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President
University Faculty Senate

A First Year in Review

With the end of the academic year—and my first as President of the University Faculty Senate—at hand, it’s time to look back at the year and take stock of what we have, and haven’t, accomplished.

President’s Initiatives. One of my primary goals for the year was to visit faculty governance groups at all of the State-operated campuses. This certainly was beneficial to me, as I gained a much more complete appreciation of the breadth of the SUNY System. There are many common issues across the campuses, especially around System initiatives such as seamless transfer and Open SUNY. Many of you have strong governance systems with very positive relationships with your senior administration; in other cases, governance is less shared. Many of you are revising your governance documents, and I want to assure you that your colleagues at the University Faculty Senate (UFS) stand ready to assist in whatever way you might wish.

Another of my goals for the year was to improve the relationship between UFS and UUP. Fred Kowal, the new UUP President, and I reached out to each other, and we have developed a strong working relationship over the last year. This has manifested itself in a number of ways, especially in the first joint meeting of UUP Chapter Presidents and faculty and professional staff Campus Governance Leaders in late March. We shared our mutual concerns and initiatives and connected leadership on campuses from our respective organizations. In addition, the UFS and UUP have cooperated closely on responses to issues around teacher education. UUP continues to take the lead in the political arena, but I would like to think that our support of their work contributed to changes in the implementation of the edTPA initiative by the State Education Department.

Finally, we’re moving forward with a June workshop on “sustainability across the curriculum,” which will engage faculty from across the SUNY System. My particular thanks to Shishir Singh (Empire State), Deborah Howard (System Administration), Taya Owens (System Administration) and Carol Donato for making my (and Deb’s) wishes come true on what promises to be a great workshop.

SUNY Voices. This initiative, sponsored as part of the Chancellor’s strategic plan, reached a milestone this year with the very successful first Shared Governance Conference that I helped organize along with Tina Good, President of the Faculty Council of Community Colleges. Nearly 150 participants from SUNY, CUNY, and elsewhere attended sessions across a broad range of topics focused on experiences with shared governance. Keynote speakers Rick Legon (Association of Governing Boards) and Ben Ginsburg (Johns Hopkins) offered both insights and controversy into the workings (or not) of shared governance as viewed from a trustee and faculty perspective. A more detailed report on this conference can be found later in this issue. We look forward to broadening the reach of the conference in the future.

Seamless Transfer Initiative. Thanks to the joint efforts in

Continued on page 2

IN THIS ISSUE

> From the Chancellor: Measuring Our Performance • 2
> From the Interim Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor: My Thanks • 4
> From the Interim Vice Chancellor for Financial Services and CFO: Achieving Stability and Excellence through Reinvestment • 5
> From the President of the Student Assembly: A Look Back—And Forward • 7
> From the Editor’s Desk: Federal Rating of Colleges and Universities • 8
> In the Spotlight: College of Nanoscale Science and Engineering, University Operations Committee • 9
> Speak Out! • 12
> Special Events • 20
> Plenary Highlights • 23
Year in Review . . .

Continued from page 1

the fall of the Faculty Council of Community Colleges (FCCC) and the UFS together with Interim Provost Bringsjord, and endorsed by the University Senate at our Winter Plenary, we revisited the Transfer Paths, which were of some concern to a number of faculty, to clarify which courses faculty from across the system agree need to be included for a student to achieve true junior standing in a major. More than 800 faculty participated in the review and evaluation of more than 35 transfer paths. What has emerged isn’t perfect, because it’s a delicate balancing act to facilitate clear guidelines for students while at the same time preserving the integrity of faculty curricular decisions on the individual campuses. But the process has opened a dialog among faculty across the System. I hope that faculty will continue to communicate about these issues, and that this process will lead to further cross-campus collaborations.

Open SUNY. The first group of “Open SUNY Plus” programs—existing online degree programs that can be brought to a broader scale—were announced in January, and proposals for the second “wave” of Open SUNY online degree programs and courses will be evaluated over the next few months. SUNY System Administration continues to explore how best to offer support services to students and faculty at a scale that can meet the Chancellor’s ambitious goal of adding 100,000 new students to the SUNY family, but they’re not there yet. However, the emerging Open SUNY Center for Online Teaching Excellence offers the potential to greatly enhance inter-campus collaborations and mentoring for faculty interested in and involved in online education.

START UP NY. Many campus plans have been approved for participation in this program, and some campuses are in an advanced stage of discussion with potential companies. I am encouraged by what I have heard about the involvement of faculty governance in the process at most campuses; administrators are engaging faculty governance in the decision-making, focused on the academic relevance of proposals. But if this is to be truly more than a jobs program, it’ll be up to all of us on the campuses to ensure that the academic ties are real.

Teacher Education. We have been strongly supportive of the work by UUP to revisit the use of the edTPA as a requirement for initial certification, and the University Senate endorsed a resolution that was initially formulated and then approved by the UFS Executive Committee that calls for removal of edTPA as a requirement for initial certification. I sent our resolution to legislative leaders, the Commissioner of the State Education Department, and the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor of the State Board of Regents. Our efforts certainly added to the voices that led the State Education Department and the Board of Regents to provide a “safety net” to students who don’t pass the edTPA, but there is considerable work on this issue that remains to be done. Please see the teacher certification website (http://www.nysdept.ofed.org/ny_annTPA.asp) if you are interested in obtaining additional information about the requirements for teacher certification. You likely have already seen details of UUP’s position through their publication, The Voice. And you can find the resolution passed by the UFS Executive Committee and endorsed by the Senate at the Empire State Spring Plenary on our website. One question that should be important to faculty in the schools and departments of education, as well as in the disciplinary content areas that teacher education students study, is whether or how curriculum should be adjusted to prepare students explicitly to meet the demands of the edTPA examination. This also gets into the question of whether external groups—in particular a for-profit examination provider (Pearson)—should, in essence, dictate curricular decisions. I think this is something very different from the curricular dictates of our professional organizations, such as ABET for engineering or CAEP for education, and thus requires closer scrutiny.

LICH and SUNY Downstate. I didn’t really imagine that my first year on the Board of Trustees would be so dominated by overseeing SUNY’s response to litigation involving the sale of the Long Island College Hospital and to ensure the survival of SUNY Downstate Medical Center. Much is continuing to happen; perhaps all will be settled by the time you read this. For now, a brief summary. SUNY and litigating parties entered into a settlement of litigation over the closing of the hospital and layoffs that involved a revised request for proposals to buy the hospital property and provide continued medical services. In principle, SUNY is allowed to exit LICH operations after May 22, but negotiations and legal maneuvers continue. And we still don’t know what the ultimate financial liability will be for the SUNY System as a whole, although the latest move is a bill introduced by Senator Lavalle to make any liabilities not covered by the sale of LICH a responsibility of the State, not SUNY. I will, of course, keep your University Faculty Senate representatives updated as the story continues to unfold.

SUNY Budget. The 2014-15 budget for SUNY doesn’t provide everything we need to cover mandated costs, including negotiated salary increases and inflationary costs. However, at least SUNY ended up with a better financial situation than the last couple of years—a small increase in State operating aid, an increase in EOP funding, an increase in the maximum TAP award (which may be beneficial to SUNY), and a substantial increase in capital funds.

Finally, I look forward to continue to work with your representatives, System Administration, and the Board of Trustees to deal with the challenges faced by public higher education in general and SUNY in particular. I wish you all an enjoyable and fruitful summer.

FROM THE CHANCELLOR

Measuring Our Performance: How Is SUNY Doing? And Where Do We Need to Do Better?

When back in 2009, we set out on the journey to create a strategic plan for SUNY, I knew that no new plan, no new initiatives would be as impactful as New York needed them to be if we did not faithfully measure their effectiveness all along the way. So we crafted The Power of SUNY, the promise of performance measurement became the plan’s cornerstone—and with that came a commitment to devise ways to track the impact of every step we were to take in line with the plan’s guiding tenets, our six Big Ideas.

Not long after we launched The Power of SUNY, the New York Times, reporting on it, had this, rather memorably, to say of The State University of New York: “It’s huge. And compared to its public peers, it’s weird.” The same article also deemed SUNY, because of its hugeness and weirdness (by which we like to think they meant its uniqueness, its complexity) as being, as such, “borderline unmanageable.” That was the perception of SUNY in 2010, the outside view of a reportedly unwieldy, unloved colossus. A lot has changed in four years that should inspire observers to reassess that view.
Since that time, systemness, something I have talked about a lot in the last few years, has become for SUNY both a defining sense of self and a goal we continually strive to meet. Born out of the strategic plan, we define systemness as the coordination of multiple components—in our case, our 64 campuses, our innumerable departments and disciplines, our system-wide initiatives, our student body, our faculty and staff, our indelible presence in New York’s communities—that when really working together make a positive impact more powerful than any action of the individual parts could on their own. That’s the true power of SUNY—our connectedness. At SUNY, whatever we do—whether embarking on the crusade for a rational tuition policy or our shared services initiative, dramatically expanding our online learning platform, or taking steps to make campuses across the system tobacco-free—we come back to the question “Does this make SUNY a stronger and more efficient system, one that better serves students and the state?”

That is always the goal—striving to provide a world-class and affordable education for all New Yorkers in a fast-changing world, and taking whatever steps are necessary to make sure students not only have access to higher education but are equipped to take on post-secondary work and succeed when they arrive on the doorstep of one of our campuses.

Now five years into The Power of SUNY, and as we strengthen and fine tune our systemness, we are taking careful stock of how far we’ve come and, more importantly, where we need to double down on our efforts to ensure that SUNY is optimally serving New Yorkers. We are calling this process a refresh, and it includes the creation of a performance management system that will guide the university as we move forward.

SUNY believes that by acting as a system and by adopting best practices from collective impact partnerships, colleges and universities can operate at peak performance and move the dial on meaningful population-level challenges. As part of the refresh process, which includes input from participants from every level across our system, SUNY has identified four critical needs—or system-level outcomes—that we can improve by channeling our collective power. These four interrelated outcomes, or goals, include:

1) Increasing college readiness;
2) Increasing the number of degrees and credentials conferred;
3) Strengthening the value of a SUNY degree; and
4) Increasing external investments and research.

Beginning late last year, together with the Board of Trustees, I asked SUNY leadership for help in determining these ambitions for the refresh. Leaders were tasked with reviewing and discussing a set of possible performance indicators as they relate to three particular focus areas: academic excellence, innovation and research, and operational efficiencies. The result of these reports was used to frame discussions at leadership meetings, and each meeting discussed a select number of indicators, culminating with a thoughtful, in-depth discussion of all indicators.

To determine indicators, participants devised and then hewed to a set of guiding principles. First, we needed to identify outcomes and indicators that are mission critical, understandable, and widely inclusive. We also knew that we had to select measures that are easy to track on a regular basis and aligned with existing assessments. Indicators also had to maintain sensitivity to external conditions, drive continuous improvement, and, importantly, be ambitious and visionary.

The key to developing any performance management scheme is to nail the right indicators based on those guiding principles. So, for instance, when it comes to the system-level goal of increasing college readiness, some of the measurable indicators we can track to mark progress include, but are not limited to:

- Number of students taking remediation courses
- Number of remediation courses offered
- Retention rates
- Test scores of enrolled new freshmen (ACT and SAT)
- Percent of students who attempt first math or English/reading developmental education course
- Percent of students who complete highest level math or English/reading development education course
- Percent of students who complete first college-level course in math or English/reading
- Number of students receiving college-level credits in Early College High Schools
- Number of New York sites qualifying for membership in the Strive National Cradle to Career Network
- Campuses involved in Cradle-to-Career (C2C) sites
- Ratio or percent of indicators trending in the right direction within C2C defined sites

As another example, toward meeting the fourth desired system-level outcome, increasing external investments and research, some proposed indicators of progress include tracking:

- External investment in SUNY’s research (sponsored program initiatives)
- Industry-sponsored research
- Jobs created through sponsored programs
- Number of inventions disclosed
- SUNY-born knowledge-based enterprises, including student start-ups
- Strategic, large-scale multidisciplinary grants in high-priority research areas

At the time of this printing, the advisory groups are refining indicators and targets for each of the four outcomes. Working with campus leadership, over the next year we will determine just what our improvement capacity is—because this system is intended to drive improvement year over year, semester over semester, student over student.

With the help of advisory groups for each outcome, SUNY is building a performance management system that will take a broader view of our progress than that which is measured in our annual report cards, though of course many of the indicators proposed above are, indeed, factors which SUNY has already committed to tracking or is already actively tracking. The Power of SUNY Refresh simply frames—or reframes—those measurements and others in a comprehensive way that speaks to SUNY’s deep understanding that higher education must continuously adapt to serve our citizenry, the workforce, and the economy, and support a high quality of life for our students, alumni, and in our communities.

By holding ourselves accountable with performance metrics identified collectively but implemented locally, we harness SUNY’s ability to improve the lives of every New Yorker in more meaningful and impactful ways than ever before.

For more information or if you have questions about The Power of SUNY Refresh, please e-mail strategicplanning@suny.edu.
My Thanks: Together, We Accomplished so Much!

My son Alexander, the younger of my two children, just graduated from the University at Albany with his master’s degree. As I proudly watched him walk across the stage, a million thoughts and emotions flooded my mind. I tried to stay focused in the moment—how proud I was of him, how grateful I was for the wonderful faculty and dean who challenged him and supported him, and how glad I was that my husband, daughter and her husband were all with me. I was steadfast in doing so...until he moved away from the photographer’s lens toward the end of the stage, my eyes tracking him intently as he headed back to his seat. It was then that I gave in to the expected flashbacks of when he was a little boy, of his many academic and athletic achievements over the years, and of his entrepreneurial spirit and his hard work in keeping his own small technology business going throughout his undergraduate and graduate studies. And soon my thoughts rushed forward to the future. To the new job in Connecticut he will soon begin and to his next set of academic, professional, and personal goals. I thought about the many lessons I know he learned over time that I hoped would serve him well in the future.

I was reminded of all of this quite vividly when I sat down today to reflect on the past year in my role as Interim Provost and, in particular, on my work with the University Faculty Senate. Together we worked to achieve several (dare I say) miracle milestones for the SUNY system that will make it possible for hundreds of thousands of future parents to experience the same pride and wonderful flurry of emotions I recently experienced during Alexander’s graduation. They will watch their sons and daughters graduate from one of SUNY’s 64 campuses and no doubt extend their own thanks and appreciation to the dedicated faculty and staff who worked with their children along the way.

Importantly, they will be doing so in what will mark a new era for SUNY—one in which seamless transfer will have become the norm, where online courses are readily available to assist in completion, and where information about SUNY campuses is transparent and easily understood.

Thanks in large part to the leadership of the University Faculty Senate, the work of the Faculty Council of Community Colleges, our local campus governance leaders, our faculty at large, our chief academic officers, presidents, Chancellor Zimpher and System leadership, and the SUNY Board of Trustees, future generations of parents will reflect on student journeys made easier than they envisioned or that they themselves experienced.

Families will be able to point to the ease of transfer within SUNY as well as easily accessible and understandable degree planning and advising tools thanks to the Seamless Transfer policy and SUNY’s customized version of Degree Works. Students will have greater access to SUNY courses than ever before possible via Open SUNY. On average, SUNY students of tomorrow will graduate faster and having accrued less debt thanks to Seamless Transfer (and also information available via SUNY Smart Track). And thanks to START-UP NY and SUNY Works they will be graduating with strong internships and practical job experience, and many will have specifically studied in high demand fields.

