

Tentative Agenda
University Senate
October 2, 2017

- I. Approval of tentative agenda
 - II. Approval of minutes from September 11, 2017
 - III. President's Report (E. Feldman)
 - IV. Discussion with the President (S. Stanley)
 - V. Discussion with the Provost (M. Bernstein)
 - VI. Discussion with the Vice-President for the Health Sciences (K. Kaushansky)
 - VII. UUP Report (C. Kube, K. Moriarty)
 - VIII. Old Business
 - IX. New Business
-

University Senate
Minutes
September 11, 2017

I. Approval of agenda: approved.

II. Approval of minutes from May 1, 2017: approved. September 11, 2017 minutes approved at the December 4, 2017 University Senate meeting.

III. **President's Report** (E. Feldman)

- **9/11:** President Feldman asked members to reflect on those who lost their lives sixteen years ago on 9/11 and also those whose lives were affected by the two hurricanes recently. Kathy Monahan asked for a moment of silence.
- **Club Red:** Club Red which meets on Friday evenings from 4:30-6:30 is a University Club where faculty and staff have an opportunity to get to know people in other parts of campus from our routine work environment. It has been moved to the J Club in the Wang Center. Dean Kopp will be sponsoring this Friday.
- **Role of Governance in Budget:** On May 4, CAPRA which is the Senate's budget committee and I received a proposal from Dean Kopp, the Dean of Arts and Sciences, about proposed changes driven by budget shortfall at Stony Brook. Consistent with Senate procedure for modifications of departments, the Executive Committee discussed this proposal and sent it to several standing committees including the Undergraduate Council, the Graduate Council and CAPRA. Each of those committees met within a two week period about the proposals and gave extensive feedback to the Executive

Committee. On May 30 I sent Dean Kopp a detailed email providing feedback from the reports of these committees. Among the issues I addressed included the impact on Stony Brook's reputation of these proposed changes, the impact on Humanities and Interdisciplinary education and the perception that we becoming a STEM university and not a broad based university. We also had specific budgetary concerns and we asked for additional information about how these proposed changes were going to save the University \$1.5M. I also noted that we supported the notion that the University has to be free to make changes in programs as the needs of students and the national academic needs change over time. In making modifications to programs, the University should follow the agreed upon guidelines which are available on the University Senate's website. The Executive Committee felt that Dean Kopp had followed these guidelines. The role of the Senate is advisory to the Administration. It is not charged with making budgetary decisions. The EC subsequently met with Senator LaValle and shared our concerns about the budget both statewide as well as on campus. Fred Walter and I have met with some of the junior faculty who are affected by these budget cuts. The University Senate through the Executive Committee and the Standing Committees have been actively involved in providing advice about the proposals from CAS.

IV. Discussion on the Budget (S. Stanley, M. Bernstein, K. Kaushansky, R. Megna)

President Stanley: The budget problems are University wide and isn't restricted to one school. Stony Brook relies primarily on three areas for revenue including tuition, state allocation both of which are established by the legislature and approved by the governor and philanthropy, research and indirect costs. SUNY 2020 allowed for modest tuition increases of \$300 per year coupled with no budget cuts through the maintenance of effort allowed us to grow and expand. It was really important that we continue to make investments during this time in faculty and in infrastructure, advising and student success. We've had opportunities in the past to invest as an institution and we haven't done so. I look to the time between 1998 and 2003 when the NIH budget doubled, but Stony Brook did not invest during that time while every other AAU school except one participated in that budget doubling by investing in biomedical research. All of them over time doubled their research expenditures while Stony Brook stayed flat. SUNY 2020 allowed us to invest in our future by committing to hire 240 new faculty, invest in advising to help the student's success and improve our graduation rates which have increased significantly. When SUNY 2020 concluded, we were thrown a curveball when the State did not increase the tuition and we had a year of flat tuition. This means that we had to forego what would have at least a \$200 per student tuition increase for a year which translated into about \$2.6M loss. Also, there was a change in State policy whereby negotiated pay raises which in the past were added to our State allocation were not under the current administration. Stony Brook was responsible for financing these salary increases. A 2% pay increase translates to about \$8-9M in additional costs to the University. This has led to a "structural deficit." The amount of revenue we receive through tuition and state allocation doesn't cover the increased costs and salary increases. To cope with this shortfall, we have created a new budget system that is more transparent and involves more planning. Vice Presidents and Deans needed to be strategic and to think long term on how to deal with the budget issue. In the past we had reserves to help us

deal with budget shortfalls. Almost every unit had reserves, but these reserves are now mostly depleted. As a result, a plan was developed to have a 3% reduction in personnel based on attrition for academic units, 6% for administrative units and a 10% reduction in other than personnel expenses in things like Procurement.

