red and lots of number in blue. All the numbers in red were meant to tell you the things that cost more money and the things in blue were meant to tell you things that save us money (revenues). Each year, although we have an \$80 Mil budget, there is a very small amount that changes over. In other words we have some number of retirements and separations that take place and we have some number of recruitments that take place. As we project out the next couple of years, I am trying to take last year's deficit number of \$3.5 Mil., that's the amount we spent as a college beyond what we were allocated, and in a five year plan I originally submitted to the Provost and President a couple of years ago, we were trying to bring this number down gradually over a five year period but now we have to do it immediately. We have to bring this to zero and we can only do this on the funds that are exchangeable within a given year. The 17/18 year is a snapshot. It doesn't show us balanced yet. If you look at the very bottom line for 17/18

it still shows us that we are \$900,000 in the hole so we were able to get \$3.5 Mil down to \$900,000. For next year we have strategies to have a balanced budget but some of those things rely on some of the cuts imposed for this year and they weren't not unpleasant like the fact that we reduced OTPS budget or we have left certain vacancies in staffing and we can't live with that long term. Although it shows us balanced next year in doing a certain number of recruitments, that's not a very satisfactory situation to close out next year because we will have continuing vacancies and we want to be able to fill some of those. To get by this year, I'll just tell you that vacancies were part of the solution, asking us to re-evaluate some of our deployments in courses and section sizes of classes was another part of the solution. We also relied on reserves this year and that's not a sustainable solution. We were sitting on about \$4 Mil of IDC reserves and about \$10 Mil. of Stony Brook Foundation reserves and I felt it was important to utilize those before we make more dramatic decisions that would have required us to do more heavy cutting. That's not sustainable because that is spending the savings account and once the savings account is gone then you can't make the following years budget.

- **Strategic Planning:** On page 7 I want to call your attention to the four major goals. This was a plan we brought together over the course of last year and the year before with a lot of faculty, staff, and student input. We had four major goals around research, teaching, diversity and public impact that really embodied four of the six major goals of the University's Strategic Plan. We have lots of things that we do in this college that achieve the overall university mission. The University Strategic Plan has two other goals around health care and being an economic engine for the area. Underneath each of these four goals there concrete objectives, things that we would be working on to try to roll up to our mission in research and education. Already we're starting to make progress on some of these.

R. Harvey: I'm trying to square two different fact. One is the other day we received an email that about a half a dozen Comparative Literature courses are to be cancelled in the spring semester and that the faculty members who were to teach those courses are going to be re-deployed to elementary language courses, other than the English course. There's an interview you apparently conducted with someone (it's on your website) where the questioner asks you will this affect courses in the 2017/2018 academic year and the answer you gave is no. Classes for the 2017/2018 academic year have already been scheduled by the registrar and will continue as planned.

S.Kopp: Let me clarify or expand on the two things Robert just said. As an ongoing process, we go back to the departments each semester and ask for revisions of course deployments when things are under enrolled or we see shifts. You were contacted about several courses in Comparative Literature in light of the fact that there are currently no Comparative Literature majors at least that we saw on the books. I don't know about any outcome that has been decided yet because I know you are working with our Associate Dean, Peter Stephens on whether some of those courses might be needed or not. If the courses are needed either because of majors that we have to serve then we will do it. If they are needed for the delivery of the General Education requirements then we will continue with those courses. If they are

not needed for either of those two reasons then we would ask your help in a re-deploying effort to meet those requirements.

R. Harvey: Why did you say no they will continue as planned?

S. Kopp: The think you are talking about was are we changing the courses for the majors that we have to finish out as a result of suspended admissions and so we are continuing, for example, the full suite of courses in theater. The point is if we needed to continue these courses and that we're not necessarily drying them up now is because we still have to serve the students who are in that degree plan. That was the point of that comment.

