

Tentative Agenda
University Senate
November 6, 2017

- I. Approval of tentative agenda
 - II. Approval of minutes from October 2, 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. 177th Plenary Session Report (F. Walter)
 - VIII. UUP Report (C. Kube, K. Moriarty)
 - IX. Old Business
 - XX. New Business
-

University Senate
Stony Brook University

Minutes of October 2, 2017 Senate Meeting

I. Approval of tentative agenda: approved.

II. Approval of minutes from September 11, 2017: approved. Minutes from October 2, 2017 were approved at the December 4, 2017 Senate meeting.

III. President's Report (E. Feldman)

- National Tragedy: Like 9/11, the Senate once again begins with a national tragedy – this time the mass shooting last night and yesterday in Las Vegas. I am deeply saddened for the loss of life and I ask that we have a moment of silence for all the people affected by this tragedy.
- Budget: We are not going to repeat the long budget discussion that we had on 9/11. I circulated Bob Megna's follow-up report and Bob is here so if there are questions relative to his report, he will be able to answer those question.
 - In these difficult budget times, my goal is to ensure that you have the correct information and also that you have an opportunity to get your questions answered by the administrators who have made the decisions around the impact of the budget.
 - In my enthusiasm to invite as many members of the HSC as possible to this meeting, I sent an email to all of the HSC Schools inviting you but I made an error in that I said incorrectly that there were tenure track faculty in the School of

Health Technology who were given letters of non-renewal. It turns out that at the time I wrote that, that was not true. If we hold our administrators to a standard of reporting accurate information, I should be held to the same standard. I apologize for that inaccurate reporting to you. Dean Kaushansky followed up with the School of Health Technology and it turns out there is one faculty member who was on a tenure track line who was not renewed.

- Please remember that the Senate's role in the budget is advisory. We do not make budgetary decisions. Our goal is shared governance so that when administration has proposals around budgetary items, we would like to be involved in the discussion prior to the time that the decisions are made. The University Senate has a dozen standing committees and we would like our standing committees to look over the proposals so that we can provide some feedback to the administrators. Faculty and staff might have some good ideas.

IV. Discussion with the President (S. Stanley)

- National Tragedy: As President Feldman has said, many of us are sickened and saddened by the events in Las Vegas. Since we are a health center I think it's worth noting that this is a public health issue. I know it's become a political issue, but guns in our country are a public health issue not a political issue in my mind. One need look no further than the experience in Australia where in 1996 they banned long rifle automatic weapons. They did a buyback program. As a result, they found a reduction in gun related violence, and mortality associated with homicide and suicide. What's really striking is that in the eighteen years preceding the ban there have been thirteen episodes of mass shootings. Since the ban in 1996 there have been zero mass shootings.
- Yesterday, Stony Brook lost one of the important leaders of the university, Peter Baigent. Peter was Vice-President of Student Affairs a position he held for twelve of his twenty-four years at Stony Brook University. He came to Stony Brook from Syracuse University where he'd been a leader in student affairs and where he'd gotten his doctorate in education. Peter was a remarkable leader. He was a pioneer in the developing of student affairs data to develop data. He was kind, generous and someone who cared very much about the students of Stony Brook. We'll work with his family to do something special to honor Peter in the next few weeks.
- DACA: I want to make clear that Stony Brook remains absolutely committed to DACA and our staff and students. None of our policies on immigration policies have changed. At the same time we are working as hard as we can on our advocacy with members of congress about DACA and to find a pathway to citizenship for these students. DACA students are not eligible for financial aid because of their status.
- Sexual Misconduct: As you know, the Trump administration and the Department of Education essentially undid the previous guidance letter on approaches to dealing, adjudicating and investigating incidences of sexual violence and sexual misconduct on campus. I want to make it clear again that Stony Brook remains committed to doing all the things possible that we've been doing to prevent sexual violence on our campus.

- This is the 60th anniversary of Stony Brook University. The Oyster Bay campus was founded in the Fall of 1957. It was my privilege at the State of the University Address to talk about all the positive things that have happened since then. The growth has been extraordinary. The initial graduating class had 40 students and our graduating class of 2017 was more than 7,300 students. There has also been a huge growth in faculty which now numbers more than 1,900 full-time faculty - an all-time record – which includes an addition of 350 new faculty since 2011, much of that attributed to SUNY 2020 funding. Our research dollars have grown from \$15,000 in 1957 to \$169M annually in funded research.