R. Megna: We are working toward more budget transparency. The lack of state funding to cover negotiated salary increases is a significant factor in our budget problem right now. SUNY 2020 was designed to fund the university system over a multi-year period to prevent the State from significant ups and downs in university funding. When SUNY2020 came to an end the state did two things: they ended the tuition increases but they kept the piece that said we are not increasing the State subsidy which created a gap. In the past the State would go a decade not increasing tuition and then increase tuition by 30% in one year. The feeling with 2020 was to have modest increases over a period of time that allows the universities, especially the University Centers, to do the things that President Stanley was talking about. Now they put back into place \$200 tuition increases for 2 years which is below the SUNY2020 level plus they are not funding salary increases. Meanwhile they are negotiating with the unions for salary increases but they are not providing the funding to do so. We have a deficit of about \$25-35M across all VP areas because we have been spending down our reserves to cover those deficiencies. We tried to design a budget plan which spreads the pain university wide. The attrition rates for faculty is about 7-8% per year. On the Administration side where attrition is more in the 8-9%, we said they can only fill in the 2-3% category and they can keep 6% off to the side. The focus was on making cuts more in the non-academic areas where possible. Savings were re-invested in the faculty areas. A 10% OTPS reduction is about a \$2M savings. We are also trying to look at the tuition sharing programs that we have on the graduate side. The President talked about the budget reductions and the contractual salary increases. If you look at the past three years, the unfunded salary increases totaled about \$18M. The investments made with any incoming money has been to partially offset those problems. SUNY 2020 money was invested in instructional staff and we haven't been increasing in the Administration.

S. Stanley: I think it's worth mentioning that this is designed to address the problem over 2-3 years so the idea is not to address it all at once. Programs have been deactivated on both sides of campus.

K. Kaushansky: One of the things the President mentioned is that the academic areas should focus on our strategic goal. The people in the School of Medicine know that I just completed a 25 department show and tell to discuss what the strategic planning had been over the last year and a half. We've employed about 150 faculty members, administrators, and staff members in our strategic plan and we believe we have a pretty robust strategic plan in the area of research, education, clinical affairs and community outreach. It's our intention to stick to that strategic plan which calls for investment in certain areas. We were given our goals to achieve in the School of Medicine and in the Health Sciences. Basically about \$3M worth of attrition based cuts in the Health Sciences with \$2M to the School of Medicine and \$1M distributed to the other Health Science schools. We assigned those cuts based on revenue, numbers of individuals etc. Each of the Deans in the Health Sciences have examined areas to be cut. In the School of

Medicine, for example, we calculated that based on that attrition rate of 3% that we would not replace a number faculty members at full salary. In the School of Medicine, we hire our research intense faculty now with a slightly different financial model which is saving us money. Department Chairs are encouraged to recruit a replacement faculty for someone who has departed or retired at a lower amount of State dollars. We have about 900 faculty members in the School of Medicine and the number of administrative FTE's is down 8 over the last 6-7 years including 2 fewer deans and 6 fewer staff.

M. Bernstein: The new budget process that Bob Megna and his team have implemented is going to make a big difference. We are going to have a lot more clarity and a lot more consistency in projecting outcomes and anticipating changes.

Question from someone in the History Department: On Bob's PowerPoint presentation, the chart showing the change in FTE staffing since 2008-2009, we get absolute numbers but it's not very clear to understand what they mean without relative numbers. Can you tell us out of the overall size of the personnel in each division so we have a much clearer idea of where we are like percentage changes? It says that 27 non-instructional people were added to University Advancement. Is that the total number of employees?

R. Megna: I will get you the percentage change chart.

S. Stanley: That is a really important point to mention. We are continuing to invest in University Advancement. We are at a point right now where every time we have a fund raiser, they raise far more in funds than their salary costs. Some are paid by the Foundation and some are paid by the State.

P. Gootenberg: Could you put the prices here at Stony Brook into context of the three other university centers? Is there something particularly severe happening here or is it comparable? Buffalo decided to some of their athletic programs to accommodate the salary deficit. Why are we not prioritizing the academic programs, the heart and soul of the university?

R. Megna: We have taken the approach that it is a university wide problem. We are asking Athletics to also make the same cuts that we are asking administration to make. It is important to understand where our budget allows us to grow right now, what resources we have available, and where do we invest those dollars to maximum impact.

S. Stanley: Our costs are higher than other universities. For example, the 2% increase in pay raises is going to be significantly higher for our pay scale at Stony Brook because we hired some of the best people who demand a higher salary. We also have a much higher infrastructure costs than almost any of the other universities.

