

ESF Academic Governance Meeting  
October 18, 2016  
11:00 AM to 12:20  
Gateway A&B

**Attending:**

**Faculty:** Neal Abrams, Susan Anagnost, Eddie Bevilacqua, Gregory Boyer, Mary Bryant, Biljana Bujanovic, Emanuel Carter, John Castello, Avik Chatterjee, Siddharth Chatterjee, Mary Collins, Paul Crovella, Douglas Daley, Janine Debaise, Stewart Diemont, Klaus Doelle, Kelley J. Donaghy, Mark Driscoll, Joanne Ellis, Theodore Endreny, Rene Germain, James Gibbs, John Hassett, Richard Hawks, Ivan Ivanov, Dawnelle Jager, Douglas Johnston, Michael Kelleher, Robin Kimmerer, Maren King, Brian Leydet, Karin Limburg, Valerie Luzadis, Jack Manno, Robert Meyer, Anthony Miller, Jaime Mirowsky, Sharon Moran, Douglas Morrison, Rafaaf Morsi-Hussein, David Newman, Christopher Nomura, Christopher Nowak, Andrea Parker, Matthew Potteiger, William Powell, Lindi Quackenbush, Bandaru Ramarao, Neil Ringler, Rebecca Rundell, Kimberly Schulz, Gary Scott, S Shannon, Stephen Shaw, William Smith, David Sonnenfeld, Stephen Stehman, John Stella, Arthur Stipanovic, Lemir Teron, Mary Thompson, Kenneth Tiss, Scott Turner, Jane Verostek, Elizabeth Vidon, Philippe Vidon, Sarah Vonhof, John Wagner, Quentin Wheeler, Christopher Whipps, Benette Whitmore, Ruth Yanai, Lianjun Zhang.

**Professional Staff:** Ray Appleby, Caroline Bailey, Scott Blair, Brian Boothryd, Debbie Caviness, Laura Crandall, Claire Dunn, Terry Ettinger, Kevin Guerin, Dave Kiemle, Christine Langlois, Karen Moore, Paul Otteson, Joe Pagcaliwagan, Dana Piwinski, Aaron Rounds, Katherina Searing, Mary Triano, John Turbeville, John View, Heidi Webb.

**Students:** Terrance Caviness, Jordan C'Dealva-Lenik, Brian Chan, Carolyn Chang, Gabrielle Donnelly, Jacquelyn Gier, Michael Jones, Richard Monaco, Blake Neumann, Ryan Scheel, Tyler Shields, Caitlin Slife, Erika Sykes, Benjamin Tayler.

**Voting members attending remotely:** Paul Hai, Paul Hirsch, Stacy McNulty

**Guests:** Matthew Amoia, Grace Belisle, Amber Calogero, Lisa Campagna, Alyssa Cook, Casey Duffy, Heather Engleman, Maureen Fellows, Sara L. French, Neil Goodman, Brenda Greenfield, Sophie Gubio-Jantzen, Rebecca Hart, Patricia Henson, Tom LeRoy, Mark Lichtenstein, Tina Limpert, Anne Lombard, Christopher Ludlom, Thomas E McGrath, Brandon Murphy, Susan Nevins, Ethan Newman, Wendy Osborne, Gary Peden, James Quinn, Van Ramin, Ethan Reanardt, Joe Rufo, Ragan Squier, Erin Tochelli, Eric Viskupic.

**Guests attending remotely:** Brian Houseal, Natasha Karniski

The meeting was called to order at 11:00 a.m. by Tom Amidon

We were delayed in starting the meeting by people signing in. We have a new practice of index cards to identify voting members, which needs to be streamlined if we are to start on time.

Please return the cards at the end of the meeting.

There was also an issue with sound transmittal to the northern campuses.

**Comments by President Quentin Wheeler**

I know we are going through a confusing time, but I am very confident in the future. Nevertheless, I have some serious remarks to make. My experience at ESF convinces me that the vast majority of our community is professional, ethical, and fair. I am thus astounded by the unprofessional activity I have seen surrounding this effort for a vote of no confidence and the nearly two years of obstruction that led up

to it.

For instance, seriously inaccurate and misleading information has been spread around campus, including by at least one chair, regarding the circumstances of Vice President Bob French's departure. I am extremely dismayed at this and I am at a disadvantage correcting the record because, as a personnel-related matter, there is little that I can say. What I can say with absolute certainty is that this chair knows very little about the relevant facts, not only about why the departure occurred, but also, the reasons behind how it occurred.