A. Flescher: My question is motivated by concerns pertaining to what right in itself, our reputation, and finally faculty and staff morale. The jigsaw piece of the puzzle here which should be constant, around which all the other pieces should fit, is that first and foremost folks shouldn't lose their jobs. That would be devastating in itself and it would be devastating to our reputation, for who would come to Stony Brook as a tenure track hire if they knew in advance they could be vulnerable in this way? I want to give intellectual credit where it's due as what I am about to suggest stems from a conversation I had with Jonathan Sanders after the last meeting and it's a follow up to Celia's question that I felt was not fully adequately answered by the President. Most of us are aware of the article that came out in JAMA that suggested that football is unhealthy. Despite the selection bias in the article in which the 111 out of 112 subjects found by MRI to have CTE were also from bodies donated by families of players, this circumstantial evidence that football is unhealthy is nevertheless more than compelling. So there is an argument that even it were budget neutral it doesn't behoove a university that's about teaching and scholarship to have a football program in any case. Indeed many universities not at the top tier are seriously considering and have scrapped their football team. But many of us highly doubt having a football team is "budget neutral." In this light my question is two part. Number one, in response to the claim, "the football program pays for itself," I think it would behoove the administration actually to show as much in transparent and clear detail. Is it really true that the football team pays for itself? And, secondly, if it turns out this claim is not true, and that football is additionally an unhealthy prospect for those who play the sport, isn't it possible that in one stroke we could go a good distance toward solving the budget problem by revisiting the value we place on funding our football program relative to our academic mission? I'm not saying it'll solve the whole problem. But, to paraphrase Jonathan Sanders, it would reflect a timely and arguably heroic grand gesture on part of the administration saying it cares about its community, its people. And as for those students who are getting scholarships here I think (I've done a little research on it) they could get scholarships elsewhere.

S. Kopp: As Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences which doesn't oversee intercollegiate athletics at the University, I have no purview over decisions around resource allocations for athletics. Nor do I have purview over decisions around resources allocations for engineering, journalism or other areas of the University. As a faculty member we all have the right to have opinions about what the university devotes it time and energies to. We can all either make the case for or against the value of intercollegiate athletics in contrast to other potential expenses within the university. As an administrator, I am tasked with the responsibility of making this college work within the resource allocation of the College.

S. Lipton: CAS has been under-funded for decades and it was underfunded before you came and is underfunded under your guidance so that's understood and stipulated. Having said that,

it's your job and our job as your faculty partners to talk about the priorities of what we do with the completely inadequate budget that you are given. I have a lot of concerns about priorities. There is a perception that the decisions made of reorganizing the college, which partly justified in terms of strategic planning and partly are justified in terms of budget and it's very hard for me personally to understand which comes from where because I don't understand where this ends up savings. It is widely perceived as an attack on the humanities and more specifically it's an attack on the literatures and the languages. That seems to me a complete and disproportionate allocation of the cuts that have to be made. I don't understand how it squares with the core mission of the college which is an arts, science and humanities college and area in which we have already started from a very weakened behind position and we are falling back further in humanities and I speak as a social scientist not as a humanist. I speak as a social scientist who values my colleagues and the interdisciplinary mission of the college. Not only are humanities starting from behind and being further gutted to the point of where they are being reorganized, in my understanding, without the approval of, without the participation of the faculty involved. I haven't seen any intellectual rationale for why World Languages and Literatures Department which [indistinct] into the strongest literature department we have in the university, Hispanic Languages and Literature, improves anything? I don't even understand exactly how it saves money if most of the faculty are just being moved around. I don't understand how having one core administrator [indistinct] in different buildings will work at all? I am most upset that the money savings comes from letting go junior faculty. I understand legally you can't let go senior faculty, but they (junior faculty) are the future of the literatures. These are people who work on what is identified, across the fields of the humanities, as where colleges paying attention to diversity, to current world events, to the future development of all the fields in question are working and they have been told to their face it's not because of their quality, so my final question is how can we hire tenure track faculty, how can we recruit people and say what we have said ever since I came to Stony Brook 18 years ago, my colleagues came to Stony Brook 35 years ago, Stony Brook is not like Yale. If you do your job and you do it well and you publish, teach and you do service, you will be tenured. Not only is it going to be hard to recruit people, it's going to be hard to retain our junior faculty. They are already talking, let's get out before we come up for tenure because rumors, perhaps inaccurate, but they nonetheless flying that tenure decisions are going to be made upon budgetary considerations as well, in which case we have damaged everything we want to do in the strategic plan.