I am so proud of all that has been accomplished this year—most of which has been years, if not decades in the making; but, as noted earlier, we have reached important milestones this year.

My pride is not only in my role as Interim Provost, but as a SUNY parent, SUNY alum, and as a former professor and researcher. To be able to say that we did it together, with a commitment to shared governance, increased communication, and a commitment to data and transparency is not only a testament to the SUNY Trustees, Chancellor, faculty governance, and our faculty as a whole, it is further evidence that the SUNY system continues to set itself apart as a leader in higher education nationally.

This is not to say that there isn’t still much hard work ahead. In fact, much like at that recent graduation ceremony, my mind is also racing about the efforts still needed to complete our current initiatives and the new work ahead of us as we set the course for the next phase of our strategic plan, The Power of SUNY 2020. However, because of the foundation we helped to solidify this year, I have every confidence that we are more than ready to meet future challenges and take advantage of new opportunities and new technologies to build an even stronger SUNY. To that end, I am pleased to share with you that:

- The Provost’s Open SUNY Advisory Committee (POSAC) will continue through the next year and I am so pleased that we will have sustained leadership with Provost’s Fellow Ken O’Brien. POSAC is tackling some of the most complex challenges of the Open SUNY implementation via four subgroups: the MOOC Advisory Group; the Prior Learning Assessment or PLA Group; the Multi-Campus Programs Group, which is exploring possible business models for multi-campus programs; and the Quality Assurance Group, which, among other responsibilities, is reviewing campus proposals for Open SUNY+ designated programs and courses. The recommendations of these groups will be broadly shared and I believe will greatly help our efforts to move forward.

- My office will continue to keep you up-to-date on overall progress in implementing the SUNY Trustees’ policy on seamless transfer. We are on course for full implementation by fall 2015 due in large measure to the hundreds of faculty who gave of their time and expertise to review the SUNY Transfer Paths and to the thousands of faculty across our campuses hard at work on the review of their programs.

- SUNY’s customized version of Degree Works is coming online for many campuses. I look forward to your feedback on this important tool as we continue to monitor implementation and introduce enhancements, including the Reverse Transfer module currently being piloted by several campuses.

- In our ongoing commitment to stronger communication, the Provost’s Office is working on multiple website improvements to ensure that you have easy access to the information you need.

- We will continue to work with campus leadership and governance to meet Chancellor Zimpher’s charge to identify appropriate goals and metrics for a performance management system; a system to demonstrate SUNY’s commitment to access, completion, success and innovation that will be part of The Power of SUNY 2020.

- Working with the Research Foundation of SUNY, we will continue to invest in collaborative efforts such as the Networks of Excellence—to bring our faculty together in ways that truly leverage System strengths to attract research and development funding. Importantly, we will nurture the most recent network in the Arts and Humanities and also begin
discussions on a new network focused on the Science of Teaching and Learning.

Together with Faculty Advisory Council on Teaching and Technology (FACT2), we want to support and encourage campus efforts to integrate technology in instruction, including enhancements to the annual Conference on Instruction and Technology (CIT).

We will also encourage and facilitate increased use of the SUNY Learning Commons (which was invaluable to the faculty review of transfer paths) as a way to bring faculty together to address new/ongoing challenges such as the introduction of the Common Core, and the need for training and alignment of higher education curricula with K-12 standards.

A common theme across much of this work is cross-campus partnerships and increased collaboration. In fact, at the recent CIT conference we talked about how we just do not have the time or resources to continually recreate the wheel—rather we have to take advantage of our systemness to identify, test and share best practices and bring those evidence-based successful practices to scale! Whether it’s research, the use of technology generally or as a communications tool, or coming together to provide students with access to System-wide resources, SUNY grows stronger when we work together.

As always, I want express my continuing thanks, appreciation, and respect to the leadership of the University Faculty Senate under President and SUNY Trustee Peter Knuepfer. His, the Senate’s, and your insights and engagement have been invaluable and your commitment to all facets of shared governance, your colleagues across SUNY, your students, and to the SUNY mission is exemplary. And a special thanks to our Campus Governance Leaders for their ongoing efforts to connect University-wide governance to local campus governance, including their recent leadership on seamless transfer. This is such an amazing time to be a part of the SUNY family, with so many more positive developments on the horizon!

FROM THE INTERIM VICE CHANCELLOR FOR FINANCIAL SERVICES AND CFO

Robert Haelen
Interim Vice Chancellor for Financial Services and Chief Financial Officer

Achieving Financial Stability and Academic Excellence through Reinvestment

The State University of New York has accomplished a great deal in recent years. We have weathered the challenges of the Great Recession and are well positioned to continue making important improvements in student access, completion and success. This has been made possible in large part because of the strength of our faculty members, who have remained committed to the University’s primary mission of teaching and research.

Guided by The Power of SUNY strategic plan, we continually focus on the key objectives that have made our institutions some of the best in the nation. As we maintain fiscal discipline and manage our limited resources more efficiently, we have implemented several innovative reinvestment initiatives as well as strengthened existing ones. Some of these efforts have focused on the recruitment and retention of excellent and diverse faculty, increasing instructional and research excellence, maintaining access and affordability, and driving economic growth through university-industry partnerships.

Reinvestment Initiatives and Impacts

Enacted in FY 2011-12, the NY SUNY 2020 law was a ground-breaking and unprecedented partnership between New York State and SUNY. Two key provisions of the law—The Challenge Grant Program to the University Centers, and the Rational Tuition policy have allowed the University to make critical investments to expand programs and promote economic development throughout New York State. Last year, the Challenge Grant was expanded to include all SUNY 64 campuses.

The FY 2015 Budget contained an additional $55 million in funding to expand and launch another round of this program, with new criteria that aligns NY SUNY 2020 with the system’s priority initiatives such as Open SUNY and the use technology to improve academic success and job opportunities for students, leveraging public-private partnerships through START-UP NY and other research programs, and better connecting students to the workforce by expanding co-operative education programs, internships, and other experiential learning opportunities. This year the START-UP NY initiative, created to establish tax-free sites for new and expanding businesses locating operations on or near SUNY campuses, will spur economic activities in the communities where our campuses are located. More than 21 campuses— including University at Albany, College of Nanoscale Science and Engineering, Binghamton University, University at Buffalo, Stony Brook University, Buffalo State, New Paltz, and Potsdam have already been approved for this program, with more approvals coming weekly. SUNY is well poised to continue delivering quality education and economic dividends to citizens and communities across New York State.

Access and Affordability

A 2014 report by the Princeton Review on the state of academics, financial aid, and costs of attendance at the nation’s public colleges, ranked 7 of our campuses among 75 “best-value” in the nation. These campuses include University at Buffalo, Binghamton University, Stony Brook University, Geneseo, Purchase, ESF, and Oswego.

Through various need-based and merit programs, we continue to ensure that financial opportunities are available to students who need them. SUNY Smart Track, which has gained national recognition, promotes student financial literacy and is designed to help students and their families to understand college costs and create a financial plan for the future.

State and SUNY Budgets in National Context

While state tax revenues continue to improve for the fourth consecutive year since the end of the Great Recession, the pace of recovery remains sluggish, characterized by fits and starts. Many states, including New York, are still faced with difficult choices as they rebuild critical services, including higher education, which have been negatively impacted by recession-induced austerity. States’ expenditures in higher education since the end of the recession still lag behind the pre-recession levels, and rising tuition and fee rates, remain a significant challenge to access and affordability. Nationally, the percentage of public higher education total operating revenue supported by tuition has progressively increased, from 23.8% in 1988 to 47.4% in 2013. However, a recent report by State Higher Education Executive Officers Association (SHEEO) shows that when adjusted for inflation, “total educational revenue (net tuition plus state and local funding) per student dropped by 6.2 percent, from $12,248 in 2008 to $11,492 in 2013.”

The Enacted FY 2015 SUNY Operating Budget

These aforementioned national trends are reflected in New York State and SUNY budgets. The FY 2015 Enacted Budget eliminated a budget gap of $1.7 billion mainly by limiting spending. The State Financial plan anticipates that annual budget growth will need to be below 2 percent over the next three fiscal years in order for future projected budget gaps to be eliminated.
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The Enacted FY 2015 State Budget sustained the majority of the Governor’s proposed funding and programmatic initiatives for SUNY. While the Legislature provided an additional $7.6 million to cover incremental costs of collectively bargained contracts, including the University University Professionals (UUP), the amount is short of the $82.2 million the University requested for these costs. Consequently, direct tax dollar support for the State-operated campuses remained essentially flat for the fourth consecutive year.

The Budget provided expenditure authorities at the requested levels for SUNY’s self-generated revenue accounts, which include tuition revenues, SUNY Stabilization, and Hospital income revenue. The tuition authority reflects an increase of $95.0M from the prior year level, sufficient to accommodate anticipated revenue increases related to enrollment levels and the $300 resident undergraduate tuition increases for year four of the 5-year Rational Tuition plan, as well as other planned tuition increases.

A substantial portion of SUNY’s direct State tax support is dedicated to the “University-Wide Programs” that provide support to broad activities such as the Empire Innovation Program (EIP) and the Educational Opportunities Centers (EOC), as well as campus-specific funding such as support for the Stony Brook Marine Animal Laboratory and Nanoscale Science and Engineering.

SUNY requested an increase of $12.0M over the 2013-14 level of $133.9M, in direct support of Strategic Enrollment Growth, Expanded System-wide support, and SUNY Innovation. While these items were not funded in the final budget, the Legislature did restore a number of programs that were initially reduced by $2.2 million in the Executive Budget to their original or higher values.

Tuition Assistance Program (TAP)

The Enacted Budget increased the Tuition Assistance Program (TAP) award ceiling for dependent students for the first time since 2000-01 academic year, from $5,000 to $5,165. The NY SUNY 2020 law requires that SUNY provide a “tuition credit” for all students who receive a TAP award, due to SUNY’s tuition being in excess of the prior TAP ceiling of $5,000. As of this writing, some technical issues exist with regard to the increase of the TAP ceiling, and therefore this budget item remains an important part of our continued conversations with the Senate, Assembly, and the Division of the Budget.

SUNY Hospitals

The Enacted Budget provided SUNY Hospitals State tax support equal to the level received FY 2014, and replaced the SUNY “loan” made in this year with direct State support. The three SUNY teaching hospitals received full authority to disburse projected revenue levels, as did the Long Island Veterans Home at Stony Brook. The additional support provided by the State to the three hospitals—while remaining flat year-to-year on a “total” basis—is now fully funded by State tax dollars at $87.8M.

Based on the Downstate Medical Center sustainability plan approved in June 2013 and subsequent legal actions, SUNY and Downstate Medical Center are expected to exit operations of LICH by May 22, 2014. As part of the February 2014 settlement agreement, a revised RFP process is now underway with a total of nine bidders currently under consideration.

Other Budget Initiatives

The Budget maintained funding for the Master Teacher Program, which is supported by a sub-allocation from the State Education Department (SED). The Enacted FY 2015 Budget created a new STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) Incentive Program which would offer tuition scholarships to New York high school students who place in the top 10 percent of their graduating class, and are pursuing a program in STEM at SUNY or CUNY. Funding for the program is provided within the Higher Education Services Corporation (HESC) budget. The program would provide funding equivalent to SUNY tuition to students who meet specific criteria over the course of four to five years, dependent upon the required length of the program. The scholarship will be converted to a loan for students who do not complete an approved STEM program, change majors to a program not within the STEM field, or fail to complete five years of employment in the STEM field while living in New York State upon completion of their program.

The Enacted Budget also included $15 million in funding for the planning and development for a new SUNY College of Emergency Preparedness, Homeland Security and Cybersecurity, as well as a new School of Pharmacy and at the University at Binghamton. It also created the New York Genome Medicine Network, in which the University at Buffalo will partner with the NY Genome Center in New York City.

Looking Ahead to FY 16 and Beyond

Given the current fiscal climate, State tax dollar support for SUNY will likely remain flat over the next budget cycle. We must strengthen our ongoing initiatives discussed above and continue to maintain fiscal discipline, which will enable the University to face the challenges presented by the closure of the LICH and the resources required to support increases in collectively bargained costs. System Administration and campus leaders expect to begin laying the groundwork for the successor program for the NY SUNY 2020, which will lapse in 2016.
and newly re-acquired level of respect from SUNY System Administration. Although we are not here to please the administration, our job to protect the interests of students and to give them a voice in SUNY policy and program decisions would be impossible if we could not maintain both a working relationship and the respect of the Chancellor and her administration. If they do not respect us, we lose ground and it would take considerable time to get that momentum back.

In addition to record numbers attending our Fall and Spring Conferences, we also were able to weigh in on many serious policy discussions at the system-level that I believe greatly impacted the decision-making of the administration. These include, but are not limited to:

- Support for SUNY Childcare Centers
- Support for SUNY’s Seamless Transfer efforts (albeit, there is still a need for improvement there)
- Providing for Textbook Affordability Solutions
- Support for Contingent Faculty Pay Equity
- Support for Improving Quality of Academic Advising
- Support for the Implementation of Open SUNY
- Opposition to edTPA Teacher Certification Examination Implementation
- Support for Continued Transferability and Support for Physical Education
- Support for Review of the effect of the sale of SUNY Downstate’s Long Island College Hospital on SUNY resources

We also once again have drawn attention to the needs of SUNY students who are veterans by continuing to advocate for in-state tuition for them. We will also be discussing finding ways to improve veteran student services throughout the system. I believe our request for a speedy solution to the situation with SUNY Downstate’s Long Island College Hospital, as well as recognition that the issues in Brooklyn were healthcare-related and not higher education issues, was instrumental in helping SUNY push the Governor and NYC Mayor de Blasio to reach a settlement in order to cease draining money from the entire SUNY system.

We also were able to make some significant structural changes to our Bylaws on my watch. In addition to streamlining our elections process for Executive Board officers and simplifying the President’s Cabinet structure, we also were able to create the position of Immediate Past President (of which I will, coincidentally, be the inaugural holder of the title) to help improve the transition process from one administration to the next.

That said, as I wrap-up my term as President and begin transition planning, there are a few issues of importance to students that I think it would be prudent for the faculty to be mindful of:

Rational Tuition

As you are aware, several years ago, the Student Assembly took the very unpopular stance of supporting NYSUNY 2020 and the stipulations that it brought regarding not only the Governor and Legislature’s commitment to the “maintenance of effort” agreement but also to the idea of “rational tuition.” As if any increase to tuition could be called “rational,” right? Well I have to say that it is certainly a far cry from having tuition raised approximately 40% almost overnight as happened in 2008-09. While still not the most popular solution, the Student Assembly has continued to stand by that decision.

As we draw closer to the end of the five years of rational tuition, the Student Assembly is going to need to ask itself if this is something that they still support. While I personally believe that it is in the best interest of all students to be able to predict the cost of education, the Student Assembly is ultimately responsible for making that decision. I encourage the faculty to start thinking about and having conversations with students about this issue now. The more conversations that students and faculty have about rational tuition now, the more informed decisions future faculty leaders will be able to make with regard to issues that impact students financially.

SUNY Voices and System-wide Shared Governance

Along with the Chancellor’s Power of SUNY strategic plan, came a new commitment to shared governance; this idea that decision-making in a collegial institution such as SUNY is the shared responsibility of administration, faculty governance, student governance, and other relevant stakeholders. Out of that came SUNY Voices. For the first time this year, students have played a big role in SUNY Voices, making it very clear that student governance is an important part of shared governance in SUNY.