I endorse a collaborative leadership model that engages members of my executive cabinet in vigorous debate. Everyone has input. Every critical and alternative idea is welcomed. But, once the group reaches a consensus, the role of every member of the group is to implement, support, and advance the decisions that have been made. I can say that, categorically, every member of my executive cabinet has been encouraged and given many opportunities to demonstrate and earn the group's trust.

As I'm sure you know, a number of department chairs have made clear their disagreement with the direction in which I am leading the college. I have chaired three departments in my life, two at Cornell and one in London. In each case it was understood that I had two fundamental roles. First was to provide leadership and administrative oversight for my department. Second, and equally important, was to be part of the senior leadership of the institution as a whole, including the support and implementation of decisions made by my superiors. As chair, I also enjoyed special access and the ability to influence those decisions by bringing forth alternative ideas and suggestions to improve them. The chairs who signed the email to campus Friday have sought to undermine the directions I am moving the college while failing to offer constructive ideas or even engage in constructive dialog. It is easy to criticize, undermine, and tear down. It is much harder to be a leader, to develop effective ideas, and to build constructively.

We have reached a watershed moment in the history of the college. As exemplified in a list of accomplishments I distributed this morning, and available here, there is much evidence that we are on the right path to restore our financial foundations and to modernize ESF in ways that will make us more visible, competitive, and effective as a leader in the 21st century. It is in your hands to determine whether we, together, have the vision and courage to reinvent ESF for the new century or whether you want to retreat to the false security of the past. ESF may have seemed stable, but since 2008, state aid has been reduced by 20% or \$5 million annually. This change in support from the state destabilized our budget and had I not taken decisive measures we would have been unable to meet payroll by 2015. The world has changed and will continue to change, with or without us. We will take the best of the present with us into the future, but going back means an almost certain glide path to mediocrity, inadequate funding, and irrelevance.

I have been accused of not understanding or appreciating the history of the college. That is simply false. The great history of the college was a major factor attracting me to ESF. My hobby is woodworking in the 18th century style. I have restored two 19th century historic houses. And my career as a taxonomist has been grounded in scholarship that routinely involves mastering literature dating from 1758 and reconstructing evolutionary history. I love history. I value history. I honor history. History gives ESF credibility as a leader in chemistry, biology, engineering, forestry, environmental science, design, management, and sustainability. To build on that credibility, however, requires us to adapt to the challenges and circumstances of the 21st century.

Before you act on our future, ask yourself a few questions:

Do you want ESF to retreat to regional recognition and funding so limited that you must accept support and facilities that are at best good-enough?

Or do you, like me, want to see ESF achieve its full potential, to seek recognition and financial support on a national stage, and to settle for nothing short of national and international excellence?

Do you want the old-boy network conspiring in the shadows, spreading misinformation, and perpetuating a system that has historically excluded women and minorities and in which petty personal prejudices are acted on rather than respectful, professional conduct?

Or do you want a meritocracy, a diverse campus that welcomes everyone who shares our ethical values, our scientific passion, and a relentless commitment to create a better future?

How some chairs have treated Dr. Luzadis in her role as interim provost is beyond unprofessional; it is nothing short of shameful. If this is a standard that you as a community find acceptable, I want no part of it. From what I have learned of you, I suspect that you find this conduct as repugnant as I do. I believe that you are decent, that you want ESF to succeed, and that you do not believe anyone should be discriminated against because of their race, or gender, or personal grudges.

I have been fortunate to spend most of my career in world-class institutions. The behavior I am seeing by a group of chairs and some faculty is not befitting a leading institution. Everyone understands that the reputation of the institution is the lifeblood of attracting the best students and faculty, attracting diverse sources of revenue, and of having a major impact. The value of the institution is prized and enjoyed by every individual who, in turn, protects and enhances it, rather than damaging it as you are now invited to do.

The saboteurs at work over the past year or more have made progress much slower than it could have been by undermining my efforts and withholding their own. While the progress we have made is impressive, consider how much more could have been accomplished were everyone supporting the college's efforts and contributing constructive ideas, rather than undermining them. ESF belongs to us all: faculty, students, staff, and alumni. I have confidence in you, and your love of ESF, and I will respect the future that you want.