Budget and Leadership: J. Sanders: I listened attentively and I also watched the video tape and I think that since all of us had our eyes focused on you that members of this audience may not have seen that there was at least one protest sign in the audience saying they had a vote of no confidence in you. I actually went and talked to the person involved and it's a Ph.D. student in a department not involved in the budget reductions. Some of the distinguished faculty wrote to the Chancellor about your leadership and that this is not an uncommon feeling. In your comments, you blame the State for our finances. We've also heard from Bob that there was no affective budget process before he came and there was something wrong in the budget process or that you couldn't tell if money was spent or not spent. I'm very concerned about the message you are sending or that you are faking the truth. There are on my list from Freedom of Information Act, fifty-two people, all administrators, making more than a quarter of a million dollars at Stony Brook and you began your address by highlighting at least two people who are already making over a quarter of a million dollars who have gotten raises. At the same time that the most vulnerable people, tenure track people who came here in good faith, are getting the boot. I wonder if not the legality of this, but of the morality and morale of the faculty and the graduate students is weighing on you and what are you going to do about it.

S. Stanley: There has always been challenges around our fiscal status. There are only so many numbers that we have available to deal with what's on the outside. I do think, frankly, that some of the problems we have certainly are due to the state. That doesn't mean that we don't have to work to deal with them, but I don't think that this is related to inappropriate spending by Stony Brook in any way. It's not justified by anything that I know of. We distributed to units their budget and gave them a fair amount of freedom on how they use those dollars. That kind of distribution model can be very successful because it gives units flexibility to do what they need to do to control their own allocations. I think you're right that there could have been some better monitoring, but that's not why we're where we are. The spending we have been doing has been investments in faculty which the University needed. We had gone for years without adding tenure track faculty. SUNY 2020 gave us the opportunity to hire needed tenure tract faculty which was important for our future performance in research. We've been stagnant in research over a number of years and we needed to hire faculty to move that forward. The combination of new faculty and advisors has helped push student success. We've gone from 47% graduate rates in four years to 57% graduation rates. Also, we had an unwritten agreement between the State, the Governor and SUNY that when pay raises were negotiated, the money for these increases would be added to our State allocation which is how

was done in the past. In 2013 after that budget was negotiated with three years of zero percent increases and the last two years at two percent that was the first time that the Governor decided not to fund those pay increases. That put an immediate \$8M deficit on the budget which every SUNY school is dealing with. In terms of the administrative salaries, I don't know where exactly you got that number but I'm not going to dispute it because I can't confirm it one way or another. It does take talented administrators. My guess is that some of those administrators are on the HSC side. We pay administrators competitively for the job they need to do. We look at what the standards are for that particular position and then we look at what pays at about the 50% level usually for that type of person. Because it's Long Island, because our costs are so high, often we have to pay more than that. I don't know of a single administrator we've had in the senior leadership team that I would say wasn't earning their money for the kind of work they have to do. This is now a \$2.7B organization which can't be run by amateurs. I feel for the faculty during this time - for the faculty you've talked about, the five individuals in Arts and Sciences who received non-renewal notices. I know Dean Kopp has been working hard with other schools to try find places for them.

The Environment: M. Bowman: The University Senate Environment Committee has set up a task force to look at how we might reduce our energy footprint. I think Stony Brook's utility bill is over \$1.25M each week. The task force tried to look at ways that we could use this analysis to improve the consciousness of the community. One recommendation was that every building should be metered so we know exactly how much energy, gas and electricity is used. The other thing was recommend is to set up incentive programs where those who are responsible for individual buildings, whether it be a Dean or administrators, would be given a challenge to reduce their footprint and cost savings would be split between that unit and the administration. The other problem is Calpine energy, as a sole source contractor, will generate all our electricity until the year 2034. I also hear that Calpine Energy has reached their generator capacity so maybe there's an opportunity to take advantage of solar energy. We must have 100 acres of flat rooftop which could be used for solar.

S. Stanley: I appreciate that Malcolm. We're looking for savings anywhere we can find it. You are absolutely correct about Calpine.

Question from the audience: What is the reason for keeping the lights on 24/7 in the two new MART buildings and the hospital building?

S. Stanley: I don't know the answer to that question. To go back to Malcolm's question and comments, you're right about Calpine that clearly wasn't far thinking when that contract was signed. Do you want to comment Bob?

