Tentative Agenda
University Senate
February 5, 2018

I. Approval of tentative agenda
II. Approval of Minutes from December and October
III. Discussion with the President (J. Greiman)
IV. Discussion with the Provost (M. Bernstein)
V. Discussion with the VP for HSC (K. Kaushansky)
VI. Report on the 178th Plenary Session (P. Wolfskill and S. Walker)
VII. UUP Report (C. Kube and K. Moriarty)
VIII. Old Business
IX. New Business

University Senate
Minutes
December 4, 2017

I. Approval of agenda: Approved. President Feldman stated that he has not been able to review the minutes from the October and November Senate meeting, so the approval of these minutes were deferred.

II. President’s Report (E. Feldman):
Election: Each Senator will be given a ballot for today’s election.
Kudos: President Feldman introduced Senator T. Tiso who announced that Stony Brook’s volleyball program competed at the Division I NCAA tournament in Nebraska for the first time. She introduced the coaching staff. First Year Head Coach Kristin Belzung, Assistant Coaches Sara Bullock, Marc Neef.

II. Discussion with the President (J. Grieman)

- President Stanley is traveling so Judy Greiman will be giving his report.
- We will be naming an Interim Vice President for Student Affairs. Lyle Gomes will be handling budget matters as Bob Megna transitions out of the VP for Finance and Administration Office.
- We are beginning the budget process for next year which will be easier because we know our tuition will be. The State budget last year passed up to a four year tuition increase. There is still work to be done around fees. We continue to do extensive lobbying to support enhanced base funding for the contractual salary increases. We will work closely with the Senate, with CAPRA and UUP. We are making sure that the
attrition that has been required is working and to see whether there needs to be any slowing down, not stopping, of hiring. SUNY Chancellor Johnson has requested funding for the retroactive salary increase.

- The **Federal budget** won’t be fully passed for a couple of months. The report released by the Joint Committee on Taxation on Thursday found the Senate’s bill added about $1T to the deficit. The House bill is expected to cost about $1.4T over the next ten years. Future efforts to reduce the deficit will be caused by this additional $1.4T and will likely result in spending cuts. The Feds have discretion in funding for Higher Education, infrastructure and other non-defense programs. The repeal or revision of higher tax benefits in the bill if passed by the House would cost students and families more than $71B over the next decade. We have worked very closely with our elected delegation. Eliminating tuition reimbursement would be a big problem for students. Graduate students will be taxed on their income plus the tuition waived. Eliminating lifetime learning credit would disproportionately harm non-traditional students. Eliminating the student loan interest deduction would increase the cost of student loans by $13B over ten years. All of that was in the House Bill. In the Senate Bill, both provisions eliminate the State and local tax deduction which is the one thing that will impact states like New York. It eliminates the state and local sales tax deduction and limits the property tax deduction to $10,000. The Senate Bill does not contain a student loan interest deduction. It doesn’t have the consolidation of the three higher tax credits. It doesn’t have the taxing of the Graduate and Research Assistant tuition waiver. Some of the unrelated business income may make it more difficult to do things like rent out our facilities. Both the House and Senate doubled the standard deduction which means there will be fewer people itemizing. This may have a negative impact on donations to the university. There is a bill called the Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act that covers everything from financial aid requirements to where and when you post a syllabus. It regulates almost every aspect of what a higher education institution does.

- We have a robust **sexual harassment** policy on campus starting with our Title IX Office with Marjolie Leonard. We have Title IX deputies throughout the campus.

J. Sanders: I have a question about leadership. There are 17,664 undergraduate at Stony Brook. There are 8,625 graduate students. Last month we had one student go missing, Courtney Murphy. Her professors and fellow students were profoundly worried about her. The University Police did do a good job in locating her. But for four days there was great anxiety about the fate of this young woman. Did President Stanley call her father or mother to reassure them personally, as a leader of this university, that it was doing everything to find this young woman? J. Grieman: I don’t have any idea whether President Stanley personally made that call, but I do know others in this institution spoke with her family. J. Sanders: We’ve seen repeatedly in crises involving students that President Stanley has been absent. Will you please find and determine if he made the call? J. Greiman: I can check. As you know we’ve had this conversation many times, Jonathan. As you know what we do in every case it is guided by the family and safety of this community.
III. Discussion with the Provost (M. Bernstein)

- We are engaged in the deployment of a **faculty mentoring and faculty leadership** program. Stella Tsirka, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, has been leading that effort.
- We have begun campus visits with semi-finalists in search for the next **Dean of SoMAS**. We had our first candidate visit last week. Two candidates are coming this week. I am very grateful to the search team which has been co-chaired by Henry Bokuniewich of the SoMAS faculty and Fotis Sotiropoulos, the Dean of Engineering and Applied Sciences.
- The four Provosts of the SUNY university centers will be meeting in New York City in January. I hope this will first of a regular series of meetings.
- You might want to take a look at the website for the Provost’s Office. We’ve had some personnel transitions, some reorganization and we have an organization chart up which might help you make sense of what the office actually does.