I came here because I believe ESF is uniquely positioned to be a national leader and contributor to science, the environment, and a sustainable future — things that have been lifelong passions for me. I have never settled for good enough in my career and I would never do that to such a grand institution as ESF. It deserves better than the actions of those seeking to hold it back. I will settle for nothing short of excellence. The changes we must make will be a great and exciting journey for ESF, but we must all be willing to put the success of ESF and our students first and to work together.

The fact is this: regardless of what people say about other colleges that have gone through this, a vote of no confidence will do damage to the reputation of ESF. It only compounds the stresses and challenges we currently face and unnecessarily slows progress — and it has no particular outcome. And a Vote of No confidence does nothing to permanently close the budget gap, strengthen our partnerships, or attract new sources of revenue. It hurts us all. It is already hurting us as colleagues and friends and is driving us apart

at a time when we need to come together.

I will continue to do the business of the College and to implement the vision and goals that were the basis of the presidential search and those articulated and approved by campus in the Vision 2020 bridging document. As anyone who works closely with me knows, I do not hold grudges, I am open to all points of view, and I am singularly focused on one thing: the success of ESF. I am everyone's president, I do not and will not play favorites, and I will continue to act with integrity and in what I truly believe to be the best interest of ESF in all cases.

I welcome constructive ideas from any and everyone. However, I ask for two things. I ask for whoever is serving as chair to do her or his job. Bring good ideas forward. Offer constructive advice. Share with me your faculty and student success stories so that I can trumpet them to the world. Trust that my administration is working for you, that we exist to create the campus on which you can pursue your individual interests and do your best in teaching, research, and scholarship. Know that a rising tide lifts all boats and that new ideas implemented to attract additional funds benefit everyone.

It is noteworthy that the group calling for a vote of no confidence has offered no alternative plan for closing the budget gap or advancing the College. Destruction without a design for the future is not a viable plan. I have shared just some of the evidence this morning of the progress we are making and I will continue to make such progress. It will go faster and more quickly, and be tailored to meet your individual needs, if you work with me. I intend to see ESF financially secure and a national leader in the environmental sciences and sustainability, however we together ultimately define them.

I challenge each and every one of you to engage in the exciting work of shaping ESF for success. It is hard work, but it is fun and deeply rewarding. I defend your right to do what you wish with a vote of no confidence, but ask yourself what you will achieve by adding one more obstacle in our path to the future. The world has changed. Your President has changed. The need for a successful ESF and a sustainable future have not. The choice is yours. As for me, I am going back to work building a bright future for the College. I hope you will join me. Thank you.

### **Status of Departmental Searches (Valerie Luzadis)**

The college financial plan allows for three searches for new positions. These will be in the departments of Chemistry (renewable materials), ERE (ecological engineering), and LA (urban focus). There are also three searches to fill openings left by retirements: construction management (FNRM), woody plant physiology (FNRM), and forest health (EFB).

The search for the Vice President for Research is underway.

### **Provost Search Committee (Emanuel Carter)**

The Committee is searching for a Provost and Executive Vice President. We are working with a firm called RPA, Inc., from Williamsport PA, which was the best of those that applied. They have vetted 44 applicants and divided by them into 3 tiers, which the committee is now examining. The committee members will each individually contribute 6 choices, and then work with the search firm to identify a short list. There will be a series of questions for candidates, a selection of neutral place interviews, and a series of on-campus interviews, with a set of three candidates presented to the President for his choice. The process has been very smooth and there is no sign of problems with integrity.

### **Introduction of New Faculty Members** Department Chairs

Ivan Gitsov introduced Jamie Mirowski. Jaime got her Bachelors Degree in Chemistry from James Madison University in Virginia, under the guidance of Dr. Barbara Reisner. Jaime then worked in quality control at Schering-Plough Pharmaceuticals and in environmental chemistry at the Meadowlands Environmental Research Institute. She completed a Master's thesis, advised by Drs. Rick Peltier and Lung-Chi Chen, at New York University's School of Environmental Medicine studying molecular toxicology and air pollution. Her PhD at NYU was guided by Dr. Terry Gordon, in the fields of exposure assessment and human health effects, and her postdoctoral training at UNC Chapel Hill, with EPA researcher Dr. Bob Devlin, involved measuring the toxic effects of nitrogen dioxide, ozone, hookah smoke, and diesel exhaust particles. Jaime plans on continuing her work looking at the toxic effects of air pollutants and identifying components most responsible for toxic responses during her time at SUNY ESF.