Though I fully believe the Chancellor, the Board of Trustees, and our current faculty governance leaders genuinely believe student participation in shared governance is important, we still must continue to make sure that the current level of commitment to student participation is maintained. Also, keep in mind that different people may occupy these positions and may not always share that view; consequently, it is important that current faculty governance leaders lead the charge to ensure that student participation in the decision-making processes with SUNY becomes standard practice.

Open SUNY

Open SUNY is one of the most ambitious endeavors in online/continuing education for higher education nationally. SUNY is continually being touted as an exemplar for other states and higher education systems across the country. Our Chancellor, as well as other members of SUNY administration, have been recognized for the innovative and aggressive approach to pushing the online agenda. That said, Open SUNY is merely the beginning.

Students are represented on the advisory committee; however, I am currently advocating for at least one more representative in addition to the President’s seat. As I have stated many times, it is very important that we continue to have faculty support for increasing student representation wherever possible. Ultimately, the faculty and students will be impacted the most by Open SUNY, and we should be equally involved through the shared governance process.
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Power of SUNY 2.0

As the strategic plan, and the Chancellor herself, draw close to the end of their fifth year, SUNY is currently looking at refreshing the plan to make sure it remains relevant for the next five years. SUNY held several regional conversations regarding the next stages of the strategic plan. Moving forward, there will be many efforts involved to, first, measure the progress of the different aspects of the current plan and see where we are, and, second, see where SUNY needs to go in the future both to ensure that the original goals are met and to stay relevant for the future.

It will be critical that not only the Student Assembly is engaged but that the University Faculty Senate also encourages the Chancellor and her staff to carve out times to meet with students and faculty to get their input. Whether this means sending staff from the Office of Strategic Planning to the Student Assembly and University Faculty Senate, or setting up regional conversations for just students and faculty, it is important that we are directly engaged in planning the future of SUNY over the next five years.

Final Thoughts

There are many more issues that will surely arise in the near future that students should have a say in. It is supremely important that you, as our faculty, remember the most critical aspect of any higher education institution: without students and faculty, there is no institution. That’s not to say that we are always the most important aspect of this educational enterprise, or the only consideration that administrators have (especially in a system as large and as vast as SUNY); however, we are an extremely important part of this institution without which the other elements of the enterprise would not survive. Remember that, always.

It has been an honor and a privilege serving as the Student Assembly’s representative to the University Faculty Senate for this past year and it was certainly an experience of a lifetime that I will remember forever. I wish you all the very best.

FROM THE EDITOR’S DESK

Federal Rating of Colleges and Universities

The issue of the accountability of colleges and universities, which has been permeating public discussions of higher education for quite a while, has been brought to center stage in the public’s mind as a consequence of President Obama’s call for the federal government to create a rating system for colleges and universities. The calls for accountability in higher education have often revolved around its cost and the purported fact that graduates are not adequately prepared for the world of work. Often the major culprit causing the high cost of higher education is identified as the professoriate, as evident in a March 21, 2014 article in Inside Higher Education, entitled “Are professors selling students short,” and another article, of the same date, in The Chronicle of Higher Education, entitled, “Lighter teaching loads for faculty contribute to rising college costs, report says.” It should be pointed out that the report referred to in this latter article was later retracted because the data upon which it was based were determined to be flawed as were the conclusions based upon them. Public higher education has also been under attack for many years, with the resultant significant reduction in state and local government support. One issue of particular import for those attacking higher education is its purported inability to adequately prepare its graduates for the world of work. Witness the fact that the governors in some states (e.g., North Carolina and Texas) have been insisting that their systems of higher education focus their academic programs on having their graduates “ready made for jobs.” This view apparently also animates the proposed federal rating system being discussed, an issue that will be discussed below.

The stated purpose of the proposed federal rating system would not only be to provide prospective students and their families with necessary and accurate information for use in selecting an appropriate college or university, to which nobody could seriously object. But also, and equally important, it would be tied to the provision of various forms of federal funding, currently about $150 billion a year in federal loans and grants. This heightened public attention to accountability in higher education due to President Obama’s decision to create a federal rating scale has raised considerable concern in the higher education community as evident in a recent article in the New York Times, “Colleges Rattled as Obama Seeks Rating System.” In that article, a number of college presidents were highly skeptical that such a rating system would work, though at least one of them thought that an effort to hold down costs and to improve graduation rates was a “noble effort.”

Why should we, who are actively engaged in the field of higher education, be rattled by being held accountable for our performance? We are no strangers to assessment. At the individual level, we are held accountable for our performance through the process that provides tenure or permanent appointment—and by the professional peer culture in which we are enmeshed. So, too, are institutions of higher education held accountable. Colleges and universities are evaluated periodically, and thus held accountable, by regional accrediting bodies—and for a number of disciplines, by their professional associations (e.g., ABET for engineers, NCAT for teachers)—whose assessment has significant financial and reputational consequences. Moreover, colleges and universities are publicly evaluated annually in the popular media by U.S. News and World Report, Barrons, and The Princeton Review, among others, which also have significant financial and reputational consequences. So, why should we be “rattled” by yet another system of evaluation?

On reason for this concern was the apparent lack of understanding of the complexity and subtlety of the experience and the varied functions of higher education. This was evident in the comment by Jamienne Studley, a deputy under-secretary in the United States Department of Education, that rating colleges and universities is “like rating a blender.” A comment like this by an official in the agency charged with creating the rating tool suggests a serious lack of understanding of what higher education is all about. And that is quite disturbing!

While we don’t know yet precisely what the rating system will look like, there are a number of elements that have been widely discussed that are likely to find their way into the “rating tool.” Specifically, it seems so far that the economic aspects of higher education—its cost and its eventual payoff in terms of the level of earning after graduation—will play a key role. While these certainly are of great importance to students and their families—a point which most faculty understand and respect—they are not the only elements of a college or university experience that should be considered important. The apparent primary focus of the proposed evaluative scheme that seems evident so far does not speak to the quality of students’ education, or to its value in contributing to them becoming active, responsible, and sentient participants in a civil society. Nor does it take into account John Dewey’s conception that “The aim of education is not merely to make citizens, or workers, or fathers, or mothers, but ultimately to make human beings who will live life to the fullest—that is, who will continually add to the meaning of their experience and to their ability to direct subsequent experience.” Moreover, it is not at this point clear how the proposed rating approach will help institutions deal with acknowledged problems that higher education has yet to resolve sufficiently: access; physical and sexual violence and harassment;
also, using future earnings as a major indicator of importance will have the direct effect of undermining the value of those disciplines that do not lead graduates into high earning jobs or careers, however, important they may be for both the individual and for society. It will heighten pressure on institutions to encourage students to select a course of study that has an early economic payoff rather than one that they or society may value since that will enhance their “rating.” It will clearly privilege the STEM and professional fields (law, medicine, business) and continue the current depreciation of the humanities, fine arts, and a number of the social and behavioral sciences—all of which are essential to well-rounded and thoughtful individuals, and to a modern, well-functioning civil society.

Lowering the cost of acquiring a college or university education is something that all of us, within or outside of higher education, can applaud and support. However, it should not be done in a manner reduces the quality of the educational programs or access to this experience for the poor and members of minority groups. An emphasis placed on graduation rates and time-to-degree, which has often been included in evaluative programs and has surfaced in the discussions about a federal rating system, that does not take into account the variation in the student population among institutions and their preparation for higher education, which will, most likely, disadvantage those institutions that have a significant number of students who are poor and/or members of minority groups. A number of these students will be underprepared for a college/university education or will need to work to support themselves and, possibly, their families, while attending a college or university; thus, many of them will need considerable remedial work, more time to complete their education, or will drop out before doing so. Consequently, some institutions will be reluctant to accept large numbers of these students for fear that it will reduce their rating in the proposed federal scheme. Clearly, we in higher education have some substantial concerns about the particular approach that the federal government seems ready to take to reduce the costs of higher education, to provide prospective students and their families with more accurate information than has been available to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of different institutions, and to hold colleges and universities accountable.” However, as Chancellor Zimpher said in recent report on this initiative in the New York Times, this is an “undertaking, one that is underway whether we like it or not… and I encourage my colleagues to seek out an active role in the process.” That’s good advice not only for us, but also for the United States Department of Education. The United States Department of Education should be encouraged/pressured to include academic administrators and teaching faculty in the development of this evaluative system now, and not ask for comments after the program has been drawn up. Most of us know all too well from our own campus experience that our involvement in the planning process of any endeavor is more likely to insure that our views are incorporated in it than if we are limited to commenting on a proposal that has already been developed. Given her commitment to, and her practice of, shared governance, Chancellor Zimpher might well be disposed to use her considerable prestige and influence to help in this effort.

Finally, we should remind President Obama that a large part of the increasing cost of public higher education to students and their families is due to state and local governments seemingly defining public higher education as a private benefit rather than the public good that it is—and which has led them to abdicate their legitimate responsibility to adequately fund it. Moreover, the dwindling governmental support for public higher education is reduced even further as a substantial portion of it is provided to private, for profit institutions (e.g., receiving funds from the New York State Tuition Assistance Program-TAP)—an issue that has received less public attention in concern about higher education that it should. m

### In the Spotlight

[Editor’s note: Faculty and professional staff throughout SUNY are generally familiar with the history and activities of their own campus as well as the functioning and value of their governance organization(s); however, they are less familiar with those on other SUNY campuses. In this section, we shine the spotlight on the nature and activities of a SUNY campus to allow the readers to see the similarity and uniqueness of the members of the SUNY system. We also detail recent activities of one of the University Faculty Senate’s Standing Committees to increase the visibility of the activities of the Senate and how its actions play a role in affecting SUNY policies and programs that eventually impact the individual campuses.]

#### College of Nanoscale Science and Engineering

Unni Pillai  
SUNY College of Nanoscale Science and Engineering

As science advances, new academic disciplines are created. The creation of new disciplines partly reflect conceptual changes in scientific thought brought about by new discoveries, and partly reflect the practical changes in the industrial economy triggered by the discoveries. For example, advances in basic chemistry in the 18th and 19th century led to the development of a flourishing chemical industry. The new requirements of the rapidly growing chemical industry resulted in a growth in demand for further research, and for personnel trained in this area, and led to the establishment of chemical engineering as an academic discipline. In a similar vein, advances in basic science in the last two decades of the twentieth century provided capabilities to scientists and engineers to manipulate matter at dimensions of a few nanometers, and this scientific ability has, in turn, opened up opportunities in many industries ranging from electronics to drugs. The new opportunities have led to a rapid increase in the demand for further innovation and for personnel trained in this field, and have been the driving force behind the establishment of the new academic disciplines of Nanoscience and Nanotechnology, and the formation of the SUNY College of Nanoscale Science and Engineering (CNSE). The establishment of SUNY CNSE thus traces time honored mechanisms that have led to new educational institutions and academic disciplines as the outcome of the symbiotic relationship between science and industry.

The origin of SUNY CNSE can be traced to the establishment by New York State of a series of Centers of Excellence across the state. In 2001, a Center of Excellence in Nanoelectronics and Nanotechnology (CENN) was established at the University at Albany. When it was established, the CENN used state funding to develop research infrastructure such as nanoscale lab space and equipment. Using $50 million in funding from the New York State Government and $100 million from an industrial partner, IBM, a state of the art 200mm/300mm clean room facility was constructed for performing R&D in nanoelectronics. In parallel with CENN, the School of Nanoscale Science and Engineering was also established at University at Albany in 2001 with the intent of providing graduate education in Nanoscience and Nanotechnology. In 2004, the College of Nanoscale Science and Engineering was established, which has since then awarded 174 graduate degrees in Nanoscience and Nanotechnology. In 2010, CNSE became the world’s first college to offer undergraduate degree programs in Nanoscale Science and Nanoscale Engineering. From its beginning as CENN in 2001, CNSE has strived to extend the history of active collaboration between academia and industry. There are over 300 industrial partners at CNSE, from across the country and the world, many of them operating on-campus research labs where they conduct R&D on next generation technology. These industrial partners
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include IBM, Applied Materials, Lam Research and Tokyo Electron. During the initial years of the CNSE, seed investment offered by New York State was integral to attracting industrial partners to collaborate on basic research conducted at CNSE. As time passed and the critical mass of industrial partners grew, CNSE was able to attract partners and industrial R&D funding with less investment. The collaboration of CNSE with industrial partners has resulted in substantial investments by the partners in support of research and educational missions of CNSE, both by providing R&D equipment and by facilitating collaboration of R&D scientists at these firms with faculty and students at CNSE.

A defining feature of curriculum at SUNY CNSE is its multidisciplinary nature. The field of nanotechnology is inherently multidisciplinary, drawing on and creating developments in traditional fields such as physics, chemistry, biology, materials science, and electrical engineering. There are four constellations in CNSE—Nanoscience, Nanoengineering, Nanobioscience and Nanoeconomics—and graduate and undergraduate students are encouraged to take courses across the four constellations. Discussions among faculty or graduate students turn into interdisciplinary projects bringing in an exchange of ideas from across the traditional disciplines. Graduate students in Nanoscience, Nanoengineering and Nanobioscience partner with those from Nanoeconomics to bring laboratory results to the market through startup companies.

Students also interact closely with industrial partners when conducting their research projects. Many graduate students complete paid internships with industrial partners over the course of their education. The internships and other interactions with onsite companies benefit the students immensely, not only in terms of complementing the resources they have available for research but also for future employment opportunities at these companies. The industrial partners also award many scholarships to CNSE students, the IBM Fellowship and LAM Scholarship are two examples.

In addition to undergraduate and graduate education, CNSE has also partnered with local community colleges to provide nanotechnology related vocational training at these colleges. For example, the Semiconductor Manufacturing Technology program at the Hudson Valley Community College, developed in partnership with CNSE, prepares students for careers in the semiconductor manufacturing industry. CNSE has also been assisting school districts in the implementation of programs that encourage science awareness in grades K-12. In 2006, CNSE started the NanoHigh program to develop and implement innovative science and engineering education programs at Albany High School. Under the program, qualified Albany High School students receive fellowships to participate in nanotechnology-related science and engineering programs at CNSE. Since its inception, almost 100 Albany High School students have received certificates for successful completion of the program. Another highlight of the school level interaction is the annual NanoCareer Day when middle-school and high-school students are introduced to the world of nanotechnology through tours, presentations and hands-on activities. To encourage young women to pursue careers in nanotechnology, CNSE launched the CNSE-Girls Inc. Eurekal® program, where program participants take part in an intensive four-week summer camp involving a number of hands-on activities that explore advanced nanoscience concepts and applications. Nearly 60 girls participated in the second year of the CNSE-Girls Inc. Eurekal® program in 2013. The educational reach of CNSE will be further enhanced with the arrival of Tech Valley High School on campus in Fall 2014, and the Children’s Museum of Science and Technology in 2015.

In addition to the creation of basic science and technology, CNSE also actively facilitates taking this innovation to next level in the market, in keeping with the vision outlined in “SUNY and the Entrepreneurial Century.” CNSE plays an active role in transferring the technology developed through research to the market through its in-house technology incubators and entrepreneurship classes. A highlight of the activities to support student entrepreneurship is the annual New York Business Plan Competition where college students from across New York converge at CNSE to pitch their ideas for new startup companies, to a panel of judges comprising venture capitalists and investment bankers. Since 2010, over 570 student teams from almost 60 of New York’s colleges and universities have pitched their ideas and ventures at the business plan competition. CNSE has also partnered with Albany Law School to start a joint educational program ENTEL, to prepare student entrepreneurs to launch startup companies.