V. Discussion with the VP for HSC (K. Kaushansky)

- **Nursing**: CCNE, the accrediting body for nursing undergraduate and graduate programs, visited Stony Brook and approved all of our programs through 2027. Congratulations to Lee Xippolitos. Dean Lee Xippolitos announced to her faculty last week that she will be retire at the end 2018. We give great thanks to Lee for all of her close to ten year service as Dean of the School of Nursing and for her thirty years of service to Stony Brook. Lee will remain as Dean until we can find a replacement. We are launching a search for a new Dean. I spoke to Rob Kelly this morning to go through the procedural issues in bringing a University Senate member on the search committee that will be co-chaired by Jackie Mondros, Dean of the School of Social Welfare, and Iris Granek, Chair of Family, Population and Preventive Medicine.
- **The School of Pharmacy** continues on its pathway towards a first class program. They are filling out their leadership roles, recruiting faculty members in collaboration with the University Hospital, the School of Medicine and other departments.
- **Ernest Baptiste** is the new **Chief Executive Officer of University Hospital** and our hospital network. Ernest was identified by a National Search led by Ramin Parsey and Peggy McGovern. Ernest received his Master in Health Care Administration from CW Post and his Masters in Health Financial Management from NYU. He has served a number of administrative roles throughout hospitals most recently about five or six years as Chief Executive Officer of Kings County Hospital in Brooklyn.
- **University Hospital** has just received **three more awards**. Like last year, we were voted as a top 5% performer in the country by Health Grades. We were voted a top 5% hospital by the Joint Commission and one of the top women’s friendly hospital in the United States. We now have a commitment from the Ronald McDonald House to build a full-fledged Ronald McDonald House on our campus and short walk away from the University Hospital and the new Children’s Hospital Pavilion.
• In the School of Medicine we are working in collaboration with the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences. We just received a large $2M a year grant in Biomedical Informatics. We are launching a new initiative on organ transplantation. Stony Brook University Hospital ranks #1 in organ procurement for transplantation. We are working with engineering to begin a scientific program to try to create artificial organs for transplantation.

• I was asked at the last meeting why are all those lights on in the MART building. The lights are always on in the MART building for security reasons.

USB: Has there been any consideration on the renaming of the School of Medicine after a local corporation whose name has become somewhat tarnished over these months by virtue of how some of that money is protected from offshore accounts?

K. Kaushansky: The School of Medicine Faculty Senate has taken that up. There is a lot of misinformation circulating.

USB: There is a good deal of negative feelings emanating from the community at large.

K. Kaushansky: It’s not going to be called the Renaissance Technologies School of Medicine. It’s going to be called the Renaissance School of Medicine.

Audience member: Renaming schools for wealthy donors should be evaluated whether or not the name is consistent with the schools guiding principles. Medical education should not be for sale for the largest donor. For those of you who are not familiar with what has been happening, people on campus and people throughout the Three Village area are opposed to it. I am hoping that you will sign a petition before you leave today voicing your opinion. Many professors on campus have written a letter to President Stanley expressing their concern and dissatisfaction.

E. Feldman: The University Senate had this discussion with President Stanley two weeks ago with the SOM Senate President. The issue from the President’s point of view is that the employees of Renaissance Technologies that have donated I think $500M to the University. The University was looking for a way to recognize those employees not the current or past CEO of Renaissance Technologies.

Audience member: At the October 2nd meeting of the Stony Brook Council they approved the proposition with one abstention. There was no discussion about that proposal on any video tape. What had happened was that President Stanley called the members of the Council and asked them beforehand what to do.

Audience member: Will they have any input into curriculum?


Audience member: And they want to give us $500M?

K. Kaushansky: They already have. The company hasn’t given a cent. The individual families out of their individual money have been the donors. There is something like 78 different families who have contributed to this university.

E. Feldman: The SUNY Board of Trustees postponed a discussion and a vote on it. It is now tabled.

J. Sanders: As a former fundraiser, it seems to me that if you got money from the employees, you should ask the corporation to match it.

USB: Is there any form of concierge medicine being practiced at the University Hospital?
K. Kaushansky: We do not have that kind of a program. We have a program where if a faculty member or a family of faculty members or friends of Stony Brook, they don’t pay anything. They call me, Sam or anybody and we manage to facilitate their access. The care and rooms are identical.