K. Kaushansky: The Academy of Arts and Sciences performed an analysis of state support for public universities across the country. Of the 50 states, 46 have disinvested in public education by an average of about 26%.

R. Megna: Occasionally, we depend on the state for support. The state cut non-SUNY employment over the same period we did the calculation about our increases.

A. Drees: The salary increases you mentioned are about \$18M over the last couple of years and the number of new personnel from your table that's about 350. If you count about \$100,000 salary per person, that's \$35M. On another slide you had shown the state allocation for the university grew by about \$18M over the same period of time. On another slide showing the

savings from the 50 Forward Initiative which is another \$12M. So expenses are \$55M towards an increase to savings of over \$19M. How is this a budget shortfall?

R. Megna: There is the whole base on which those increases took place not just on those additional people. The other piece was over that period of time we were not covering salary increases. We were all ready as 2020 moved in and were hiring additional faculty. We were not covering salary increases that were taking place at that time. The process wasn't as transparent as we would have liked. We weren't sure that areas weren't taking the cuts they were asked to take and they were covering those reserves they had.

R. Liebson from Statesman: What potential factor will the Excelsior Scholarship play in the budget and have you factored that into the new plan?

R. Megna: I think we are still trying to sort through the impact of Excelsior on admissions and it's a too early to know how much and what final enrollment is. The state should be compensating us for any additional expenses associated with Excelsior. However, there is going to be a lag between when the state compensates us and when we are out-of-pocket for those Excelsior dollars. We're supposed to be compensated by the State for all the Excelsior expenses. Assuming that's true we may have some cash flow problems over time trying to catch up but it should not have a dramatic detrimental increase and maybe we'll have a positive increase if we can get an increase in enrollment.

S. Stanley: We have about 350 or so at this point in time, but that's not a solid number.

C. Marshik: You said that Athletics was cut in the same way and it's a university wide problem. I take they are also taking the 3%, 6% and 10% cuts. I'm wondering if there was discussion about that because obviously you can have a university football team but you can't have a university [indistinct] departments and I wonder whether we still want to go forward assuming that we all share blame unless you want to start getting a B.A. in basketball.

S. Stanley: Athletics has a number of values to the university. There already has been a reduction in sports. Two sports have been discontinued by athletics including Men's swimming and Men's tennis. I think Athletics is important in providing a way in which people can identify with the University and helping build the student community.

K. Moriarty: We're asking a lot of people on our side to help with a lot of the different things that we need to fund higher education. Who are you asking, who is saying no and who should we reach out to say you need to help us. If the numbers are right, we are talking about a 1% difference here? If we go a \$400M we're talking about 8%? You mean to tell me New York State can't say to one of its premier institutions we're going to gradish you 1% or 8%?

R. Megna: There is a Maintenance of Effort bill that the legislature has passed on the Governor's desk which he has not yet signed. If the Governor signs that bill this would help.

R. Megna: When there was an MOE during SUNY 2020 that said we'll give you \$300 increases for multiple years but the subsidy remains flat. The question was, what does flat mean? When I was budget director, flat meant flat. It didn't mean you incorporate salary increases into that.

S. Stanley: I very much appreciate the UUP's efforts on the maintenance of effort front. I am doubtful that if the bill hasn't been signed by now that it will be signed and put into law. I think we need to talk to the new Chancellor of SUNY about this.

J. Dubnau (Anesthesiology): I was an undergraduate here in the class of 1988. I was a biochemistry major and I have fond memories of the Women's Literature course, a course on racism taught by Professor Dubai, a course on Russian Literature and a Spanish language

course. I don't know the financial situations of the departments at the time those courses were taught but I do know is that looking back on it, it doesn't matter. What matters is that I received a diverse, well-rounded education here and I'm a better citizen and better person for it. I have grave concerns about undermining intellectual atmosphere here by cutting programs. Are there other sources of funds that are not included in the charts on the budgetary slides; Central funds that could be used to rescue the intellectually diverse atmosphere.

R. Megna: If we had extra money to fund these pieces, we would. What I think we've been trying to do is say we have a budget situation that allows us to do certain things up to this amount of money. We as a university have to decide what things we are going to do within that constraint. If there was extra money we'd be putting it out there.

M. Bernstein: We made major investments and will continue to make major investments in an array of programs. We made major recruitments in History. We attempted major recruitments in Philosophy and we may try again next year. We made a series of excellent recruitments in Creative Writing. Part of what we're trying to do is aggregate resources so that we can invest them in strategic ways rather than take available resources and divide by "n" because this approach will get no measurable impact. The goal is to strengthen the university overall.