### **Endorsement of College-wide Student Learning Outcomes Assessment** (Kelley Donaghy)

The endorsement of this report will be deferred to the November meeting when it can have more time on our agenda.

### **Diversity Strategic Plan** (Scott Blair)

The College Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee has been developing the first ESF Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan. We began in April, which was before SUNY announced that these would be required of all 64 campuses by November this year. We have developed seven over-arching goals; you can find our goals and strategies on the campus governance web site. The plan will include a history of the work at ESF, a SWOT analysis, and an assessment.

We welcome feedback from the community. The members of the committee are Sarita Bassill (GSA), Scott Blair, Tim Blehar, Kelley Donaghy, Heather Engelman, Annette Hightower, Robin Kimmerer, Michael Klatko (USA), Anne Lombard, Matt Potteiger, Susan Sanford, and Tim Volk.

The last of our listening sessions will take place next week and we hope to have your endorsement on November 15. Please visit our website: [www.esf.edu/ide](http://www.esf.edu/ide).

### **United Way Campaign** (Karen Moore and Wendy Osborne)

This year's campaign is underway. We had a successful Taste of ESF kick off with tasty food and camaraderie. For those we saw, thanks for coming, and for those that couldn't make it, we hope to see you at future campaign events.

To date we've raised \$5,238 toward our \$50,000 goal. Money raised goes to benefit health and human service agencies within Onondaga County and the United Way. The United Way doesn't just raise the money, they identify community issues and needs, work with community groups and develop special initiatives. If you have specific questions about United Way of Central New York, their website has an FAQ section that answers the most-asked questions.

Pledges can be made online and links were sent in this morning's email. Throughout the campaign, we will have a number of prizes to award and those that increase their donation by \$1 a week over their last year's contribution will be entered in the United Way's Step Up Challenge drawings.

We also have an ongoing basket raffle featuring 10, soon to be 12 baskets donated by a number of offices on campus. Tickets – 20 for \$5 — can be purchased in 120 Bray Hall between noon and 1 p.m. or from 7:45 to 8 a.m. on the days my son's bus is on time.

We will also have a TV and some other surprises that we'll be raffling thanks to the generosity of Joe Rufo. We'll let you know when those tickets go on sale. Drawings for all the raffles will take place at our Grand Finale Breakfast Dec. 5.

And finally, the sooner we hit our goal, the sooner you'll stop receiving emails from me. That alone might be more incentive than a parking space.

### **Procedures for executing a Vote of No Confidence (Donaghy)**

The Executive Committee wanted to remain neutral and to have a procedure. We didn't think it was a good idea that one person and a second could tip us into a VNC at any meeting. We drafted a new standing rule, which our bylaws state can be used upon unanimous consent of the Executive Committee. We are also required to introduce rules to the full membership, which we did last month. The rule includes a requirement that 20% of the voting membership support a VNC, normally by petition, with a provision for confidentiality. Then the motion for a VNC would come from the AGECE. There would be a special meeting to discuss the resolution, and an electronic ballot.

This was unanimously accepted on October 4, 2016.

There was a motion from the floor that the number of times a VNC could be carried out against any single administrator within a time period should be limited, which is a policy we will work on once we get through the current crisis. The rule includes a requirement that 20% of the voting membership support a VNC, normally by petition, with a provision for confidentiality. Then the motion for a VNC would come from the AGECE. There would be a special meeting to discuss the resolution, and an electronic ballot. This was unanimously accepted on October 4, 2016.

When the issue of a VNC came up again this summer, the Executive Committee wanted to remain neutral and to formalize a procedure that would be open and transparent. We didn't think it was a good idea that one person and a second could tip us into a VNC at any meeting. We drafted a new standing rule, which our bylaws state can be used upon unanimous consent of the Executive Committee. We are also required to introduce rules to the full membership, which we did last month. There were many good suggestions for amendments, and we incorporated many of them. There was a motion from the floor that the number of times a VNC could be carried out against any single administrator within a time period should be limited, which is a policy we will work on once we get through the current crisis. The rule includes a requirement that 20% of the voting membership support a VNC, normally by petition, with a provision for confidentiality. Then the motion for a VNC would come from the AGECE. There would be a special meeting to discuss the resolution, and an electronic ballot. This was unanimously accepted on October 4, 2016.