IV. Election of the University Senate President (F. Walter)

- You’re all here today because you care about the University. You care about the University Senate and you care about the leadership of the University Senate. This is a contested election. The choice of who you want to lead the Senate and to speak to its constituency, the faculty, professional staff and students on both sides of Nichols Road. Who you choose is crucial in these times when the university administration reacts to external pressures in ways that have ramifications for its academic mission. The University Senate, through its President, is the voice of shared governance on this campus. I remind you that the policies of the Board of Trustees of SUNY recognize the importance of shared governance in the planning and operation of SUNY in a way that doesn’t always seem to be acknowledged by our administration. Per our by-laws, the President of the University Senate is responsible for setting the agenda, chairing all meetings of the University Senate. The President of the Senate or his or her designee chair the Executive Committee and represents the University Senate in the Stony Brook Council, the Provost’s Advisory Group and other campus-wide administrative committees that involve senate representation. The President of the University Senate is the ex-officio member of all University Senate standing committees. The position of the President is uncompensated. It is generally unappreciated but the President of the Senate must speak and stand up for the interests of the constituency. This year we have two outstanding candidates running against each other. Professor Nancy Tomes from the Department of History and Ed Feldman, incumbent, President of the University Senate and Associate Professor from the Department of Family Medicine. They are both highly qualified. Each of the candidates will get to speak for about five minutes. We will have a question and answer session. I will then ask the two candidates to step out of the room and we will have an open discussion without them present. This will be an off the record discussion and nothing leaves this room. When they come back in the room, then we will have the election.

Candidates Edward Feldman and Nancy Tomes made brief statements to the Senate and answered questions from the floor.

F. Walter: I would like to thank you all. I hope you have enough information to make an intelligent decision.
M. Schedel: Is the public discussion mandated by the constitution?
F. Walter: No. If there is a motion to have the discussion we’ll take a vote.
M. Schedel: I move to have a discussion.
F. Walter: Is there a second. There is second. Everybody in favor of having an open discussion say aye. All in favor.
Both candidates left the room and the Senate then discussed the relative merits of the candidates prior to the vote. After some discussion, a written vote was taken.

F. Walter: The ballots have been counted. Dr. Nancy Tomes is now the President-Elect of the University Senate

V. Discussion about Football at Stony Brook (A. Flescher, J. Sanders, S. Heilbron, J. Penna)

T. Tiso: Can I please ask that we defer this until next semester since they haven’t met with all of the committees yet? I’m on the University Affairs committee and we have never even heard of this. This is something that doesn’t have to be done this minute.

E. Feldman: I would see this as an initial discussion.

T. Tiso: I make a motion that we defer this until the next meeting in February.

E. Feldman: Is there a second to that motion? There’s a second. Is there discussion on that motion to table the discussion about football to the next senate meeting?

Audience Member: Both the Student Life Committee and CAPRA have met with Shawn.

E. Feldman: I’ll call for a vote to table the motion. Motion fails.

A. Flescher: The reason I’m up here is because various members of the administration informed us that folks would be losing their jobs. Nothing can be taken for granted and it’s in that spirit today that Jonathan and I are going to ask some questions.

1. What, with as much clarity and transparency as possible, reflects the budgetary burden associated with Stony Brook’s Football program? Can the athletic director present the hard numbers to demonstrate that our football program, if it doesn’t pay for itself, at least does not disproportionately drain the budget? To date, the case has not been made. Should our football program get an uncritical pass, in terms of being funded, during this era of scarce resources?

2. In general how do we decide what values to prioritize at Stony Brook? Granting it’s not a democracy, what is the process by which we decide where to invest in lean times? Do faculty and students have a voice in determining our values? If so, what is this voice?

3. In light of this first two questions, it occurs to Jonathan and me that there is also an additional ethical dimension that bears consideration with regard to the football program, pertaining to the well-being of our students. Should Stony Brook be out in front of the debate about football safety or wait to see what transpires over the next several years? On whose shoulders does the burden of demonstrating the safety (or non-safety) of football fall at institutions of higher education? Do we wait until there is sufficient research conclusively to denounce football as unsafe or do we err on the side of caution and suspend our football program until there is solid evidence to support Stony Brook’s current view that football is not unreasonably dangerous?
A. Flescher: When the question was first asked of President Stanley at our first senate meeting about football and whether this might be one avenue for considering how to contain the budget given the safety concerns. The President said that there are interesting reasons to support an athletic program. After Donald Trump’s administration issued its travel ban, I wasn’t just impressed but moved by President Stanley’s words. He said everyone at this campus was welcomed to be at this campus. He fostered an inclusive spirit.