The research and educational collaborative activities of CNSE also extend to other regions, through a number of centers established across upstate New York. CNSE manages and supports Solar Energy Development Center in Halfmoon, the Computer Chip Commercialization Center (QUAD-C) in Utica, the Smart System Technology & Commercialization Center (STC) located outside Rochester, Photovoltaic Manufacturing and Technology Development Facility (CNSE MDF) in Rochester, and the CNSE-AMRI Innovation and Commercialization Ecosystem (CAICE) located at the Buffalo Niagara Medical Campus in Buffalo. These extend the nanotechnology related research and educational activities into the fields of clean energy and health-care, among others.

The programs undertaken at CNSE have won wide support from many quarters, with Apple co-founder Steve Wozniak remarking that “if I was in college, this is where I would want to go to school”. President Obama on his visit to the campus, applauded the CNSE model, “You have an outstanding university. Now I want what is happening in Albany to happen across the country”. To facilitate the growth of CNSE, SUNY Board of Trustees passed a statute in 2014 elevating CNSE to a new college under the SUNY system. The establishment of nanotechnology related industrial facility at Marcy in Utica, has led to a close collaboration between CNSE and SUNY IT at Utica. The collaboration was formalized by the SUNY Board of Trustees with a statute for the formation of a combined institution.

CNSE has traveled far since its beginnings in the Center of Excellence in Nanoelectronics and Nanotechnology in 2001. The history heralds a future as eventful as the past. The aspirations of the future are epitomized in the logo adopted by the new institution. The logo is that of Hermes, the herald of the Olympian gods, embodying the institution’s mission to serve as a 21st century educator, innovator, and economic catalyst. Hermes is the author of many inventions, the god of commerce and promoter of interaction among nations, and celebrated for his helpfulness to mankind. Aided by the wings on his sandals and his cap, Hermes traveled with great swiftness, an embodiment of CNSE’s agility in exploring and implementing new opportunities to educate, innovate, and enable economic vitality.
The University Operations Committee is comprised of 13 members, selected broadly from all university sectors. The diversity of the committee membership assures that it is staffed appropriately to take a university perspective in its deliberations. As with the chairs of the other University Faculty Senate (UFS) standing committees, the University Operations Committee Chair is a member of the extended Executive Committee and participates in all activities of the extended Executive Committee.

The committee is governed by what may be one of the most challenging and diverse charges of any UFS standing committee: The Committee shall be concerned with the effective participation of the faculty in University personnel policies, including equal employment practices and affirmative action. The Committee shall also be concerned with the development and administration of the budgetary and planning activities of the University and shall undertake research and analysis, and shall make appropriate reports and recommendations, on models, methodologies and issues to best practices and/or policies in budgeting and operations. The committee shall also provide advice and guidance on matters related to the libraries, computing and telecommunications.

In order to address and respond to the charge, the committee is assigned liaisons from system administration to help guide the activities of the committee and secure data and information from system sources. To advise on the budget, Assistant Vice Chancellor (AVC) for Budget, Planning, and Analysis, Wendy Gilman is assigned to the committee. Associate Provost (AP) for Academic Technologies and Instructional Services, Carey Hatch, serves the Operations Committee and advises on library services and the operational aspects of the emerging digitally enabled instruction initiative, Open SUNY. Both system professionals bring to the committee a depth and breadth of knowledge and access to detailed information from their respective functional realms. It has become the practice of the committee to receive regular reports and updates from the liaisons at scheduled committee meetings. In turn, the membership disseminates the content of reports to their constituencies and the chair reports to the UFS Executive Committee.

Beginning in 2007, budgetary concerns again became critical for SUNY (they always are) as the state reduced the SUNY budget by 10% or more in consecutive years. As state support for SUNY declined, the UFS and SUNY cabinet level administrators made the budget and its implications the top priorities for UFS discourse. During this time, the Operations Committee received lengthy and detailed reports from AVC Gilman. The committee typically receives the same budget report that is delivered to the SUNY Board of Trustees. In addition, AVC Gilman is available for questions and provides budget documentation for committee initiatives when needed. Working in conjunction with the AVC, the Operations Committee revised and published the Budget Handbook in 2013.

Central to the charge of the Operations Committee is its “advice and guidance on matters related to the libraries, computing and telecommunications.” The committee is typically populated by a good number of library directors and library experts holding various titles. With a concentration of expertise in library operations, the committee is able to represent constituents from across the state and provide valuable feedback to System Administration through liaison and AP Hatch. As the Open SUNY initiative unfolds, it is evident that the charge of the committee will need to be updated to include advice and guidance on operations related to digitally enabled teaching and learning. With the chancellor’s goal of 100,000 new online students and a significantly enhanced technology infrastructure, a new set of responsibilities for the committee is emerging.

The committee periodically produces and publishes reports on matters related to library operations, such as the Trends in Acquisitions 2000-2008 and, currently under committee review, Library Acquisitions at SUNY State-operated Campuses 2002-2012, produced under the leadership of distinguished librarian, Dr. Joseph Petrick of Alfred State.

Over the years, the committee has contributed to university-wide discussions related to equal employment and affirmative action. In recent years, the committee has indirectly shared its responsibilities in this area with the Committee on Diversity and Cultural Competence. In 2013, under the leadership of immediate past committee chair, Ron Sarner, the committee renewed work on the Longitudinal Faculty Profile by Gender, first published in 2009. The profile has been updated and is ready for publication upon review and final approval by the committee. In 2012, in an effort to address the needs of campuses conducting handbook reviews and revisions, the University Operations Committee created a spreadsheet containing every faculty handbook in the SUNY system. The spreadsheet was posted to the UFS website and contains web links to the handbooks of all state operated campuses and all community colleges. This spreadsheet requires annual updating so that the newest versions of the documents are available for campuses considering or engaging in handbook research and revision. Easy access to campus handbooks has reportedly facilitated the work of campus governance, and has facilitated the pursuit of shared governance across the system.

In 2014, the committee conducted a survey of the campuses of its committee members to determine the viability of campus workplace violence policies and trainings, which are required of every SUNY campus. The findings of the survey indicated that some campuses have model training programs and well-understood policies and processes in place, while other campuses fulfilled the system requirement minimally and in some cases superficially. The findings of the workplace violence survey were communicated to System Administration, the SUNY Board of Trustees, and to the UFS winter plenary attendees. The committee encouraged campus representatives to raise awareness of workplace violence policies and training on their campuses.

The University Operations Committee is always available to serve the UFS Executive Committee and the UFS President. In 2012, the UFS President was asked on short notice by the provost to select key metrics to be included in a new budget allocation model that was scheduled for implementation at the start of the next fiscal year. The UFS President charged the University Operations Committee to select from a list of over 140 measurable variables the most relevant ones for the diverse, SUNY state-operated campuses. With nearly full participation of the committee membership, the committee worked over a weekend to deliver its findings by the start of business on Monday.

Finally, the chair of the University Operations Committee is occasionally called upon to serve upon relevant university-wide committees and task forces. For example, the current chair was appointed to the SUNY Shared Services Steering Committee and the Provost’s Open SUNY Advisory Committee in 2012 and 2013 respectively. Service on university-wide committees by standing committee chairpersons, provides the UFS with a presence and a voice in the work of important university-wide committees and task forces, which enhances shared governance within SUNY, and contributes to the stature and significance of the UFS.
Access and Completion in SUNY; Working within a Complex University System

Kenneth P. O’Brien
The College at Brockport

SUNY was born in the immediate post-war period and the driving issue was access, the systematic denial of educational opportunity to minorities by the state’s extensive network of private colleges and universities. At that time, it was New York’s Jewish communities that had been excluded from the private institutions and that mounted great pressure for a public university, especially public professional schools in medicine. According to Todd Ottman, who wrote the chapter that detailed SUNY’s founding for SUNY at Sixty, “On March 5, 1948, four separate bills . . . were drafted by the Governor’s office, and were introduced into the legislature under bipartisan sponsorship. The first three bills established SUNY and its community college system; the last bill was a fair educational practices measure.”

The 1950 Master Plan identified an expansive egalitarian mission for the emerging system: “With this University supplementing private institutions opportunity for higher education is to be provided eventually for every qualified student in the State, irrespective of sex, race, creed, national origin, or economic status.” And in the succeeding decades, the State backed this promise by generously funding a range of “opportunity” programs, particularly the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) that was created in the late 1960’s, largely by the efforts of a Buffalo Assemblman, Arthur Eve. The program was modeled after CUNY’s SEEK program, which had been established the previous year. EOP began operation at Buffalo State in 1967 with the admission of students who were both economically and educationally disadvantaged. By definition, EOP students fell below each college’s standards for regular admission. Within five years, the program had spread to thirty campuses, enrolling 4500 students. Over the succeeding decades, the program helped more than 55,000 degree graduates succeed. Its students today are retained at greater percentages than other freshmen, and the six-year graduation rate is very close to the national averages for all students, about 57%.

If EOP is a legacy of the 1960’s sensibilities that demanded that groups previously ignored by or omitted from higher education receive the support necessary to pave a pathway to academic success, Chancellor Nancy Zimpher updated the access issue for the SUNY system in the last five years, demanding that it redirect its attention and energy to forge bonds with those engaged in reforming preK-16 education. In committing the university community, all of SUNY’s campuses, to working to stop the leaks in what is called the educational pipeline, she has redefined the access issue to better fit current realities. Here’s the problem: the most recent data document that out of each cohort of New York’s 9th graders, only 57% graduate on time, 41% enter college immediately and only 19% acquire either an associate degree in three years or a bachelor in six. While many would see these data as indications of a failure of completion—which they are—they need to be understood as a denial of access as well. The economic and ethnic groups that achieve at the lowest levels are the poor and children of color, many of whom have not been adequately prepared to enter the university with a reasonable chance for success. And, as a public system of post-secondary education, we must claim this as our issue. As the Chancellor said, “We cannot separate higher education from the experience students have before and after college . . . Ensuring access and success is not only a matter of SUNY’s responsibility to help create opportunities for individual students. It is also absolutely essential to the economic future of New York State.”

The commitment to access, then, has been and continues to be a part of SUNY’s institutional DNA, codified in State Education Law, Section 35: “The mission of the state university system shall be to provide to the people of New York educational services of the highest quality, with the broadest possible access, fully representative of all segments of the population in a complete range of academic, professional and vocational post-secondary programs including such additional activities in pursuit of these objectives as are necessary or customary.”

Financial inequalities are another formidable impediment for the children of the poor to gain access to higher education. But, again the state has provided unique and generous assistance. Through the Tuition Assistance Program (TAP), which was first introduced in the 1970’s, New York State has provided billions of dollars in public support for college education, with the largest share going to students attending private colleges and universities. Yet, by the 1980s, an informal relationship developed between the maximum TAP award any student could receive and the tuition charged by the state’s public universities for resident undergraduates in baccalaureate programs, a relationship that was threatened by the enactment of NYSUNY 2020, the legislative program that created a tuition schedule that set modest increases (about $300/year) for each of the next five years for the 34 state-operated campuses.

The important point is that SUNY and CUNY had to create a TAP GAP fund, into which each campus contributed 25% of its increased tuition charges to fund the difference between the maximum TAP award and the rising level of tuition. This amounts to state-sponsored tuition discounting, done in the name of maintaining access by ensuring that the most needy of our students would not face higher costs as a result of annual tuition increases. Incidentally, and this is no accident, the tuition and fees at New York State’s public baccalaureate campuses remain the lowest in the region and among the lowest in the country.

Access also has geographical aspects, especially in a state as large as New York. Remember Ottman’s reference to SUNY community colleges. From SUNY’s creation in the post-war era, the system that was cobbled together was designed to include an extensive network of community colleges, geographically dispersed entry points for the system that, according to the 1964 SUNY Master Plan, would have a campus within commuting distance—30 miles—at almost every potential student.

Access for the system’s community colleges worked in yet another way: they were open-admission institutions, taking all New York high school graduates (and some who had not yet graduated), offering a wide range of programs, some of which were aimed at specific preparation for jobs and careers, others of which were expected to lead to further education at one of the system’s emerging network of comprehensive colleges. The latter were the nine normal schools that had been transformed first into Teachers Colleges and then, according to the 1964 SUNY Master Plan, into colleges of liberal arts and sciences able to receive the estimated twenty thousand students who
were enrolled in liberal arts curricula in those community colleges. In other words, from the beginning, SUNY was designed as a system with multiple points of access and a pipeline to complete undergraduate degrees. These policy imperatives were reaffirmed as early as the late 1960’s when the modern SUNY was born.

As seen above, community colleges provide the institutional bridge to the second focus for this article, completion, especially when the frame for our discussion is the SUNY “system.” Since more than a third of SUNY baccalaureate degrees are awarded annually to students who enter the degree-granting colleges as transfers, “seamless transfer” of credits and programs is an important element to any system-wide completion agenda, even though the issue was framed long before that phrase was heard.

As indicated, every SUNY Master Plan from the late 60’s to the late 70’s mentions the importance of student mobility. Beyond the Master Plans, there are the Board of Trustees resolutions, six in all, beginning in 1972, reaffirmed in 1980, and again in 1987 and yet again in 1990, and again in 1998 and, most recently, in November 2009. Despite slight changes in language, each resolution promised “seamless transfer” of community college students to a baccalaureate campus, guaranteeing those who earned either an AA or AS in a parallel program junior status, and “full credit for general education courses taken and not be required to repeat successfully completed courses with similar content.” Leaving aside the thorny definitional issues, the fact that the policy had to be repeated each decade indicates that real-world implementation never quite matched the policy promise.

By the first decade of the new century, the Board of Trustees was fed up with sporadic complaints from students, parents, even legislators—especially legislators—about transfer problems and insisted that the transfer system be fixed. The issue took on greater urgency after the student member of the New York Commission on Higher Education regaled his colleagues with his own transfer horror story, evidence that led the Commission to note in its 2008 final report that “New York does not have a legally mandated transfer policy, and SUNY and CUNY have full discretion to determine their respective policies. In sharp contrast, all of the peer states have adopted statewide transfer policies.” No one could say that the threat posed to the traditional independence of the individual campuses in the public systems was veiled.

In the past five years, SUNY has struggled to understand the larger transfer patterns and provide a series of policies and procedures that would facilitate students moving from one campus to another. While it is not necessary to detail each of the steps in the process, the outline is clear: it began with the SUNY General Education (SUNY GER) requirement passed by the Board in 1998 that was common to all campuses, which identified courses that exhibited the requisite student learning outcomes approved by a system-wide faculty committee in each of the ten specified categories. These courses were guaranteed transfer across the system. Despite the fact that cultural politics drove the SUNY GER initiative, this program nevertheless provided a significant step toward the long-standing goal of seamless transfer through the creation of groups of courses in each of the ten designated areas that would be guaranteed transfer across the system and that would satisfy specific SUNY baccalaureate degree requirements.

After the specific requirements of the SUNY General Education program were revised in 2009 to facilitate student mobility, and a report by the Joint Committee on Student Mobility that was endorsed by both system faculty governance bodies, the University Provost quickly moved to create disciplinary committees with equal representation of faculty, more than 400 in all, from both the community colleges and the baccalaureate campuses. The committees were charged with identifying the disciplinary courses normally completed in the discipline major before the junior year. A general descriptor was written for each course in these 38 academic majors, a group that comprises 95% of all transfers, and these courses were supposed to be guaranteed transfer across the system. In addition, each campus was obligated to provide an appeals process for any transfer issue for students who believed they were being denied credit for the courses they had completed. To facilitate the transfer of credits among campuses, the system has moved to create new web-based tools for program advisement.