S. Kopp: You began by characterizing this as an attack on the humanities. **S. Lipton:** I said it's perceived as an attack. **S. Kopp:** As you said at the end, even if it's not the facts it's the rumors and the rumors become the conversation and the purpose of a forum like this is to continue the conversation and make sure we are all fully cognizant of everything that's going on than we can disagree about it. The intention is not to have an attack on any particular area of the college. That doesn't serve us as liberal arts college for this campus. It is an attempt at picking programs that are going to lead us and so it's not just that we're going to be reducing resources in some programs, it's that we are adding resources in other programs. While we have many programs of distinction, we are relying on our programs of distinction to further build up the excellence of this campus and the reputational draw of this campus. This whole discussion about strategic planning and how do we allocate our resources is not meant to cut things, it is meant to build resources in programs of distinction. I feel very committed to that. I think the

History Department is a program of distinction and we have many other programs of distinction so you ask how is it we can have a search going on in the History Department because I think it's a program that will help build us up as a campus.

S. Lipton: My first reaction to that is that this model of building of programs of excellence, you didn't say the words but let's face it, there is some implication of penalizing, downsizing, eradicating programs of non-excellence, creating this sense of competition and zero [indistinct] ignores the fact that we are a shared enterprise. Maybe things in Physics work a little bit differently. First of all, we don't worry about attracting majors to History. The college as lots and lots of undergrads and some of them will always end up in History and we don't want them to all end up in History. We want some to end up in Literature. We want our History majors to be able to take Literature. We are a shared endeavor. We are not a corporate model where we are competing sales team trying to get the best sales award at the end of the year.

S. Kopp: I've heard you yet I have to respectfully disagree that all of our programs have to go forward. I do believe that we are a comprehensive college or liberal arts college and I don't believe this is a corporate model. It is very difficult to keep a research enterprise going in every single program right now.

S. Lipton: Occasionally programs have to be closed. I think a lot of us don't understand (a) the priorities because you talk a lot about the Arts and Sciences and the Humanities and it's not feeling like the decisions are in accord with what we are told about priorities and (b) the process; who decided in what venue and with what consultation that Stony Brook, which is the premier performing arts center on LI, doesn't need an undergraduate theatre major? If such conversations were had with all of the stakeholders please tell me because I don't where they happened when that decision was made.

S. Kopp: I laid out what I thought were going to be the budget constraints for this year and what would be the challenges of meeting those budget constraints and there are cuts in there and if we did it across the board there would be many programs that would be simply not searching in the coming year even if they had four or five retirements in the same year. That was a non-workable situation and I set that as a constraint. I then consulted with the Chairs said these are the things I would do as strategic decisions that would get us in line with our budget and I looked for alternatives and I got some savings from other things which allowed me to modify the original proposal I made and keep at least one degree plan that we were going to have to suspend. It was consultation with Chairs, the University Senate, and the senate budget committee informed of the constraints we were facing. It did not allow itself at that time for consultation across the entire faculty but I did consult all the Chairs that these were the things we were going to face. To say there's consensus among the Chairs, there is not.

S. Lipton: There is a widespread sense that consultation does not actually make its way into any decision making whatsoever which is why there is frustration with the process.

J. Dubnau: In addition to being a faculty member here I was an undergraduate here in the 1980's and as a biochemistry major I don't think the Dean would have predicted that I would have taken a Spanish language class and that it would have influenced me as a citizen in the way I vote and the way I think and cause me to consider putting my kid in a public school with a dual language program. I think that the way you are approaching this, treating this enterprise that is something that can be subtracted and divided and where you can calculate the worth

of literature, for example, I think is a very anti-intellectual way to go about the enterprise of running the College of Arts and Sciences. This is more of a comment, not a question.

S. Kopp: I was also a student of liberal arts at my alma mater the University of Chicago. The general education requirements were far more than any other credit requirements of our degree. I would guess it was sixty percent. That's mostly what we did was general education requirements. I consider myself a student of the same background that you are embracing with your comment. It's not that we are not going to have general education courses and a rich diversity of them, but we can't afford as many and we can't afford as many research enterprises. It's not true that we are not going to offer language or literature courses, we are. But we are not going to be able to offer as many Ph.D. programs because it's the most expensive thing that we do. We can't afford to do everything.