J. Dubnau: My question was about the asterisk that was on one of the slides that says that there are categories of money that are not included in the chart above. Central funds and other sources of funds.

R. Megna: What I'll do is try when I get out this other information, what is in that asterisk amount so people can see it. Again, there is no attempt to hide resources here.

M. Bernstein: The goal of the new budgeting process is that month to month and quarter to quarter we will track how each unit on the academic side as well as the administrative side, are mapping to their budget target so we can make adjustments through the year and not end up in the situation Bob described earlier where we miss our targets and then suddenly we're chewing up reserves that are meant for other things because we have to cover shortfalls.

R. Megna: I can tell you that every spare dollar that was not tied down of any central funds money that was in this budget is being used to help the academic areas.

S. Stanley: We didn't have clarity on our budget situation until last year. We now have pretty good clarity.

Question from the Floor: How does it help with the non-renewal of long term lecturers at the university who have relatively low salaries to begin with? How is that helping our deficit? Is it true, as might be circulated, that it is because lecturers do not provide to the intellectual atmosphere of the university?

M. Bernstein: The non-renewals are not about people failing to contribute to intellectual atmosphere or culture at the university. In fact, what's painful about this process that we have valued colleagues and even friends to whom we are giving a year's notice who have been here for a very long time. Nobody likes that and shouldn't like it. These are the contracts that are essentially moveable in the current environment. We are acting in accordance with all the contractual terms for all of these affected colleagues giving them the appropriate notice and in some cases trying to see if there are opportunities to re-deploy them but in other cases having to say goodbye. Independent of issues of management, we need to plan better. We need to anticipate enrollment shifts better, we need to anticipate the needs of our students better, we need to anticipate shifts in the funding department for research and scholarship. Another

aspect of the budget is that our research portfolio has flattened out so our IDC returns are off. That's another big source of revenue for us that has not been growing in pace with costs.

Question from the Floor: It looks like part of the problem is that you are trying to increase salaries by 2% which is inflation. Why can't you bargain for that.

R. Megna: I'd love to, but the State of New York says no to that.

Question from the Floor: We've seen a significant decline in international students because of the recent issues with H-1, visas, etc. What is causing this decline?

R. Megna: This is definitely a danger to our forecast. We love getting more domestic students because of Excelsior and that's great because the State of New York will compensate us for it. A decline in international students would be a significant cost to the university.

S. Stanley: We did see a decline in domestic, out-of-state and international students. Around 150 students declined which is significant in terms of the budget. However, we've increased our retention of our international students retaining 135 more than we did the previous year.

Question from the Floor: What is the policy for "deactivation of programs"?

K. Kaushansky: As I understand the policy we don't need permission from Albany, but we need to notify SUNY through the Provost and the President. We are in the process of notifying them.

Question from the Floor: So this decision was made without SUNY approval?

K. Kaushansky: We don't need approval we need to notify as I understand it.

S. Stanley: We've talked to SUNY Central about this and I think they are very comfortable with our approach. We notified them that we are assembling this information for them and they have accepted the fact that we are preparing a letter.

Question from the Floor: Where do get more information about the different amounts of money in particular the tuition that is mentioned? It doesn't add up to \$1.5M a year. Also what will the university do to with their reputation for not renewing junior faculty and not giving tenure to your faculty?

R. Megna: I think we have information on total tuition and how these changes affect. I'll try to get that to you.

M. Bernstein: With respect to reputational impact, non-renewing colleagues has been necessitated by a set of budgetary and strategic circumstances that I am convinced in the end these will make us stronger. Our reputation will be far more seriously damaged if we don't stabilize our budget. We are establishing the foundations for future growth. I think the way to sustain reputation in difficult circumstances like this is to speak honestly and frankly about why we're doing what we're doing and how we did it. We made strategic decisions fundamentally on the basis of quality, the prospects for success in the future and who we are at Stony Brook. Our reputation is going to be enhanced by making strong strategic decisions.

Comment from the Floor: That's insulting.

M. Bernstein: I'm sorry that you find that insulting. I think the essence of strategic choice is to understand that we cannot do everything. That is a recipe for mediocrity.

Question from the Floor: You outlined a system for a budget that is transparent and that is very admirable. What is not at all admirable and is very questionable, is the implementation of this concept. The Department of Cultural Studies and Comparative Literature is in the process of being folded into the Department of Hispanic Languages with a new title Comparative World Literature. In the process, three admirable junior colleagues are being terminated who teach World Literature, Vietnamese Literature and Vietnam American Refugee questions, North

African Literature and Italian Literature. How does terminating these junior faculty support the development of a program in Comparative World Literature? These three colleagues are junior faculty who have completed a one three-year contract and according to tenant in American academia and certainly among the universities of the AAU, they would expect to be renewed. Everybody knows you can't write a book in three years. This is a standard practice. How does that feature in your application of the new transparent goals?