How has this all worked? Well, that depends on the perspective. By the numbers, it seemed to be working pretty well: 46% of the baccalaureate degrees and 27% of the associate degrees were awarded to students who came to their degree-granting campus as transfers. And, once closely analyzed, it became obvious that transfer patterns among the system campuses had become much more complex than we had originally believed. Despite the fact that previous policies were drafted for movement from community colleges to baccalaureate degrees, we now know that this is little more than a third of the transfers across the system, while a 4 year to a 4 year campus is about 22% of all transfers; a 4 year to a 2 year campus is 26% and a 2 year to a 2 year campus is 17%. In fact, adding those last two together reveals that more than 40% of the transfers within SUNY went TO, not from, the community college campuses.

In terms of the average number of credits earned by the baccalaureate degree recipients who entered their state systems as either first-time full-time freshmen or transfers, the SUNY system excels, with both groups earning an almost identical average of 133 credits for their degrees. This equality compares well with other public systems, such as the California State system, where transfer students must earn an additional three credits. Texas, which is big in all things, can claim the “prize,” as its transfer students, on average, need an average of eight additional credits to earn their degrees.

Of course, such averages mask wide variations for individual programs, even particular campuses. While specific appeals have been few in recent years, the community college presidents across the system still believed that the system disadvantages their graduates and had insisted on changes, threatening legislative action. Largely as a result of the threats, the Board of Trustees passed yet another resolution designed to address the remaining with system-wide transfer issues, a resolution that led to the MTP (Memorandum to Presidents) of May 2013.

This latest of the long trail of resolutions was for the first time been accompanied by specific steps that will bring seamless transfer and the completion agenda into a meaningful (and mandatory) system-wide body of practices, not just recommendations. The two most striking, and the two that drew the greatest faculty ire are credit limitations for both associate and baccalaureate degrees (64 and 126 respectively) and the insistence that the disciplinary transfer paths that those faculty groups had created two years earlier, and the SUNY general education requirements, had to be embedded in degree programs at both the associate and baccalaureate level. Students could begin at any SUNY campus and, after two years the equivalent of full-time work, transfer to another SUNY campus with their general education largely or completely satisfied and they would have rising junior status in their chosen major.

The latter proved, as one would expect, to be more difficult to achieve than many realized. The system-wide faculty governance groups passed resolutions in opposition to the imposition of curricular mandates, especially those of involving introductory courses in majors that were not always organized in a similar pattern. The result was the remarkable process we witnessed this past semester, with more than Continued on page 14
Through an extensive strategic planning process, SUNY has committed itself to policies and practices that are fully consistent with the completion agenda. In fact, last December the Chancellor hosted a two-day meeting of campus presidents at which specific targets were set for the metrics already identified for the SUNY Report Card.

As we can see in the extensive data sets called for in the Report Card, the SUNY completion agenda has many moving parts, including support for the Educational Opportunity Program, with many of the newer initiatives clustered under the umbrella of the system’s participation in “Access to Success.” As a system, we start from a reasonably good position, with both Stony Brook University and SUNY New Paltz having been identified as achieving distinction in graduating significant numbers of low-income students, providing models for other campuses to follow. In addition, in the 2009 Access to Success report, SUNY is named as having achieved the highest six-year graduation rate for low-income students for public systems across the nation. Good certainly, but not good enough.

As is evident from the above, the SUNY system has taken its long-standing mission to provide the broadest possible access to the highest quality public higher education to students across New York State, and it has re-affirmed that mission by extensively re-working its policies and practices governing student transfer, by its work with the pre-collegiate educational system, and by its commitment to degree completion. Each of these initiatives reveals the enormous difficulties of coordinating sixty-four campuses into a single set of policies or procedures, but each also reveals the possibilities of a state-supported system of post-secondary education to leverage size, scale, and complexity to better meet the shifting educational needs of its constituent citizenry. That has been the SUNY promise and it remains our primary mission.

In May 2013, Upstate University Hospital changed its policy on “Interpreter Services for Patients with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) or Hearing/Visual or Speech Impairments” for both its downtown and community campuses. No longer would it provide live interpreter services unless specifically requested or if a dire emergency arose. Instead, health care providers were strongly encouraged to utilize telephone translation services and video where literally available with a goal of 90% compliance.

The advantage of this policy is that the hospital was able to save approximately $1 million in contracts with live interpreters services over the course of the year. This perspective, however, may be shortsighted for more than just the budget of the local non-profit interpreter services. Clinical errors resulting from inadequate interpreter services can lead to greater costs due to higher patient return rates, more emergency department visits, wrongful injury or death-law suits (Lee et al. 2005). Thus, it may be more cost effective to provide live interpreter services than to rely upon inadequate telephone and video translators.

Anecdotally, the fallout from this policy has been palpable. Within a month of this policy effective date, I took care of a Somali woman who had a precipitous delivery at our non-obstetrical hospital campus. I was instructed by the nursing supervisor to use a Vocera communication device, which I wear around my neck during shifts in the Emergency Department (ED), to contact a telephone-based translator when this patient presented with active labor. The device kept picking up the woman’s laboring vocal expressions rendering the communication impossible. Another emergency medicine attending physician supervised the delivery, while I examined the newborn. After confirming good health of the neonate, I handed the young woman her beautiful baby boy with a smile, but no English or Somali words were exchanged between the health care team and her and her husband because of the language barrier. It was a surreal experience, both gratifying for its successes and frustrating for its failures!

Days later, I also took care of a Burmese girl having uncontrolled seizures. Her family spoke a dialect of Karin. I contacted the Language Line, but no interpreter was available who spoke the dialect. In the past, refugee communities often provided a live interpreter for any patients presenting to the ED, particularly useful for rarely spoken languages. In this case, I was unable to determine which medications the girl had been taking for seizures or what environmental or infectious exposures she might have had. This directly resulted in ordering more diagnostic tests because of inadequate history. This served to add costs to her care that could have been prevented with a live interpreter.

Motivated to bridge the language barrier gap at our hospital, I presented these two cases to the director of interpreter services at our hospital. To her credit, she said that both of these situations should have merited a live interpreter under the exception due to dire emergency. She told me that she would personally ensure the ability of attending physicians such as myself to request live interpreters for patients with dire emergencies.

Hoping to persuade her in the legally compliant direction, I invited a deaf law professor to witness her statements. He had prosecuted against several health care institutions in the 1990’s for failing to provide appropriate interpreter services for patients with Hearing, Speech, or Visual impairments under the American with Disabilities Act (ADA). His expertise on accommodations
for the deaf population is worth exploring, as the standard of care for providing live interpreters for American Sign Language is also threatened by alternative translator services, specifically video-based.

While the quality of live sign interpreters has been questioned in situations such as the fraudulent funeral, in-person certified health care translators are much appreciated by the deaf population. The National Association of the Deaf (NAD) issued a policy statement on the use of video remote interpreting (VRI) in hospitals in April 2008. “It is the position of the NAD that the use of on-site interpreters should always be paramount, and when VRI is used in the absence of any available on-site interpreter, it must be used properly in terms of policy, procedure, and technology. Failure to conform to these standards is not only a failure to ensure effective communication under federal law but also creates unnecessary risks to the medical welfare and health care of deaf individuals.”

Anecdotally, a family friend of mine who is deaf went to a non-SUNY major academic medical center ED complaining of chest pain. He was not provided an interpreter and became agitated, resulting in chemical sedation and physical restraints. This should never have happened and should never happen again, but I am sure that it would if the trend away from automatically offering live interpreter services continues to profligate.

Let us get back to negotiation with hospital administration. The director of interpreter services reassured me that the nurses and nursing supervisors would be reeducated about the ability of attending physicians to request live interpreters for patients with dire emergencies. I have since not had any difficulty obtaining live interpreters when needed, but a sense of inadequate service to patients remains, in part because the trend away from live interpreter services toward telephone and video translators will continue. A neighboring non-SUNY community hospital has also recently switched to exclusive video translation services for LEP and deaf patients. There is no denying the momentum within the health care industry to spend money on technology in the spirit of cutting costs. Witness the federal government-incentivized campaign for electronic health records.

Where do underlying ethical principles found in hospital mission statements guide us? Upstate University Hospital, in addition to the other SUNY hospitals, maintains a “Patients first” mentality. Even in the wake of budget cuts and a poorly thought-out hospital acquisition in Brooklyn, the principle of patient satisfaction ought to count in balance with cost. One study in a pediatric emergency department showed greater satisfaction of LEP patients with professional interpreters live than with interpreting services by telephone or ad hoc interpreters (Garcia et al., 2005).

Utilizing live interpreters also preserves valuable time of health care providers. Fagan et al. (2003) compared the duration of consultations of different strategies in an outpatient department: telephone interpreters (36.3 min. mean provider time; 93.6 min. clinic time); ad hoc interpreter organized by the patient (34.4 min mean provider time; 92.8 min. clinic time); live professional interpreter (26.8 min. mean provider time; 91.0 min. clinic time); and control English-speaking patients (28.0 min. mean provider time; 82.4 min. clinic time). Live interpreters required the least amount of time, even compared to no interpreters.

Most reasonable people agree that professional interpreters are “best practice”. Bischoff et al. (1999) emphasized the risks of using ad hoc interpreters and the need to use professional interpreters; they called for “coordination at national level, policy development and training, in order to ensure adequate communication and quality care for migrants” (p. 248). The question remains whether or not these professional interpreters should be virtual or actual. My answer is that live interpreters provide the most timely, cost-effective, and highest quality of care.

Crossman et al. (2010) provides the alternative perspective in a telephone translator industry-sponsored study. Visits by LEP families to a busy, urban pediatric emergency department were randomized to live interpreters, telephone interpreters or bilingual physicians. The in-person interpreter actually scored worse on quality and satisfaction than either the telephone or bilingual physicians. However, the authors pointed out several ways that live interpreters would seem to be advantageous over telephone interpreters, though that was not part of their study. Live interpreters could help LEP patients find their way if they had to visit multiple departments within a hospital. Live interpreters could provide continuity for patients, feedback to providers after interpretation, and explanations of particular cultural relevance. The authors admitted that a major limitation of their study was that their in-person interpreter was Peruvian, and the majority of their LEP patient families were Mexican. If the telephone translator service were mostly Mexican, this may have contributed to confounding bias of cultural translation. And, of course, the funding by CyraCom International, which provides telephone translation, raises skepticism of the results.

Locatis et al. (2009) used NIH funding to study the differences among the three methods in one medical center’s pediatric and post-partum clinics. His study found that patients preferred the in-person to video and telephone translators and video over telephone. Contrary to Fagan et al., the in-person interviews took significantly more time.

If best practices are controversial, then what is to be done? Short of performing a large-scale independently funded comparison study, the popular standard of care of providing live interpreters should be supported. Rather than continuing to protest for necessary patient resources in a financially precarious setting, however, I would like to offer a plausible, synergistic solution showcasing the oft-repeated slogan of the Chancellor: the “Power of SUNY.” Why not integrate foreign language departments as well as sign language instructors and clinical service departments into providing graduate level or upper

undergraduate level interpreter services? Training programs emphasizing medical terminology and patients’ health information privacy are widely available. Students and faculty alike would find the experience mutually beneficial. And patients would suffer less in the darkness of being lost in translation.
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Administrative Costs and Instructional Budgets

Minna Barrett
Comprehensive College at Old Westbury, New York

In his book, The Fall of the Faculty: The Rise of the All Administrative University and Why It Matters (2011 Oxford University Press), Benjamin Ginsberg, David Bernstein Professor of Political Science at Johns Hopkins University, writes that faculty across the sectors of colleges and universities throughout the United States have been losing ground in their salary growth, academic funding and in their authority to design curriculum and insure the quality of the education they deliver. Fulltime faculty are being terminated and replaced with adjunct faculty. Ginsberg explains that along with the budget shift, a power shift has taken place as faculty control of the design, delivery and assessment of the curriculum has moved further out of the jurisdiction of faculties and is dictated more and more by administrators who are often not academically qualified.

He argues that when those of us now senior in the professoriate were acquiring their undergraduate and graduate education, the administrators who argued over and served to administer the educational and research missions of the campus were drawn from the faculty, few of whom trained to be professional college administrators. Once culled almost exclusively from the faculty and loyal to it, they understood and typically valued the traditional mechanisms and functions of the faculty and the academy. Today, as public funds wither, more and more professional administrators are increasingly loyal to boards and councils and fundraising.

These administrators pressure, direct or dictate to faculty what was once the purview of the faculty—educational programs and curricular decision-making—and it is accomplished often by ignoring the required governance mechanisms granted to faculty by policy and tradition. The current trend toward professional, vocational and career-driven education, and away from liberal education, is part of this redirection. Across the US, administrators have successfully argued to reduce the requirements of liberal education. Breadth of knowledge is “irrelevant,” so long as students meet a minimal standard set of courses and course distribution.

Ginsberg argues that an increasing reliance on vocational and professional training and the declining importance of critical thinking and foundational academic skills are occasioned, fundamentally, by the expansion of higher education administrators, most of whom do not hold appropriate academic qualification or have the requisite academic experience, and most of whom are detached from the fundamental mission of the university: to learn, to search, to serve. And, their redirecting the academic focus of the curriculum and reducing the number of fulltime invested faculty make it more difficult for faculty to engage in the service tasks required to maintain the academic quality of the campus mission. Without control of the academic process, and with a lack of reward for and commitment to governance service, faculty rights that have been guaranteed by policy and tradition are seriously undermined.

The impact of this expansion in administrative staffing, Ginsberg argues, is the erosion of quality education, particularly in the undergraduate curriculum which is being directed away from its traditional mission of integrating preparation for a “chosen” career during a time that allows students to experiment with and develop interests and commitments to a life long obligation, with an education that prepares students to become responsible adults in a complex society with a “working” understanding of the values and mechanisms of democratic institutions. Ginsberg argues that the mission of the university is being undermined by the drive for “efficiency,” curricular control and reification of administrative values while undermining the academic values of research for the production of technical and social knowledge intended to innovate social progress by challenging the status quo.

In his review of “Labor Intensive or Labor Expensive: Changing Staffing and Compensation Patterns in Higher Education”, Scott Carlson summarizes substantive data and conclusions from a report released by the nonprofit, nonpartisan Delta Cost Project, in support of Ginsberg’s themes. In the Chronicle of Higher Education (February 5, 2014), Carlson reports that “the number of full-time faculty and staff members per professional or managerial administrator declined by roughly 40 percent, to around 2.5 to 1”, in the past decade.

He further reports that at most types of colleges, “Full-time faculty members also lost ground to part-time instructors who now compose half of the instructional staff at most types of colleges, particularly at public master’s and bachelor’s institutions”.

Carlson posits that a range of critiques of the academy isolate the cost of instructional salaries as accounting for the rise in tuition and other costs at public colleges and universities. Donna M. Desrochers, an author of the above referenced report, explains that this isn’t the case. “Faculty salaries were ‘essentially flat’ from 2000-2012 . . . and we didn’t see the savings that we would have expected from the shift to part-time faculty.”

Private research campuses fared the best, apparently, while the public community colleges fared the worst, losing both full and part-time staff, but increasing professional staff. Carlson concludes that, “The expansion in wages and salaries derives not from instruction, institutional support, or academic support, but from student services, which can include, athletics, admissions, psychological counseling, and career counseling, among other activities”.

While administrative and professional staff do support students outside the classroom, are they more effective at retaining students than engaged fulltime faculty dedicated to supporting student success in academics? While extra-curricular activities (now referred to as co-curricular, in line with validation for the growth of this sector) are part of the experience of student development, it is primarily academic success that leads to the earning of a diploma and, therefore, attending to the needs of the academic mission that is central to student success. Consequently, adequate funding for the academic side of public higher education is fundamental to student success.