J. Dubnau: I can give you a suggestion of how else you might have gone about it. You might have come to the faculty and said we have a crisis here and I need you as the faculty to help me fight the university and say this is not a situation that can be solved by taking a knife to the intellectual enterprise that we are engaged in. Instead it's a problem that needs to be solved by making the rest of the university (administration) dig deep in their pockets and figure out a way to solve this, what I view as a relatively small in the larger scheme of things, the budget crisis within Arts and Sciences. There has to be a way for the larger university to recognize the importance of the intellectual exercise that we are engaged in. I think the way this was gone about didn't take into account and didn't take the consideration of the faculty into account.

S. Kopp: I'm going to respectfully disagree with you that I didn't consult and I'm going to also not be able to agree with you that I didn't somehow advocate what are the cost/benefits of the kinds of decisions we ended up having to make. I certainly advocate for our programs in this college yet there are still constraints that the entire university is working under right now. Thank you for your comment but I'm afraid it doesn't reflect the entirety of what's going on this year or next year.

F. Walter: I think Sara hit on the nail with her first comment is that there has always been a budget crisis in Arts and Science. As far back as I can remember, and I'm in my 29th year, there has been a structural deficit in CAS. That tells me that the formula that is used at higher levels to come up with a budget for CAS is just wrong. I want to applaud you for being transparent. You've given us the numbers. I think we're all adult enough to understand that you have a problem with the numbers and to make it add up you have to make significant changes. I think we are mostly in disagreement with the idea of non-renewing junior faculty. The bigger problem though is the level of funding at the Vice Presidential level. Bob Megna presented the budget at the University Senate meeting last week and Axel Drees pointed out that the numbers didn't seem to add up and I've looked into to them and they don't add up. If you take the numbers that were presented there is a \$410 Mil allocation from the state as of this year or next year and if you add up all of the expenses and the savings that Bob Megna has identified, granted you left out a couple of sectors of the university, but we should have about a \$40 Mil surplus this year at the university and not a zero sum last year and we should have a \$90 Mil surplus next year when the President is claiming we're going to have a \$35 Million deficit. The numbers don't add up. Something is being left out above your level and this is something the faculty need to be aware of. This university is more than just CAS. We don't have a good accounting of how the Provostial budget is split up between the various colleges and we have

an even less transparent view of how the university budget is split up among all of the Vice Presidential areas.

S. Kopp: You all have a University Senate and I know you're asking questions and by virtue of repeating Axel's question, I guess it's your question as well, how do the numbers for the university add up? I encourage you to be in conversation with Bob Megna about it. I will tell you what the CAS budget situation is as transparently as I can and it's not quite the case that it's always been in deficit. Our deficit ballooned over the course of SUNY 2020 because I'll just say lack of planning for what it means to grow the faculty. We did do what we said we were going to do but within this college the growth of faculty requires a growth of staff, research resources and growth of facilities. Not all of that was accounted for or at least it was assumed that other parts of the base budget would be maintained while that growth was happening and that SUNY 2020 was going to be an add-on. But in fact as you know better than I do because you were here in the years before me, there were cuts coming to the university at the same time as SUNY 2020 brought in new funds which almost, to my understanding, exactly canceled out. There is a report from the AAAS that talks about the threat to public research universities because of state cuts going on right now and actually NYS is kind of highlighted in that report because the growth of tuition for NYS is offset by the cuts per student FTE from the state appropriations for the universities. We experience this big growth and yet there were these cuts happening at exactly the same time. The numbers I saw from Bob Megna is that we did accomplish that growth in faculty across the University. We wouldn't have been able to do that if we simply used all of our faculty attrition through retirement to meet the cuts. I don't agree that the deficit has always been there because when I look back in the books as far as 2010-11, it was in balance. It's that we shot up a deficit at exactly the time of the growth of faculty.