J. Sanders: We need to pay attention to football because like some of the characters in Animal Farm some animals are more equal than other animals. I think we need to look at the football program through a number of lenses. The first lens is historical. I don’t know how we got to this big football program at Stony Brook. I don’t know if the faculty or the student body were really consulted. The thing I do as a journalist is that I ask experts. What experts do you know? I remember Joe Namath brought the NY Jets a championship. Joe Namath now says that if knew what he knows now about the injuries created by football, he would not play football. Bob Costas, long time broadcaster, has recently said that football is injurious, crude, rude and has no place in American sports. Dennis Choi, Chair of the Neurology Department offered this statement for the meeting:

“I believe that there is now compelling evidence suggesting that the game of American football imposes substantial risks of brain damage on regular players. More research is urgently needed to identify safe levels of play. Likely game rules or protective equipment will ultimately require change to protect players. A national dialogue should take place, aimed at establishing interim safety measures, and universities have a responsibility to initiate and lead this dialogue.”

Woodward and Bernstein always told you to follow the money. So let’s ask about the money. There is going to be a bill brought up in the state legislature that will prevent the use of State money specifically for football. No one knows if it will pass or not. Let’s ask a question about our 17,364 undergraduates. Each of them are compelled to pay an intercollegiate fee of $273 a semester. That’s $4,740,372 this fall. Who determines how this money is spent? Do students have a voice in that? If not, is that taxation without representation? Does our football team really look like Stony Brook?

Audience member: That’s a terrible and ignorant thing to say.
J. Sanders: Ok, you can have your turn. Try a visual culture approach. Maybe our football team looks like what Stony Brook should look like. Maybe it is more integrated than the university. Maybe Shawn is doing better than President Stanley in getting African Americans students. Maybe we need to look at this through the lens of what does Stony Brook look like. Does it look like some disproportionate hiring of people to use their bodies? Is it a form of colonialism? We hear a lot about diversity at Stony Brook. We’re moving to be more of a STEM oriented school. Maybe for people coming from a variety of different backgrounds, this kind of American football holds no attraction. Maybe we need e-games, e-sports instead of football. We need to have a public discussion about this. We need to weight this because football represents all of us and we may not want it to.
S. Heilbron: I’ve invited some of my colleagues to speak on the medical concerns raised and to speak about the main benefit of athletics. I think our student athletes of color would take great exception to your comments Jonathan as do I. What does athletics at Stony Brook mean? First of all no one wants to see any tenure track faculty get non-renewed. No one wants to see any academic program get cut. We are here to serve the academic mission of Stony Brook University. Athletics is to shine the spotlight on the academic mission. That is our role is and nothing more than to provide transformative experiences for our student athletes. Athletics is unifying - it brings people together. It helps tell the story of our campus. Athletics helps generate publicity for the University. I am proud of our student athletes. They leave here with a degree in their hand and a credible opportunity to get a job when they leave. We have not been exempt from the budget cuts. We have taken our share of cuts. We do have the ability to generate our own revenue. If you looked at our budget you would see that a small investment made by the University. As we continue to grow we will continue to generate more revenue. Albany and Binghamton undergraduate actually pay higher athletic fees. I’d like to introduce Elizabeth Zanolli, our head athletic trainer, Jim Penna, James Paci and Brian Cruickshank who are our physicians who can speak about the issues raised around injuries.

J. Penna: I am the Chief of Sports Medicine from East Campus. We are here for our student athletes. We are here at the invitation of the athletic director but separate from the Athletic Department. We are here to make sure what our students do in every sport is safe. I want Brian to briefly expound on what we’ve done for concussion on this campus. We have ongoing research observerships. We have increased staff and capabilities to exceed the NCAA requirements on what is required and to watch over a concussion program.

B. Cruickshank: I am the medical director of the Concussion Clinic. In terms of safety, we look to treat concussions in terms of what we know about concussions. Everything is evidence based. The recent articles that have come out, specifically regarding football and CTE which is chronic traumatic encephalopathy, is incomplete. One of the authors from the NFL article that came out over the summer is also a member of this other group called Concussion Support Group. There are over 30 renound concussion experts who meet every couple of years to review all the most recent literature and publications about concussion. After they meet they release a consensus statement. The consensus statement released this year says: “A cause and effect relationship has not yet been demonstrated between CTE and sports related concussions or exposure to contact sports. As such, the notion that repeated concussions or sub-concusses impacts causes CTE remains unknown.” We don’t have the exact cause of CTE. The first way we look at concussion is treatment to our student athletes. The first thing is recognizing concussion and getting them into a concussion protocol. This protocol is reviewed and critiqued on a yearly basis and not only by the staff here at the university but this is a document that is sent to the NCAA. The NCAA has a separate committee of experts that reviews our protocol to make sure it meets the standards. We have three concussion studies that we are working on.

Motion to adjourn. Meeting adjourned.
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