R. Megna: The Calpine issue is a really big issue because part of that contract was which was negotiated before any of us were here was that we couldn't use renewables. It actually prevented us from using solar and other renewables in a more comprehensive way. Fortunately, the contract is not up in 2021-22 so we are in the process of doing an RFP to see if we can do better with the Co-Gen facility and NYPA. The New York State Power Authority has

done an assessment of our power needs and is thinking about rebuilding our power plant. Obviously, they would allow us to use renewables, so I do think there is a lot of potential for more savings on the utility side.

S. Stanley: This is a major focus for us going forward. I think we can do better than we are doing now. We have been coming under our targets and have been saving money.

R. Megna: All of the utility savings goes into central funds which means that it gets reallocated for specific university wide projects.

I. Cohen: The Health Science side of the campus has seen a massive increase in building which hasn't been paid for and requires enormous loans that we have to continue to pay. We have been told both in the basic sciences and clinical department that we have to contribute \$6.5M a year towards maintaining these loans. At a time when there is such limited amount of funding available, I raise the question of whether a new School of Pharmacy at this particular point in time that's not necessarily funded in full by the State should go forward.

K. Kaushansky: Our physical plant was built 40 years ago and there hasn't been a substantial increase in space on this side of campus in those 40 years. Yet our faculty has more than doubled in size, our clinical volumes have tripled and the hospital was recently evaluated as 40% smaller than the benchmark size for an academic medical center with 603 beds. Moreover, this is a busy health care facility. At one point in March, for our 603 beds we had 670 patients in the hospital, so we are under sized. Most of the dollars for the construction of the two new buildings were either raised by the State (\$83M), from philanthropy (over \$100M) and the hospital's contribution for both the MART and the Bed Tower. The Bed Tower should be able to pay for itself through the increased revenues that come in through patient care. The School of Pharmacy is not only not fully funded by the State, it's not funded at all by the State and yet, by creating an aggressive formula, we can pay for the entire School of Pharmacy without a single robbing of Peter to pay Paul. The School of Pharmacy would be paid for by the tuition revenue that will come in for those students. We are not taking the money out of the hospital or the other HSC schools.

I. Cohen: I happened to look up on the Pharmacy accreditation site for Binghamton and Stony Brook. Stony Brook wasn't even on the accreditation site while Binghamton has been on the accreditation site for three years. I went on the site and it says there are going to do all the things rapidly and assuming they pass all of those things in July they will be given accreditation to take students and the plan is to accept students in July. It seems to me that is a little unrealistic. As the Dean has said, it is my understanding is that \$6M has been borrowed from the President. The reason I brought this up is those tenure track faculty are going to enormously hurt the reputation of this university if we just cut them loose because people are not going to take jobs here. At the same time that we are letting those people go there is a movement of \$6M from main campus to the HSC for this School of Pharmacy. It is hard for me to imagine where these students would come from. I find the process by which this is being done and to be borrowing money from main campus at a time when we are in a serious crisis

for tenure track faculty who should never be let go except for serious reasons of incompetence. Otherwise our credibility is destroyed.

K. Kaushansky: Let me correct a lot of misstatements that Ira just made. First of all, the money that is coming from the main campus is required to be used for the betterment of the Health Sciences. It's not being taken out of tenure track faculty members on the west campus. This is money that originates from our growing clinical practice which is sent to the President Office to be used for support of the HSC. Number two, it's not \$6M. I think right now we have maybe \$1M worth of faculty members hired. Once the students arrive and start paying tuition that will be paid back. Number three, this School of Pharmacy will recruit students because it's simple economics. The tuition on the other two pharmacy schools on Long Island, one in Brooklyn, one in Queens, is about \$15,000-\$20,000 a year more than what the Stony Brook tuition will be. Nobody including the accrediting bodies doubts that we will fill our enrollment. There are scores of undergraduates at Stony Brook who want to go into pharmacy. The final point is that I cannot think of more compelling place to locate a school of pharmacy than immediately adjacent to a top notch School of Medicine, School of Dental Medicine, Nursing, Social Welfare, Health Technology, and a hospital that already has a pharmacy residency program. Binghamton has an infusion of \$65M. The School of Medicine will benefit by those faculty members who are recruited to the School of Pharmacy that will add to our critical mass of scholars and educators. We will teach classes together. So I take exception with virtually everything that Ira said just now because this is a very compelling story. Yes, Binghamton has had an infusion of \$65M of State dollars, but the point that SB is a financially viable school, making it a compelling educational and research argument for enhancing what we already have here at Stony Brook.