Many of us have talked ourselves out sharing our experiences with the way that the shift to adjuncts to reduce academic costs, no matter how competent and dedicated they are, is no match for a complement of fully engaged full-time faculty. Neither adjuncts nor professional staff are required to go though the review that faculty must. We already know that an adjunct faculty member, even when prepared at the academic level of a full-time tenure-track professor, isn’t compensated for holding office hours, advising, support of independent study/research or service learning. At SUNY College at Old Westbury, that can also include adjunct faculty with little or no academic training in or commitment to the fragile social justice, sustainability and global citizenship missions.

Inflating Academic Costs—Deflating Administrative Costs

The accounting of the academic cost of higher education is often inflated when administrators (not department chairs) selected from faculty ranks remain salaried from the academic side. Their departments continue to carry their salaries and they are replaced by adjuncts. The department and the
students lose the benefit of an experienced fulltime faculty member because their work is mostly administrative while their pay remains attached to the department. Perhaps to allow for, or to rationalize, the practice, the faculty member may retain a relatively minimal teaching load (and might continue to engage in departmental affairs) while the substantially greater proportion of her/his time is spent in administrative duties. Dollars that should be charged to the administrative budget are instead “packed into” the academic instructional budget, incurring costs with no direct instructional benefit to the department. This results in a distorted reporting of the real costs of administration and the burden on instructional support.

There is yet another practice that inflates academic budgets, even when the administrator is salaried from the administrative side. The administrator returns to fulltime teaching with the enhanced, administrative salary and concomitant benefits disproportionate to department colleagues who have been solely on the academic side. These colleagues haven’t had the advantage of prior administrative salaries to boost their current pay, despite their potentially equally or more valuable direct mission-related contributions to teaching, research and service. This can happen even when the administrator has never received a 360-degree performance review as is required of faculty.

Consequently, the academic budget carries the additional burden of an administrative salary supplement as well as the added cost of the accrued higher level of benefits for the work-life of that returning faculty member—all at the expense of the taxpayer. As a result, the academic budget is perceived to be greater than should be the case. While some measure of compensation to a faculty member for taking on administrative responsibilities may be reasonable, returning to full-time faculty status with that supplement and added benefits is, in my opinion, not only not justi-

**Declining State Budgets**

Drastically declining state allocations are destructive to maintaining the consistency and quality of degree granting public higher education. When I was a student at a highly competitive state university, it was funded by state budgets that accounted for 81% of the costs of maintaining that excellence. At that time, the governor lauded public higher education and the value it brought to the State, coveting his involvement and urging children of the state to attend the fine system he supported. Today, the same system the citizens supported at 81% of its cost, they now support at merely 19% of the cost, while students and their families carry 81% of the costs. Equally important, this inadequate level of support for public higher education is further challenged on the instructional side as a larger proportion of the allocation is now devoted to administrative rather than to academic costs.

This declining state support for public higher education, and its traditional focus on providing a liberal education, undermines the value of this activity’s importance in creating critical social capital, as well access to knowledge for generations to come that is essential in dealing with technological and social problems faced by the state, the region and the nation. Ken O’Brien described it effectively in the 2013 Fall/Winter issue of Bulletin, when he wrote, “I believe the strongest contribution we make to the economic health of our communities, our state, and our nation is the nurturing, development and creation of human capital. This is the indirect value-added element we offer the state.”

---

**Mini-symposium on Non-instructional Administrative Costs**

**Editor’s note:**

In the 2013 Fall/Winter issue of this Bulletin, D. Bruce Johnston, former SUNY Chancellor and specialist on financing higher education, wrote on article entitled, “US Public Universities in and Era of Continuing Austerity: More of the Same or Profound Change,” in which he highlights three possible changes in higher education that might play a role in reducing its costs: increasing the instructional loads of at least some faculty, significantly reducing non-instructional administrative expenditures, and changing the way knowledge is conveyed and students learn.

In that same issue, a panel of faculty commented on the effect of the first issue, increasing the teaching loads of some faculty.

In the current issue, a panel of faculty look at the issue of reducing non-instructional administrative expenditures, though from varied perspectives.

In a future issue of the Bulletin, the issue of changing the way knowledge is conveyed and students learn will be the subject of yet another mini-symposium.

---

**Administrative Bloat in the Age of Cutbacks**

David Carson  
SUNY Buffalo State

The area of greatest growth—and expense—on college campuses over the past generation has been in administration. Students and their parents across the nation have the right to wonder if they are getting the proper bang for their bucks.

According to an article by Benjamin Ginsberg in the September/October issue of Washington Monthly (“Administrators Ate My Tuition”), in 1975 there was one college administrator for every 84 students and one professional staff person for every fifty students. In 2005 those numbers had changed to one administrator for every 68 students and one professional staff person for every 21 students. In the meantime, the percentage of full time faculty has either remained flat or actually declined.

My own campus at SUNY Buffalo State offers an illustration. Between 2003 and 2013 the number of vice presidents increased from four to five. The number of associate vice presidents jumped from ten to thirteen. The number of deans went from four to six. The number of associate deans went from three to four. And the number of assistant deans jumped from one to four. This constituted an increase in the number of these positions from 22 to 32. Organizational flow charts from 2003 and 2013 show a net increase of twenty administrative positions, from 126 to 146. There was not a corresponding increase in the number of full time faculty.

This seems to be the new reality on college campuses: there has been an increase in administration, a decrease in full time faculty.

Continued on page 18
time faculty, an increase in part-time faculty, rising tuition, and decreasing state support.

There are various explanations for this. The external demands on colleges and universities are greater than ever before. Government regulations regarding hiring, safety, student aid, athletics, and performance have created a layer of bureaucracy that is new and enduring.

Another external demand has come in the form of unfunded mandates from system administrators (who themselves have been multiplying in number). Over the past 15 years in SUNY, those mandates have related to general education, assessment, seamless transfer, and teacher education, just to name a few. Each directive must be met by each campus with a plan for implementation, an actual implementation, metrics for assessment, and then a review. These mandates have increased the bureaucratic workload, and campuses have responded by hiring more administrators and professional staff just to keep up.

Another external demand placed on colleges comes from the accreditation agencies. With pressure for individual programs—teacher education, music, business, communications, etc.—to receive professional accreditation, campuses must find someone to handle the avalanche of paperwork, and that usually means dumping the duty on an already overburdened department chair, or else hiring an accreditation guru. The same holds true may be glitzy, but they are not at the heart of the academic for Middle States accreditation. These agencies are beasts that must be fed, so campuses feed them. But the cost is usually at the expense of scholars in the classrooms.

One last external force which has driven the proliferation of administrative positions over the past 15 years in SUNY has been SUNY’s own funding models. Models such as RAM (Resource Allocation Model) and BAP Budget Allocation Process) dictated that funding would be driven by enrollment, so campuses had no choice but to respond with administrative positions to create marketing strategies and campaigns, recruit students from near and far, entice them with plush housing and catchy slogans until they submit their first check for tuition. Then, each campus must offer an increasing number of support services for those students in order to keep them and to assure them of the opportunity to graduate on time.

In fact, according to Scott Carlson in his February 6, 2014 article, “Administrator Hiring Drove 28% Boom in Higher-Ed Work Force, Report Says,” published in The Chronicle of Higher Education, most of the expansion in administration positions has come in the area of student services. The report cited by Carlson, “Labor Intensive or Labor Expensive: Changing Staffing and Compensation Patterns in Higher Education” was conducted by the Delta Cost Project, a non-partisan, non-profit organization that analyzes college finances. It shows that faculty salaries remained flat between 2000 and 2012, and that the shift to part-time faculty did not yield the savings that campuses had anticipated. Those potential savings were eaten up as the ratio of full time faculty to administrators declined sharply. The report also shows that, “the expansion in wages and salaries derived not from instruction, institutional support, or academic support, but from student services, which can include athletics, admissions, psychological counseling, and career counseling, among other activities. Nearly every type of college had increases in that area, with little growth, or even declines, in other areas.” (Carlson, “Administrator Hiring Drove 28% Boom in Higher-Ed Work Force, Report Says,” The Chronicle of Higher Education: Administration, February 5, 2014.) According to Carlson, many businesses have outsourced services which are not central to what they do, but colleges and universities are trying to do it all, even if “it” is not at the heart of the academic mission.

So, what can be done? There doesn’t seem to be any clear consensus about how to reverse the trend toward administrative bloat, but perhaps there are some approaches that can help. First, within SUNY, system administrators could help by making certain that any mandate from Albany is fully funded. This would prevent campuses from being forced to divert funds from academic use to administrative use. System administration could also help by coming up with a funding model that is tied more to academic success and less on enrollment. Marketing strategies and ad campaigns mission of SUNY.

Second—and this will not be popular with faculty—some of the duties currently performed by administrators could be performed as well or better by faculty, especially in the areas of student support and academic support. Faculty can advise, they can set up orientation programs. They can create their own first year experiences for incoming freshmen. Granted, there are many things that faculty cannot do, but, for the good of the institution and for the good of the students, faculty could do more.

Third, make administrators more accountable to their home institutions. Faculty have multiple levels of assessment that they must deal with each and every year: student evaluations, peer evaluations, program evaluations, general education assessment, departmental reviews, etc. Most administrators do not have anything nearly equivalent. There should be continuous reviews of administrators involving the entire campus. Faculty have to write annual reports, so should administrators and they need to be held accountable for job performance based on standards and rubric which are widely published and understood. Administrators are big on review of academic arrays. They should also be subject to reviews of administrative arrays.

Fourth, put administrators who have academic backgrounds (and the vast majority do) back in the classroom once a semester or once a year. That would help reduce the reliance on part-time faculty, plus, it would give administrators some insight into the faculty perspective.

Fifth, consider the possibility of part-time administrators. Most administrators would probably scoff at the idea, but if there are more than enough out-of-work Ph.Ds. who are desperate enough for a teaching position that they will teach a class of ninety students for $2500 a semester, there must be more than enough out-of-work MBAs and unemployed graduates of management programs who are willing to do fund raising for a similar amount. I’m not holding my breath.

Higher education is at a crossroads. It seems as though every news story about America’s colleges and universities focuses on violence on campuses, the appalling ignorance of too many college students about science, math, American history (and other subjects as well), or the skyrocketing cost of a college education. Something can be done about the costs, but it is going to take a change of heart and a change of will.
Zimpher’s systemness is designed to transition the SUNY system from a state in which the whole is “equal” to the sum of its parts, to a state in which the whole is “greater” than the sum of its parts. This essay examines two related elements of systemness: procurement and strategic sourcing.

Campus autonomy in SUNY has led to considerable replication, redundancy, and waste in operational functions. In the current economic climate, one can reasonably ask “is the model of campus autonomy in SUNY sustainable?” When the system adopted its current federated form during the Rockefeller years, public support for higher education and the resources to pay for it were comparatively robust. Equally important were societal values and a political consensus that investment in public higher education is a universal public good. As former SUNY Chancellor, D. Bruce Johnstone, astutely advises, “The American public research university has been caught in a decades-long era of rising costs and declining public funding, ameliorated only by internal reallocations, a loss of tenured and tenure-track faculty positions, aggressive fund raising, and very high tuition increases.” (Johnstone, D. Bruce 2013)

Johnstone’s “bird’s eye view” of the higher education dilemma—rising costs and declining revenues—is equally relevant for all of the sectors of the State University of New York.

This essay adopts a different level of analysis, a “worm’s eye view” of the higher education dilemma, by examining the systemic consequences of campus autonomy in decentralized procurement and non-strategic sourcing. “Strategic sourcing is the collaborative and structured process of critically analyzing an organization’s spending and using this information to make business decisions about acquiring commodities and services more effectively and efficiently.” (DPAP, Defense Procurement and Acquisitions Policy, http://www.acq.osd.mil/dpap/ss/) Strategic sourcing is a simple concept to understand, but far more challenging to implement in an operational environment in which campus independence and autonomy define the system. The idea, basically, is to purchase commodities and services in ways that yield savings through economies of scale. Almost everyone can identify with saving money by purchasing goods in larger quantities, the so-called “quantity deal.” A pound of oregano costs proportionately less than a single ounce. A ream of standard sized 20 lb. printer paper at Staples costs $6.95, while a case, 10 reams, costs $53.99, or $5.39 per ream. If SUNY purchases 100,000 reams annually, even with this rudimentary, retail pricing example, the savings would be $156,000, roughly equivalent to the cost of two tenure track faculty positions. Presumably, the unit price at 100,000 reams, or any commodity purchased in large quantities, decreases unit cost proportionately. The scale of SUNY purchasing could potentially result in highly significant purchasing power, which is not currently being exploited as extensively as it might be.

The same principle holds across the spectrum of commodities and many contracted services: library books and electronic databases, computers, monitors, paint, plumbing supplies, toilet paper, hand towels, rock salt, heavy equipment rentals and elevator repair contracts, virtually everything we use and many things we take for granted in the day-to-day delivery of education and education services on our campuses. SUNY Director of Shared Services, Laura Stetson, reported that the system campuses enter into contracts with 438 industrial equipment vendors annually and 1300 advertising vendors in any given year. (Stetson, Laura 2014) When the procurement of some goods and services is centralized at the level of the system, significant savings are realized and waste is reduced. The partial centralization of library resources and electronic databases has led the way in SUNY shared services, demonstrating that the system and its individual campuses can benefit from strategic sourcing.

Students and faculty can be better served and scarce resources can be redeployed in service to the academic program.

When we consider the diverse array of goods and services purchased by a system the size of SUNY, the potential savings that might be redirected to the academic program are immense. Currently within SUNY, with few exceptions, purchasing and procurement takes place at the campus level in local purchasing departments who guard closely their authority over relevant processes. The SUNY procurement process is decentralized, “While there are some university-wide contracts, each of the 30 state-operated campuses does the vast majority of their own purchasing,” (http://old.suny.edu/meansbusiness/vendors/business_with_SUNY.cfm) Purchasing and procurement on SUNY campuses even descends to the department or program level. Many academic department budgets allow for considerable discretion in purchasing of equipment and supplies, contributing further to potential inefficiencies and waste. Department level purchases are priced much closer to the retail end of the pricing spectrum.

The SUNY shared services initiative was launched in early 2011, when the SUNY chancellor announced a 3-year goal to reduce administrative costs by 5% and redirect the savings, $100 million, toward student and academic supports. SUNY’s goal as articulated by the chancellor, is to turn the savings back into “instruction and direct student support.” As of 2014, $28 million in savings has been implemented and $56.6 million in savings has been identified. (Stetson, L.)

In principle, no one objects to saving scarce dollars by being more efficient, and certainly, no one objects to reinvesting those savings in the academic program. However, the history of campus autonomy and weak “systemness” makes any departure from the historical and cultural norm more challenging than one might think. On a more direct level, purchasing and procurement offices...
and the personnel charged with local responsibility for procurement have vested interests in preserving the processes and practices as they now exist. The greatest challenge to the shared services initiative will be to reduce threat perceptions of the purchasing and procurement professionals and draw on their expertise in the development of new processes and practices.