M. Bernstein: The Dean of Arts and Sciences is now involved in discussion with all of the affected units with this reorganization in languages which is going to be an arduous and challenging process. I have no doubt that the reorganization is going to achieve both budgetary efficiencies and a focus with respect to future hiring and development of a curriculum that I think will work to the benefit of the college.

D. Rilling: You stated that as a result of this budgetary process we would have some clarity and that they'll be changes or adjustments over the next two or three years. I'm wondering to what degree tenured faculty, tenure-track, and lecturers for vulnerable departments come up next year for their third year review or their one year review and their going to find a very similar thing happen next year.

S. Stanley: The program review will be ongoing. My hope would be as we get stabilized and as we go through this process over the next few years we really can identify one of those areas we can focus on and what are the areas we are going to invest in.

L. Dietrich: I know you talk about diversity a lot and you've just hired a Chief Diversity Officer but how is not renewing faculty in Hispanic languages consistent with a commitment to diversity?

S. Stanley: The points you are raising are all very important. I think this is the challenge that I have. We have a commitment to diversity and have made extraordinary investments in diversity. We continue to work to diversify our faculty and our student body.

M. Reibeiz: What do you plan to do if you are trying to reduce the visibility of Hispanic languages. What are trying to do to make Latinos and Hispanics welcome on campus. How are you going to recruit students and faculty and especially when are you going to make Hispanics and Latinos participate in the governance of the faculty being hired at higher level?

S. Stanley: We do have a lot of work to do in terms of hiring more Hispanics particularly at the senior level. I think Hispanics languages is staying within this new construct. Many of these things are enrollment driven.

N. Goroff: Many universities and other organizations under similar circumstances offer incentives to get people to consider retirement. Is there any discussion of such a program to free up some of those resources in a more strategic way?

S. Stanley: When we faced a crisis in 2009, we actually had a program established for early retirement incentives. SUNY created a program that Stony Brook utilized. My experience was that it really didn't work. It encouraged some people to retire but they were people who were already going to retire. The costs associated with the incentives tends to work negatively against the budget overall.

M. Reibeiz: I would like to point out on the argument of diversity. The most vulnerable among us are the underrepresented groups. If you look at the rate of lecturers, it's mostly women or people of color. Looking at you (with all my respect), the higher in administration, the more white males we have. The biggest group that is being let go is women. I would like to point out

as an Arab American, as being under attack, my community is under attack, that immigration sentiment in the United States is that people hate immigrants and you're telling me today that the mission of education we in Stony Brook have no place for faculty who teach Arabic Literature? I represent the voice of Middle Eastern and Muslims on campus. I'm one of the very few faculty who teaches these courses and you're telling me that I'm not essential to your university? You're telling my colleague who drove his family from Canada that his Asian courses are not important? My colleague who teaches Africana Studies is not important? I understand the budget. I understand in my limited knowledge. The way I hear it that you used your savings on a swimming pool, on raising your own salaries, on Far Beyond, Far Beyond what? I moved my family here from Ohio and the only thing you have to tell me is that I'm not essential to the mission of the University, that I have no role to play and you have no commitment to me and the reputation will be fine? That is shameful.

J. Souza: If we look at the tenure track faculty and we look at how many of them are white males, than we look at the non-tenured track and we look at lecturers or we look at the tenure track who don't have tenure, how many of them are what she's talking about, females and the diversity that you talk about. If the contracts are that we can't get rid of the tenure track of older white males how are we supposed to get out of this problem? Unless we have some type of retirement then even if we lose money at least we're not losing the diversity portion of it and then eventually we'll get it back.

S. Stanley: The idea of spending more is a challenge. We will be hiring some during this time. I don't know the demographic of adjuncts. It speaks volumes of how we make decisions about recruiting and tenure in the past.

David from Pharmacology: I don't understand your definition of attrition. If you're downplaying the role of retirements and you are moving to lay off people and not continue contracts. I'm confused by those definitions.

S. Stanley: Attrition has to be done by discretion. There are certain functions of the university that have to be replaced and we are not going to be able to trim.

R. Megna: The attempt here was to do all of the savings plan through attrition to the extent that it was possible to do. In some smaller areas that's a difficult achievement but certainly in the larger areas like the Provostial area, that is something that should be manageable just through attrition.

Old Business: None

New Business: None

Meeting adjourned at 5:17.

Submitted by:

Laurie Cullen
Secretary