V. Discussion with the Provost (M. Bernstein)

- Sam alluded to our celebrating 60 years of our institution you might note in my report we are also celebrating 50 years of our faculty in Marine and Atmospheric Sciences. There will be some special events to celebrate a half century of SoMAS.
- Budget: I would like to make one comment both about budget process and then a comment about what was recently discussed about faculty non-renewals. You are all well aware we have a new budget process underway at the University. The Provosts Office have started our first quarter meetings with the academic units of the west campus. These meetings are going very well. They are allowing the Provosts Office to accumulate a lot of information both strategic and operational about all of the units. This is going to assist us in working with the leadership in all the academic units in mapping through the current fiscal year and in planning for the next fiscal year. The comment I'd like to make, some observations were just made in some of the colloquy about the faculty non-renewals. I want to emphasize that these tough decisions are strategically grounded. Yes, we're operating in a very tight budgetary environment but we're not just throwing things up at the wall. We are making some hard headed decisions about where our strengths lie and where our strengths don't lie. So in terms of faculty non-renewals in certain units in which we have now suspended undergraduate admissions, we have had to make some tough acknowledgements of

where we do not have the quality to sustain investment right now. We are making tough decisions about quality and quality is the name of the game at the end given the excellence of our university and what we aspire to do in the future. That's why across the board cuts have not been part of the tactics here.

J. Sanders: I'm not sure we would be on the same page about what the strategic cuts were, but what I am concerned about is just what you are concerned about and that is going forward. I think the ripple effect here of the non-renewal of tenure track people goes far beyond the five people involved. Part of it may be the psychology of communication. We have so many young professors who commute and often commute together from Brooklyn and they talk about what is happening to their colleagues. What should I tell my friends at Chicago, Berkley or Columbia? Should they even think about coming here? And that's part of what I tried to raise in some part the morale question of this. There is not a lot of confidence that this is not going to spread to somebody else or somebody else's department.

M. Bernstein: I completely understand morale challenges but speaking as senior member of the faculty I think it is important that we mentor all of our junior colleagues to do the most essential thing necessary to secure their futures which is to focus on their research, teaching and professional activity. That is what they must focus on. If they then see an opportunity elsewhere that they want to closely consider, again its incumbent upon us as senior colleagues to help them work the issues there, to compare that opportunity to possibilities here.

D. McKinnon: There is a \$25M deficit this year and a \$35M deficit next year? Is it going to get bigger the year after?

R. Megna: I think that the actions we are taking can stabilize our situation and get us to a much better place. I hesitate to say that it's going to take one year. I think we are talking about a two to three year process.

D. McKinnon: Is there any other effective mechanism other than attrition to deal with this budget deficit?

R. Megna: Employees are where the money is in most kind of endeavors especially in higher education. We are saving \$2M just by cutting OTPS expenditures which goes a long way to preventing some attrition. We can cut back on our spending in travel, in saving paper, and buying computer services. We are looking at those and contractual services and obligations to see where we can cut back.

D. McKinnon: What's an estimate of cutting faculty?

R. Megna: I don't look at it that way. I deferred to the Provost about program review and determining what programs make sense and what doesn't make sense. Attrition is not costing anyone here a job. Managing headcount is something we can do both in administration and

education. Remember the administration is taking twice the cut that the faculty side is taking, not in terms of actually cutting, but in terms of not rehiring.