There are also practical concerns and some efficiencies in purchasing products and services locally, and this may contribute to resistance to change. Campuses will always need to obtain some goods and services on short notice. In some cases, local vendors will offer better deals and will deliver the product or service more economically and expeditiously. Too much centralization and coordination of procurement is potentially as wasteful as too little. Campuses should retain their procurement authority where and when it makes sense, just as the system should hold authority over large scale strategic sourcing. One need only recollect the legendary inefficiencies of the former Soviet Union’s “planned economy,” where the use of every paperclip required approval from central planners. The challenge for SUNY is to find the proper balance between local and system-wide sourcing in order to benefit from our size and buying power.

Strategic sourcing is but the first step in the shared services agenda. Eventually, the initiative will look to gain efficiencies in various functional areas, such as IT infrastructure, including data centers and networking; IT enablement, including end user services; finance, including general accounting; Human Resources, including self-services; and in academic and student support services, including admissions and financial aid services. These areas are likely to be more challenging in terms of cultural change than in the realm of purchasing and procurement.

While purchasing and procurement represent the proverbial “low hanging fruit” of shared services, higher order functions like IT infrastructure and student academic and support services may draw to the surface fierce territorial sentiments and even stronger resistance than we observe in purchasing and procurement. Technical and logistical problems in this realm are challenging, but manageable over time. Dozens of university systems around the country have already proven that shared services can reduce redundancy and waste. The larger challenge for SUNY is cultural. The system-wide cultural value of campus autonomy runs deep in SUNY and is accompanied by entrenched bureaucratic structures and organizational practices. Finally, people matter most. Leadership at System Administration and on the campuses will need to capture the creativity, energy, and enthusiasm of every person who works in the procurement chain. Without support at the base, the best laid plans of leadership will meet with skepticism and willful resistance.
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While purchasing and procurement represent the proverbial “low hanging fruit” of shared services, higher order functions like IT infrastructure and student academic and support services may draw to the surface fierce territorial sentiments and even stronger resistance than we observe in purchasing and procurement
SUNY Fredonia receives the first ever SUNY Shared Governance Award.

Some ideas they have implemented include having the Campus Governance Leaders (CGLs) serving on the provost’s council; monthly email from the CGL to all faculty and staff; using clickers for all voting as well as attendance at faculty meetings; using Condorcet Internet Voting Service (free, from Cornell) for online voting and record retention. There was also emphasis on viewing bylaws as the campus “operating system.” Defining roles and processes can maximize trust and confidence as well as efficiency.

An excellent roundtable on diversity in shared governance yielded no solutions, but generated lots of excellent discussion. It became obvious that everyone must consciously work at this. Mentoring, guiding people into faculty governance, rewarding people for participation; all of these are effective practices, and diversity must be a priority.

An assortment of papers and panels focused on different aspects of shared governance. In one of the first papers, Dr. Gwen Kay spoke on the use of task forces as a model for shared governance. Questions regarding this paper focused on the implementation of recommendations as well as subsequent follow-up of them; and the involvement of professional staff and students. One audience member, a Trustee, suggested that Trustees might be useful members or resources on some task forces. A panel from Morrisville State College spoke to the issue of cultivating shared governance by seizing opportunities: Middle States accreditation, strategic planning, and preparing for a presidential search. The group at Morrisville used the opportunity created by chaos to refine their by-laws and increase shared governance. The panel members (which included the provost and interim president) talked about the need for committees, task forces, etc. to take on substantive issues; the work must have value if faculty and others are expected to invest their time and energy. A paper focusing on the budget process was presented by faculty at Binghamton University. They noted that according to the 1966 statement on Governance of Colleges and Universities, budgeting is a core feature of shared governance. There were many suggestions about how to follow best practices, either those in the SUNY Operations Handbook, or the National Advisory Council on State and Local Budgets. Two papers viewed “systemness” as an opportunity to enhance shared governance on the campuses. For example, the University Faculty Senate provides resources for sharing and learning as well as an opportunity for campuses to share their concerns with the Chancellor. A structured orientation program was described which provided leadership training for incoming CGLs. It will be held again (June 5-6 in Albany) and all campuses are encouraged to send CGLs AND Student Assembly representatives.

The morning keynote presentation by Benjamin Ginsberg began with his statement, “Shared governance is an oxymoron.” He spoke of the administrative bloat which has greatly diminished faculty voice in decision-making processes. He recommended that faculty “increase consciousness” concerning lack of faculty involvement in important issues and become more militant in objecting to administrative demands.

Finally, the wrap-up roundtable on “Working Together to Share Shared Governance” presented the perspectives of faculty, students, presidents, provosts, and trustees. The takeaway message for the participants in this conference is that shared governance is alive and well at SUNY, but much work remains. However, future conferences on Shared Governance need to involve representative administrators, faculty, staff, and students from campuses in which shared governance is not routinely practiced. Attendees without a doubt returned to their campuses excited and invigorated. Ideas, challenges and best practices discussed over those two days may have laid the groundwork for the next campus to receive the 2nd SUNY Shared Governance Award. ■
At its 3rd Annual Meeting and Dinner in Saratoga Springs on May 20, 2014, the Academy formally inducted the 2013 cohort of Distinguished Faculty into the Academy. It also presented the Distinguished Academy Medalion of Distinction to Dr. Ralph M. Garruto, a distinguished anthropologist, human population biologist, and neuroscientist. Dr. Garruto’s long career has spanned research with natural experimental models, infectious and chronic disease, gene environment interactions, health transitions, food chain disorders, neurodegenerative diseases, and studies of human biological variation in evolutionary context.

The formal meeting prior to the dinner included a panel discussion of Open SUNY that was moderated by David Lavelle, the former SUNY Provost. Carey Hatch, the Associate Provost for Academic Technology and Information Services provided an overview of Open SUNY, which was followed by a discussion of the advantages and potential problems of Open SUNY by Ken O’Brien, former President of the University Faculty Senate and Jamie Dangler, Vice President for Academics for UUP. The panel discussion was followed by a progress report by the members of the programs that were being worked on: James Hurtgen (Fredonia) on the Visiting Distinguished Scholars Program, Norman Goodman (Stony Brook) and Robert Kraushaar (System Administration) on Mentoring Programs and Research Facilitation for Junior Faculty, and Caroline Dowling (Potsdam) and Elise Newkirk-Koffila (System Administration) on Community Engagement and a general question and answer period for all attendees.

### Celebrating New York State and New Yorkers

**Daniel S. Marrone**

**Farmingdale Sate College**

Covering areas within Rockland and Orange Counties, Harriman State Park is the second largest facility in the New York State Park System. Highlighting this New York State Park is the Anthony Wayne Recreation Area (see photograph at right).

Who was this person and why is he referred in history as “Mad” Anthony Wayne?

Born on January 1, 1745, Wayne sensed at an early age that his destiny would be related to leadership in battle. Growing up in Chester County, Pennsylvania, Wayne enjoyed a fairly comfortable life at the 500-acre Waynesborough estate that was inherited by his father, Isaac Wayne in the early 1700’s. Anthony was schooled in the arts and sciences at the College of Philadelphia that is now called the University of Pennsylvania. An excellent student in mathematics, he subsequently became a surveyor. In this role, Wayne developed stamina for rigorous outdoor life while at the same time he met influential individuals such as the most famous Philadelphia, Benjamin Franklin. With this connection, Wayne was asked to join an association that in 1764 purchased land in Nova Scotia for a new colony. Wayne’s role in this endeavor was to serve as agent and surveyor for these newly purchased lands.

After a year in Nova Scotia, Wayne returned to Pennsylvania and began courting Mary “Polly” Penrose, the daughter of the prominent Philadelphia merchant, Bartholomew Penrose. They were married on March 25, 1766, and settled into the Waynesborough family estate where Wayne farmed and opened a tanning business while still surveying for clients. In 1774, Wayne began a lifelong joint career in politics and in the military. That year, he was elected to represent Chester County at the Pennsylvania Provincial Convention. The purpose of this gathering was to formulate a response to Great Britain’s heavy-handed treatment of its American colonies and specifically to the martial law imposed upon Boston’s citizens. On January 2, 1776, Wayne was unanimously recommended by the Pennsylvania Committee of Safety to the rank of Colonel of the 4th Battalion of the Pennsylvania line. A day later, the Continental Congress voted its approval for Wayne at this rank in the Continental Army.

**Battles of Brandywine, Paoli, and Germantown**

By the end of 1776, following the leadership capability he displayed at the Battle of Trois-Rivières (Three Rivers), in Quebec, Canada, Wayne was promoted to Brigadier General by the Continental Congress on February 21, 1777, and given the command of Fort Ticonderoga in the New York frontier. However, Wayne found nothing but hardship at the fort with inadequate food, clothing, and war materials for the men he commanded. He was glad to be relieved of his duties at the fort in mid-May 1777.

Wayne then served with distinction at the Battles of Brandywine and Germantown occurring on September 11 and October 4, 1777, respectively. Between these battles, however, Wayne came under harsh criticism for inadequately protecting his troops camped at the Village of Paoli. What became to be known as the “Paoli Massacre” occurred on the evening of September 20th. Overnight, the British stormed the Patriot camp and bayonetted hundreds of unprepared American Continental soldiers. Always protective of his reputation, Wayne demanded a court martial from Commander-in-Chief George Washington in order to clear his name. Wayne did indeed achieve this objective because the court martial board concluded a verdict of “not guilty” on November 1. Furthermore, the court martial board commended Wayne as “an active, brave and vigilant officer.”

Valley Forge, Raid at Stony Point, and 1781 Mutiny

He next served with distinction at the Valley Forge encampment during the arduous winter and spring of 1778. On June 28 of that year, Wayne and his Pennsylvania regiment performed admirably at the large-scale Battle of Monmouth Courthouse in New Jersey. Of even greater significance to Wayne’s stellar military career was his carefully planned and successfully executed raid at a British-held fort in New York on July 15-16, 1779. During the night, Wayne’s troops launched a surprise bayonet attack on this encampment at Stony Point which juts out over the Hudson River (the raid took place not far from the Recreation Area that bears his name).

Wayne and his Pennsylvania regiment viewed this raid in some ways as “payback” for the “Paoli Massacre” perpetrated by the British one year earlier.

From late 1779 through the beginning of 1781, Wayne commanded troops at various New Jersey and New York locations. Life at these various encampments was tedious and, at times, precarious. On January 1, 1781, many soldiers of the Pennsylvania line mutinied for being without the basic necessities of life and for not being paid for over a year. After killing one of their officers and wounding two others, the mutineers marched to Philadelphia. Extremely tense negotiations ensued between the mutineers and the then President of Pennsylvania, Joseph Reed. Fortunately, with almost all of the mutineers’ demands being met including a general amnesty for the rebellious soldiers themselves, the mutiny ended.

**Southern Command, Promotion to Major General, and Stifling Debts**

In mid-1781, Wayne continued to serve as the commander of the Pennsylvania line under the overall leadership of Major General Nathanael Greene and, at times, of the Marquis de Lafayette. By July of that year, Wayne and his troops were constantly on the move in Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. In September and October 1781, Wayne’s regiment...
directly participated in the massive defeat of the British army at Yorktown, Virginia. For all intents and purposes, General George Lord Cornwallis and his British army were now defeated. Subsequently, Wayne was ordered further south to complete the victory of the American Patriots by severing alliances the Native American Creek and Cherokee tribes had with the now defeated British forces. For his esteemed leadership and services while leading his troops in Georgia, Wayne was granted a sprawling rice plantation that was called “Richmond.” In the closing days of the Revolutionary War in fall 1783, Wayne was promoted to the rank of Major General in the Continental Army.

After the war, Wayne turned his energies toward Pennsylvanian politics. After several unsuccessful attempts, Wayne was finally elected to the U.S. Congress in 1791. Alas, his tenure there lasted only six months because the U.S. Congress voted to overturn the election results due to voting irregularities. His political troubles, however, paled compared to his financial difficulties as the result of several failed business ventures. Creditors seeking to arrest him for non-payment were threatening him with debtors’ prison. As a consequence, Wayne was forced to stay away from his native state as much as possible in order to be out of reach of his Philadelphia creditors. By 1792, Wayne recovered financially by the lucrative sale of his Georgia plantation. Unfortunately, at this time, his health was rapidly deteriorating due to recurring bouts of fevers as well as acute gout both in his arms and legs.

Wayne Organizes and Takes Command of the “Legion Army”

The Treaty of Paris in 1783 ended hostilities between Great Britain and the new United States of America. However, the treaty had little effect in stopping the continual bloodshed occurring in the Northwest Territories of the new nation that today encompass large parts of the present-day states of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio. Native American tribes, agitated by the defeated though still ever-present British troops in the Territories, were fiercely defending their ancestral tribal lands from encroachment by American settlers from the original 13 colonies fanning out westward. Intense, years-long negotiations between the various Native American tribes and emissaries from the Washington Administration ended in failure. With negotiations going nowhere, President George Washington sent out American armies to quell the violence in the Territories. The 1790 and 1791 American forces sent by the president to achieve this aim both met with complete failure. In 1792, the President turned to Wayne as commander in a third attempt to quell the unrest in the Northwest Territories. Wayne organized his “Legion Army” whereby ground troops, mounted soldiers, and artillery were all combined into one cohesive military unit. Furthermore, Wayne provided substantial basic and advanced military training to his forces prior to entering battle. As always, Wayne was a stickler concerning military discipline—in his view, an essential component of a winning fighting force. With the right military organization, adequate training, and superlative leadership by Wayne, the “Legion Army” was able to defeat the Native American tribal forces at the pivotal Battle of Fallen Timbers occurring on August 20, 1794. [The name of this area was derived from the many trees that had fallen down in a previous hurricane.] The Native American tribes, now weakened militarily and entirely abandoned by British troops, had no other recourse than to sign their approval to the Treaty of Greeneville in August 1795. Under this treaty, the Native American tribes ceded vast territories to the new nation in return for various forms of compensation from the U.S. government.

Last Years and Legacies

Following the signing of the Treaty of Greeneville, Wayne returned home to widespread acclaim. However, Wayne suffered from poor health and from an utterly disloyal second-in-command, Brigadier General James Wilkinson. Unknown to Wayne, Wilkinson was continually sending numerous letters to President George Washington criticizing Wayne’s ability to command. Washington was well aware of Wayne’s abilities and disregarded Wilkinson’s letters. In future years—too late to relieve Wayne of his disloyal second-in-command—evidence was uncovered that directly implicated Wilkinson in several questionable activities including serving as a paid agent of the Spanish government! However, before all this damning evidence was revealed, Wayne had to contend with a subordinate constantly attempting to undermine his authority in the Northwest Territories. With an untrustworthy subordinate, he could not rely upon Wilkinson to act appropriately in his absence. Thus, Wayne was obliged to repeatedly journey to the territories to ensure that matters were attended to in correct order. Returning from one such trip, he took violently ill with a raging fever at Presque Island near today’s Erie, Pennsylvania. On December 15, 1796, he died from his illness.

Anthony Wayne has been widely recognized for his leadership and valor in battle. Well over one hundred U.S. cities, communities, counties, forests and parks, rivers, schools and colleges, streets and highways, and towns and villages are named after him. The last name, “Wayne,” was given by Hollywood moguls to actor John Wayne (born Marion Morrison) and to the comic book superhero Bruce Wayne to convey strength, resilience, and bravery—all Anthony Wayne attributes!