F. Walter: If you take the number of people added, 340 or so, throughout the university, that is about half at most of the increase in state allocation which is about \$90 Mil between 2011 and now. The increase in positions alone cannot account for using up all of the money that we've gotten from the state since 2011.

S. Kopp: We're outside of the scope of this body and my purview.

P. Gootenberg: I've been here since 1990 and what I want to say honestly and sadly in the 25 plus years that I have been here, I have never had such a deep sense of faculty mistrust and distrust of the CAS administration that has gone on in the past year or so. We need to have faculty with faith that things are going in the right direction. How do you think CAS can actually restore the credulity or the morale of faculty at this time?

S. Kopp: I think you're right, the morale has taken a big hit this year. You've personalized it to me. All I can do is point to the principles and say this is the goal and I hope we can agree on the goal. It will be in imperfect endpoint and I will try to continue to solicit your input and everyone's input on how we get to that endpoint. At some point I have to make a decision within my responsibilities. All I can do to increase the faculty buy-in and make you more aware of challenges we face. I would hope that as programs and faculty see the fruition of some of their aspirations then that's when the buy-in comes because we will see as opposed to being bogged down across the board we are starting to see programs of distinction take off.

P. Gootenberg: It's not the budget cuts per se I believe that are getting to the faculty moral, but it really is a question of the process and the feeling that we've been left out and that our proposals and our alternatives have not been taken as seriously as they should have been.

M. Schedel: We talk about your strategic plan and we all agreed we developed that together and you said you don't think we can get there without these cuts. Is it at all possible that we can get there without cutting our junior faculty?

S. Kopp: I'll tell you the same thing I told them and their chairs. In order to maintain a certain timeline for our budgeting process, I had to give a certain set of non-renewals by certain dates and did say I would work to offer appointments where possible in other programs. I have been working and the chairs and they know this. I hope they have been communicating it with their faculties. I hope that everyone has heard that. I will be working to create the possibility of appointments in other programs but that is essentially creating the budgetary authority for a new recruitment in another program and so that means other budgetary savings to create those other appointments. At the time I had to do the non-renewals I did not have that sorted out and so I had to deliver the non-renewals.

M. Schedel: Do you want to explain that further?

S. Kopp: Not any further. I think I've said exactly what I could say at this time. You asked the question could it happen? Yes.

M. Schedel: How is my follow-up. This is the crux as I see it.

S. Kopp: It will require other savings to be developed so that we have the equivalent of new searches and other programs

M. Rebeiz: Are some of these going to be reversed?

S. Kopp: It's possible to do so and I am working to do so. You know that because I've said it in at least two chair meetings.

M. Rebeiz: Well there hasn't been any follow-up.

S. Kopp: Because we're not that far into the year yet.

M. Rebeiz: These people have received official letters that they are terminated.

S. Kopp: No that's not the case. They've received letters that they do not yet have a renewal. That's different.

M. Rebeiz: As one of the tenure track faculty who is not being renewed, I received a letter from human resources that said that I am officially terminated as of September 1st and I need to leave the office and everything that Stony Brook gave me must be returned.

S. Kopp: I did say, and you heard me say this before, if we can offer another appointment we will do so.

Lisa ??: I want to talk about the new faculty here, recent appointments and junior faculty and their morale because a lot of us are mentors to these faculty and this is important commitment to the faculty. I see them as quite demoralized and quite concerned in a way that they really should not be. I wonder what we can do and one thing would be not to fire the junior faculty and two to improve the morale and situation for junior faculty. This is important for the people who are here right now and it's also important if we are going to attract good junior faculty.

D. Chase: It was also the question of what do we do to improve the morale of junior faculty because we recognize that the moral of junior faculty is critical and also that potential hires are observing this and will influence their decisions to whether or not they want to work at Stony Brook.

S. Kopp: I hope what we will do is convey that although this was a very hard set of decisions to go through what we're really working on is ability to build strongly in other programs. I hope the chairs and leadership of other programs will then be very vigorous in their recruiting efforts

and say those were hard things that we did as a campus but it was in an effort to continue to build resources for other programs of distinction or serve a large number of students. That is something I think potential colleagues can understand.