Mark Driscoll: This is a moot point, because it's already gone through. But you have taken away the right of a member to make a motion. I would like a ruling from our Parliamentarian on this point.

Ken Tiss, Parliamentarian: I have nothing to add to what I said last month. Anyone can make a motion at any time.

Tom Amidon: I made the ruling last time. Roberts Rules do not supercede the rules of the organization.

Mark Driscoll quoted from the bylaws, which say that we will follow Roberts Rules of Order, except in cases in defined by our bylaws and those of the Board of Trustees.

Tom Amidon: The Board of Trustees does not include our Bylaws. We operate by our bylaws, which

supercede Roberts Rules of Order.

Ruth Yanai: In the next bylaws revision, we should replace “and” with “or.”

Jack Manno: What is the argument and what effect does it have?

Kelley Donaghy: Under Roberts Rules, any person can make a motion. Our policy is that such a person needs more than one person to second the motion. We don't want to be under a threat of no confidence all the time. Other institutions have such policies, requiring 30% or a document that has to be certified by some number of people. This gives more gravity to a VNC.

Doug Daley: First, “After a second special meeting” suggests that there is a first special meeting. I move that “second” be removed. Second, is an electronic ballot truly secret? The Sargeant at Arms can tell who voted. I move that the voting be by “secret” ballot, not “electronic” ballot. This is an issue where secrecy is more important than most of our actions.

Mark Driscoll seconded the motion.

Andrea Parker: There is a way to protect identity with electronic balloting, with only the IP address recorded.

John Castello: I appreciate the concerns raised. The best solution is to hire a private firm that would turn over the results of the vote. Or the double envelope, the way the union does it. Again, someone completely neutral would have to count the ballots.

Rafaat Hussein: An independent company could be challenged legally to surrender what they know. A few years ago, ESF used a company for a survey on the best places to work for. That company said that the survey was secret.

Mark Driscoll: I want to speak in favor of the motion, although our bylaws say that any member can ask for a secret ballot.

Doug Daley: There is a presumption that electronic balloting is secret. I am not specifying the method of conducting the secret ballot. I am not opposed to electronic balloting.

Brian Boothroyd: Now it says “after a special meeting”, but it should say “after at least one special meeting.”

Doug Daley accepted the friendly amendment.

Tom McGrath: I fall under qualified academic rank, which doesn't allow me to vote. Is this going to be part of a future consideration of these very important issues?

Tom Amidon: Yes. There are other people who are not happy that they cannot vote. We are interested in increasing inclusivity, but not in the midst of this process. Note that people who want to participate in academic governance would be then expected to do the work as well as vote, such as participating on committees.

The motion carried by a show of hands.

Mark Driscoll: This vote will take place after the meeting, which is not allowed, except for elections. Technically, you should suspend the meeting until the vote has taken place.

**Introduction of VNC Resolution** (Robert Meyer)

My role here is to introduce the Resolution for a VNC. There was a meeting last summer in which some members asked the AGEC to develop a resolution for a VNC, but the AGEC cannot do that. We did work with the authors to edit their motion, and our role is to bring it to this meeting.

Tom Amidon: There will be a meeting on Tuesday November 1 for voting members only, in Alumni (Nifkin) Lounge. I will accept amendments to the motion, by Monday at noon. No vote will take place at that meeting. Please attend the meeting if you are interested, we will not be live streaming it, to ensure confidentiality.

**Proxy Voting** (Heidi Webb)

Heidi Webb: For those who cannot be here, for those of you at the remote campuses or off campus for other reasons, you can identify a voting proxy. There is more information about proxy voting in the bylaws.

Ken Tiss: The Sargeant of Arms is allowed to designate someone to receive ballots at the remote campuses.

Paul Otteson: Some people might want to choose to delegate someone else to speak for them.

Tom Amidon: If you are going to speak for 15 or more people, tell me ahead of time, and you might get 5 minutes instead of 2 minutes.

Giorgos Mountrakis: Will the lawyer for the Board of Trustees be at the meeting? In case we have any questions about the investigation.

Ruth Yanai: Communications with experts in advance of the meeting can be brought to the meeting by members.

Rafaat Hussein: The number of members is a fraction of the ESF community and the Syracuse community. I suggest making an online blog so that all members can make comments.

Doug Daley moved to adjourn.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:25.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Ruth Yanai