VI. Discussion with the Vice President of the Health Sciences (K. Kaushansky)

- One of our strategic goals was to create an NCI Designated Cancer Center here at Stony Brook. We have now easily achieved the research goals that we need to achieve. We have over \$20M in NIH, NCI and other institute sponsored primary research in cancer medicine and cancer biology which is above the \$10M threshold needed for NCI designation. We are now focusing on clinical thought leaders. We are in the process of recruiting clinical thought leaders that will get us over the last milestone of becoming NCI designated.
- A number of very large and impressive grants have come to Stony Brook in **Biomedical Informatics** to study cancer based informatics. We have been awarded a large in inter-professional education between Dental Medicine, Nursing and Social Welfare. Another large grant was awarded in Biomedical Engineering, the first ever Tech Foundation grant at Stony Brook.
- Major **recruitments** are under way including a new Chief Executive Officer for Stony Brook Hospital and a Chair of Ophthalmology where we are in negotiations with our top candidates.
- The **School of Social Welfare** has had a very successful year in growing enrollment that was hinged upon developing a campus in Manhattan.
- The two new buildings that Ira was referring to unfortunately are behind construction schedule and will be completed next year.
- **Clinical growth** has noted for quite some time. Our Commack clinic is at 50% capacity.
- The **hospital** has grown in quality. We just received some clinical score cards. We have moved up 20 spot across the U.S. in our hospital quality metrics and we are about two spots away from the very top ranking in our ambulatory quality of care. We performed almost 600 cardiac operations last year and we had zero mortality.
- Stony Brook Medicine sent a number of volunteers including physicians, nurses and other health care professionals to help in the aid of **Puerto Rico**. San Juan is not quite ready for the health care providers just yet.
- We have had a forty year affiliation with **Winthrop Hospital** for the education of our medical students which is currently a clinical campus of Stony Brook Medicine. We send 40 third and 40 fourth year students who spend their entire final two years in med school at Winthrop. NYU School of Medicine and Health Care System took over Winthrop Hospital. A month ago I received a letter from NYU they were terminating our long term relationship with Winthrop as of May 2020. We are exploring options for our students, but the least attractive option is to reduce our class size.

Question from the audience: There is a sense that Northwell seems to be gobbling up all of the local community hospitals. We have Southampton which is a very expensive affair. What is there left for us to do? We need to replace Peconic Bay and Mather is taken over by Northwell.

K. Kaushansky: We are planting the Stony Brook flag at Brookhaven, Southampton and Eastern Long Island Hospital, but those are not going to solve our need for educational sites, because they are too small. We are in active discussions with the Catholic Health System about potentially using Good Samaritan Hospital as a teaching site. We are talking with Mt. Sinai and potentially of using South Nassau Community Hospital. While Northwell is affiliating with many local hospitals, I believe that we provide a much superior product.

A. Bloom: After a long career I've watched a lot of different medical schools build research. Even then you needed the best people and you needed a great deal of money. We have leveled off here. Even if we have a new attractive building, you will continue to have a hard time attracting new faculty with the cost of living on Long Island unless we are in the top ten percent. New competitive faculty are going to cost a great deal of money - new money either from philanthropy or elsewhere. I don't think it can be underestimated that worse thing is to have a good building and not be able to fill it with the best people.

K. Kaushansky: I agree 100% that it takes both. We are attempting to build the infrastructure that is necessary for people to be successful. We are investing the dollars that we have from philanthropy and from our clinical practice. Even our clinical practices have set aside money for investment in research. When the MART building opens our imaging facility will be second to none. I'm working with Dexter and his team to actively recruit faculty members and money for faculty members.

A. Bloom: How much does clinical bring in for research?

K. Kaushansky: Right now we are bringing in about \$380M in clinical revenue and 0.5% of that was devoted specifically to allow us to develop the Clinical Translational Science Award.

VII. UUP Report (C. Kube, K. Moriarty)

- C. Kube: It's going slow on the negotiations front. We are hoping it will be settled by the end of this year. In the HSC, we are trying to make our members aware of DSH money dilemma. The federal government failed to require appropriating DSH money to the hospitals. From what we understand, the hospital will be getting the money the federal gov't, but the matching share from the State is being negotiated. Do you know any updates on that Ken?

K. Kaushansky: There are couple of conflated issues surrounding DSH. The Accountable Care Act was built on the assumption that everyone was going to have regular health insurance and that we wouldn't need DSH dollars. The current administration failed to repeal/replace the Accountable Care Act. As a consequence, the safety net hospitals do in fact need the DSH. For the last four years those cuts which were part of the Affordable Care Act have been postponed. It takes an act of congress every year to vote to postpone the DSH cuts which was not done this year, so \$2B in funding from the Federal Government is being held up. DSH is a 50/50 match

from the State and the Federal Government, so there is \$2B less Federal money to match what the State puts up. The State has a budgetary shortfall this year or \$4B, so there has been postponement of the matching dollars for DSH. We were asked to reduce our payment by \$7M.

VII. Old Business: no old business.

VIII. New Business: no new business.

Meeting adjourned.

Submitted by:

Laurie Cullen
Secretary