A. Drees: On the comment about investing in strong programs and asking chairs to cut in a strategic way. One of the things, I don't know if you have seen this most recent rankings in the Times of Higher Education that shows that Stony Brook dropped from being 78 in world ranking to now below 250. As a point of reference, the 78 was in 2011 and that was at the time where there were also big budget crises. Budget cuts were made across the board. So it's not clear to me that the methodology that is chosen now and the particular way how it was implemented actually helps advance the reputation of Stony Brook. I very strongly want to second what Paul said and that's a matter of process of how things are discussed. It has been many times said and most of the memos you sent to the faculty include a statement that decisions were made in consultation with the faculty. With all due respect, I want to state that that is incorrect. We have in fact talked about choices to be made and in the spring a large group of chairs formed working groups to come up with alternatives. There was a lot of discussion but there certainly was not consent. I think the majority of suggestions that the chairs made were not incorporated into the plan.

S. Kopp: I will be careful never to say consent because that doesn't represent where we have been.

A. Drees: I think it would be important to get more input from the faculty and the gateway to that is to [indistinct] from the chairs and to get there is to work more closely with the chairs.

S. Kopp: There were some suggestions that were made by the chairs that I did adopt and that changed the course of some of the plans we made over the summer. There were other suggestions the chairs made that would not be implementable on time scale that was needed. I will continue to consult and make everyone aware of what is going on.

P. Manning: We prey on weak programs to support the strong ones programs and you fail to imagine that we are unit, that we work with each other, that we are what you said you wanted to do when you came, which was to strengthen the college and instead you have divided it and you have done things to save money and it worked for your administrative convenience but which are intellectually incoherent and destructive. If as I heard today the plan is to save jobs by transferring lecturers in Geosciences into the writing program that makes a [indistinct] writing programs attempt to define a purpose, to builds its program, it simply means you are moving people from one spot to another spot without regard to the intellectual wholeness, the fertilization of departments. It seems to me that if you move them from here to there, you are not actually saving the money but you do destroy the interaction of these departments. You need to conceive of the intellectual capacity of the college as a whole and the unquantifiable vitality that results from different departments with different points of view. It seems to me that departments are getting shuttered and that's the excuse for getting rid of junior faculty. Junior faculty are the future of the university. There is no attempt it seems to me to imagine that we simultaneously celebrate the Alda Center for Communicating Science and close Theater. The Alda Center for Communicating Science is founded by an actor. If you look at the faculty, the first name you see is Professor of Theater. If you look at the staff of the Alda Center you see MFA's. In the end I just want to [indistinct], Axel, which is to say informing is not consulting. Diverse viewpoints have to be heard. Intellectual coherence matters more than

budget cuts and the fabric wires going to the university as a whole, then what I think what we want to ask you to do is stay with the upper administration, your [indistinct], you planning have resulted in this. People whose work fits in with the very mission that we have committed ourselves to are being cut and we cannot go on like that. It makes a mockery of the enterprise that we have committed ourselves to.

Paul ??: I would like to add another keyword to this difficult, complicated set of elements that we have to consider and when we prioritize and I think one of the things you show in the diagram is clearly diversity. That's a difficult complicated process in which we all have to collaborate. I came to Stony Brook fully committed to the public institution and to help the institution. It is important to protect those positions that represent the constructive fabric, the very thing [indistinct] representation in keeping the diversity of our college. We try to bring the best solutions that we can imagine but sometimes those best solutions lack diversity. In order to be creative we need many voices.

S. Kopp: Let me respond to Paul and Peter. Yes we would love to advocate as strongly as we can to the mission that we have and I believe together we will but I also have to have us understand SUNY faces challenges, the state has imposed those challenges and we will have to meet those challenges. We are largely a college of faculty and staff and if we have to contract in some way, we'll have to do it in the best way for the intellectual survival and progress of the institution. To Peter's point, if I wanted the solution that was the most administratively convenient, I would do the things that would set us back the worst and that would be that we'd just have cuts across the board. Everyone would share the same percentage cut as the college. So if we'd like to characterize this as convenient, I assure you it's not.

Meeting adjourned.

Submitted by:

Laurie Cullen
Secretary