The extreme bravery and daring-do he demonstrated on numerous battlefield engagements earned him the sobriquet, “Mad” Anthony Wayne. When one visits New York’s Anthony Wayne Recreation Area in New York’s second largest park, it would be most fitting to remember what this American hero accomplished.
RESOLUTIONS

Resolution on Seamless Transfer Paths

Whereas, the University Faculty Senate and the Faculty Council of Community Colleges have long supported the concept of seamless transfer and have worked closely with SUNY System Administration to establish processes and procedures to ensure seamless transfer for students, and
Whereas, groups of faculty members from State-operated campuses and community colleges, including over 400 faculty members selected in consultation with the UFS and FCCC, worked together for at least a year to identify courses and descriptors typical of foundational and cognate courses in majors that represent those chosen by some 95% of transfer students in SUNY, and
Whereas, those disciplinary panels’ mandate was to identify course and content typical of requirements for the first two years for majors at SUNY institutions, but not to define these as universally required courses for those majors, and
Whereas, for seamless transfer to succeed, receiving institutions must accept satisfactorily completed courses from defined transfer paths in order to provide each student who has completed an A.A. or A.S. degree with the opportunity to complete the corresponding major in an additional two years of full-time study, a principle endorsed by the UFS, and
Whereas, the diversity of faculty and missions across the SUNY System appropriately leads to differences in the details of requirements and electives for majors, and
Whereas, the Faculty Council of Community Colleges passed resolution #ASA2: 2013-2014, Resolution in Opposition to a De Facto Core Curriculum on October 19, 2013, and
Whereas, the University Faculty Senate passed a Sense of the Senate motion at the 165th Plenary meeting at SUNY Maritime on October 26, 2013, opposing the creation of a core curriculum and charging the UFS Executive Committee to formulate a resolution to clarify the Senate’s position, and
Whereas, the Interim Provost is working with the UFS and FCCC leadership to establish a process that will allow larger groups of faculty in disciplinary fields to review the transfer paths and advise on their completeness, including any needed additions and/or subtractions,
Therefore, be it resolved that the University Faculty Senate Executive Committee requests that the Interim Provost work with Campus Chief Academic Officers in consultation with their campus faculty governance leaders to identify an appropriate faculty representative for each discipline that has a transfer path related to one for which the campus has a registered program; these disciplinary representatives will review the transfer path courses and descriptors and will recommend to the Interim Provost revisions if necessary to that transfer path, including whether courses/descriptors are universally required or recommended for transfer into a major, and
Be it further resolved that the University Faculty Senate Executive Committee requests that the Interim Provost work with Campus Chief Academic Officers in consultation with their campus faculty governance leaders to identify an appropriate faculty representative for each discipline that has a transfer path related to one for which the campus has a registered program; these disciplinary representatives will review the transfer path courses and descriptors and will recommend to the Interim Provost revisions if necessary to that transfer path, including whether courses/descriptors are universally required or recommended for transfer into a major, and
Be it further resolved that the University Faculty Senate Executive Committee requests that the Interim Provost work with Campus Chief Academic Officers in consultation with their campus faculty governance leaders to identify an appropriate faculty representative for each discipline that has a transfer path related to one for which the campus has a registered program; these disciplinary representatives will review the transfer path courses and descriptors and will recommend to the Interim Provost revisions if necessary to that transfer path, including whether courses/descriptors are universally required or recommended for transfer into a major, and

Resolution on the Status of the New York State College of Ceramics

Whereas the New York State College of Ceramics has been an integral part of the State University of New York since the founding of SUNY in 1948, and
Whereas the New York State College of Ceramics has, for more than a century, been a premier institution within its mission fields of visual fine arts, ceramics, glass, and materials, and
Whereas the New York State College of Ceramics is operated by Alfred University under contract with the State University of New York, and
Whereas the State of New York provides in excess of $10 million per year in support of the New York State College of Ceramics, and
Whereas concerns have been expressed to the University Faculty Senate about the marginalization of the New York State College of Ceramics within the Alfred University community, and

Whereas the link on the State University of New York website for the College of Ceramics points to the homepage of Alfred University, which in turn has no direct link to the New York State College of Ceramics nor any mention of it, and

Whereas the New York State College of Ceramics has no uniquely identifiable page on the Alfred University website, and

Whereas faculty representatives to the University Faculty Senate from the New York State College of Ceramics have repeatedly expressed to the Senate their concern regarding the diminished identity of the New York State College of Ceramics and the contributions of the State University of New York within the Alfred University community, and have further identified concerns regarding the use of state funds provided to Alfred University for purposes other than the support of the New York State College of Ceramics,

Whereas, the resolution in support of NYS College of Ceramics passed by the University Faculty Senate in 2005 (142-02-1) has not been fully implemented.

Now therefore be it resolved that

The University Faculty Senate requests the Chancellor to undertake a study of the relationship between the State University of New York, Alfred University, and the New York State College of Ceramics, such study to include consideration of alternate structural arrangements such as the affiliation of the New York State College of Ceramics with another SUNY unit.

166-02-1 passed without dissent, January 25, 2014

Resolution requesting participation of Alfred University and Cornell University in the process of recognizing SUNY faculty for distinguished achievement

Whereas, The State University of New York has a system of promotion of faculty members at state-operated campuses to the extraordinary ranks of Distinguished Professor, Distinguished Teaching Professor, Distinguished Service Professor or Distinguished Librarian, and

Whereas, SUNY faculty members at the NYS College of Ceramics and the statutory colleges of Cornell University are not eligible for such promotions as they are faculty members of Alfred University or Cornell University which do not have corresponding ranks, and

Whereas, the community colleges of the SUNY system do not employ extraordianry ranks but recognize distinguished faculty as an “honoring distinction,” and

Whereas, community colleges of the SUNY system do not employ extraordianry ranks but recognize distinguished faculty as an “honoring distinction,” and

Whereas, faculty members whose work demonstrates an ongoing commitment to excellence, intellectual vibrancy, elevated standards of instruction and rich contributions to public service deserve recognition by their colleagues,

Be it therefore resolved, The University Faculty Senate asks that the Chancellor correspond with the Presidents of Alfred and Cornell Universities inviting them to participate in making SUNY faculty members at their respective institutions eligible for the honorific distinction of distinguished faculty under the existing SUNY review and recommendation processes.

166-03-1 passed without dissent, January 25, 2014

AWARD

David Lavallee—Friend of the Senate

The “Friend of the Senate Award,” which recognizes “outstanding service to the Senate” by someone outside of the Senate, is not an annual award. It is only conferred when there is a suitable candidate for it; it has only been awarded about 5 times previously, the last time in 2012.

At this time, the Executive Committee of the University Faculty Senate voted to confer this honor on David K. Lavallee, former Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost. In conferring this award, President Peter Knuepfer made the following statement:

There were many reasons for this award. I would include among these your constant support for University Faculty Senate representatives and for shared governance—not just with words, which we hear from every administrator, but with deeds, which is much rarer. You always extended a genuinely warm welcome to us,

SPRING PLENARY

PRESENTATIONS

The following presentations can be accessed at the University Faculty Senate website:

- Provost’s Office Report: Elizabeth Bringsjord, Interim Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
- SUNY Finance and Budget Report: Robert Haelen, Interim Vice Chancellor for Financial Services and Chief Financial Officer
- Ethics Forum: Andrew Fitz-Gibbon, SUNY Cortland, on behalf of the University Faculty Senate Committee on Ethics and Institutional Integrity

Continued on page 26
Plenary . . .
Continued from page 25

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Committee on Diversity and Cultural Competence
Noelle Chaddock Paley, Chair
SUNY Cortland

Plenary Presentation: Phillip Ortiz, Tim Gerken, and Carlos Medina co-presented the Making Diversity Count white paper at the Fall 2013 plenary session of the University Faculty Senate (UFS) at the University at Albany. The presentation was well received and can be found on the UFS website.

Shared Governance Panel Presentation: Beth Hinderliter, Philip Abraham, Phillip Ortiz and Noelle Chaddock Paley were panelists in the “Diversifying Shared Governance” panel at the Shared Governance for Institutions in the 21st Century: Beyond Stereotypes on April 23-24, 2013 in Albany.

Survey of the diversity landscape and structures on SUNY campuses: The survey instrument has been finalized and the survey will be launched in Fall 2014.

Fall 2014 Diversity Conference: The committee is working with the SUNY Office of Diversity and Educational Inclusion in preparing a conference, Making Diversity Count: Ensuring Equity, Inclusion, Access and Impact, which is scheduled for November 12-13, 2014 at the Albany Marriott Hotel. A “save the date” communication is forthcoming. At the present time, one of the keynote speakers, Dr. Daryl Smith, author of Diversity’s Promise for Higher Education, has been identified, contacted, and has agreed to participate.

"Making Diversity Count" position paper: The Committee will be following up with UFS Senators and Campus Governance Leaders on how the paper has been received on their campus, and the extent to which it has been acted upon.

Diversity and Inclusion of Native American, Veterans, and LGBTQAI populations: The committee will be looking at the problems of the exclusion of these populations in our diversity considerations and what might be equitable solutions to these problems. One such concern of particular focus for the 2014-2015 committee will be the conversations around the bill introduced by Senator Hoylman calling for a ban on gay conversion therapy http://www.nydailynews.com/news/national/albany-pols-push-gay-conversion-therapy-article-11432238.

Health care disparities: The committee continues to be committed to decreasing the gap in access to and the quality of health care for different populations, and will work on ways to keep this concern central to our diversity and inclusions conversations in 2014-2015.

Ethics and Institutional Integrity Committee
Charles Moran, Chair
SUNY Cobleskill

Forum: Committee member Dr. Andrew Fitz-Gibbon, Professor and Director, Center for Ethics, Peace and Social Justice at SUNY Cortland engaged the attendees at the Spring Plenary in a Forum on the Practice of Ethics (“Looking for the GOOD”). It is intended that this will facilitate the committee activities listed below.

Conversations on the “Practice of Ethics”: The committee intends to broaden this conversation through in-person and/or webinars to constituencies across SUNY and potentially beyond.

Committee’s “Guiding Statement”: The committee has worked on a statement intended to be a guiding light for the committee’s role within the UFS. This effort, intended to define and enable the committee, will be redirected to flow from the Forum and feedback from the Forum.

Academic ethics database: The committee has engaged in several attempts to build a database of academic ethics activities across SUNY. Most recently, it has asked the senators for assistance in sharing information about their campus’s activities. The committee will continue to work with senators to establish this database.

Policy as a strategy: The committee continues work on using policy to address ethics issues. This is intended to be a collaboration of the UFS with SUNY Administration. The Forum is expected to facilitate this project as it helps explain the committee’s basis for using this approach. The first policy being addressed is electronic privacy. It would also serve as a prototype for further policies. The publicity of confusion over such a statement’s implementation at Harvard University has brought attention to the role and sensitivity of such policies. The committee reviewed ethics policies of the Board of Trustees and the Research Foundation, which differ substantially in purpose and may not serve adequately as guidelines. A policy in collaboration with SUNY Administration, if successful, will be presented to the Executive Committee of the UFS.

Committee Focus: The committee is focused on the visibility and awareness of ethics education, research, and policy across SUNY. The committee is not an adjudicative body and not in a position to render opinions or judgments.

Governance Committee
Rochelle Mozlin, Chair
College of Optometry

New “yellow books” (University Faculty Senate By-Laws and Procedures) and Governance Handbooks have been printed.

Resolution on SUNY Educator Prep Programs and Board of Trustees’ Resolution

A resolution which addressed PROCESS was brought to the Executive Committee for consideration. Resolution on Failure of Consultation and Shared Governance Regarding SUNY Educator Preparation Programs and the New NY Education Reform Commission was passed by the body.

Compensation for VP/Secretary

In light of the increasing responsibilities of the President, a more significant time commitment has become required from the Vice President/Secretary as well. The Governance Committee considered the options and suggested that the campus contribution per senator be increased to $5000 per year in order to pay for half-time release of VP/Sec’y.

Alfred Ceramics

A resolution was brought to the Executive Committee requesting that the Chancellor undertake a study of the relationship between the College of Ceramics and Alfred University, including the use of state funds. The resolution was passed by the University Senate.

SUNY Voices

CGL(campus governance leaders)/Student Assembly Orientation—a 2nd orientation is scheduled for June 5-6 in Albany NY. The planning committee has developed a schedule and agenda, and is looking forward to another successful orientation. This is the first time that students will be included.
Conference on Shared Governance Beyond Stereotypes—Shared Governance for Institutions of Higher Education in the 21st Century—was held on April 23-24, 2014. The 1st Ever Shared Governance Award was presented by the Chancellor to SUNY Fredonia at the conference. A brief summary of this conference has been provided earlier in this issue.

Evaluation of Presidential Commitment to the Principles of Shared Governance

It is very difficult to define “outcome measures” for presidential review. Therefore, a document was developed that is modeled after Middle States description of the various standards. It lists the characteristics of good shared governance with different examples of “evidence.” Presidents would be asked to develop their own portfolio that provides evidence that demonstrates their commitment to shared governance on their campus in word and deed. This document, by the Executive Committee, endorsed by the University Senate, and forwarded to Chancellor Zimpher, may be found below in the Resolutions section.

Graduate and Research Committee

Shadi Shahedipour-Sandvik, Chair College of Nanoscale Science and Engineering

Attracting the best graduate students to SUNY: The committee conducted a survey of graduate students at 19 campuses on why they chose a SUNY campus to undertake graduate studies. Some key findings from 4147 respondents (2453 Master level students, 1271 doctoral level students, and 423 professional degree students) are

- 42 percent of the respondents only applied to one graduate program.
- Only 39% of all students graduated from a SUNY undergraduate program; only 13% were influenced by their undergraduate faculty in their choice of attending a SUNY graduate program; and only 30% were influenced by their undergraduate research.
- Based on the 20 Likert questions the top five reason that students attended a SUNY graduate program were:
  1. Tuition Costs (assistantships were separated from tuition costs in this study)
  2. Reputation of the program of interest
  3. Reputation of the SUNY college or university
  4. Faculty reputation
  5. Information from the program website

Conclusions and recommendations can be found in the full report, which will be available at the University Faculty Senate website.

Engaging Graduated Students in New York State: Keeping the talent within New York State. The committee has designed two studies to examine programs that have been initiated on the campuses to help retain the talent within New York State. One survey will be sent to graduate deans to find out what programs of this kind are in place at their campus. The second survey will be directed to alumni to find out which initiatives, if any, kept them employed in New York State after they completed their graduate training. These surveys will be implemented during June 2014 and results shared with the Research Foundation during July 2014.

Sustainability in Education: The objective of this initiative was to develop a framework for sustainability concepts to be integrated into campus curriculum at all levels and fields. Members of the committee participated in a “sustainability education” roundtable held at Cornell University in November, 2013. Using their experience at Jack Byrne’s (Middlebury College) workshop where each participant designed a draft course incorporating sustainability into their area of study, members of the committee will be in a position to conduct similar workshops at various SUNY campuses in the future.

Graduate Student Salary (dis)parity across SUNY campuses: At any given point in time, the Research Foundation employs ~2,000 SUNY graduate students across all campus locations. Separately, SUNY employs about 9,000 graduate students at any given point. The data below provide, which only includes salary and not fringe benefits or tuition reimbursement, is a snapshot of Research Foundation graduate student employment as of October 2012. In accord with Research Foundation student employee policy, all graduate student employees have to be part-time; the data have been normalized to equate to 20 hours per week of work for comparison purposes. Actual amount worked varies by campus location and by student employee. To include College of Nanoscale Science and Engineering (CNSE) data which was not divided into academic subcategories, data was randomly assigned to academic subcategories for comparison purposes.

Do graduate student employees achieve similar pay for work in similar fields, working similar hours?

Significant Findings:
See chart below

Is there a difference between campuses?

The salaries varied between campuses (per the full report). However, the university centers consistently had higher salaries than the comprehensive colleges. On the other hand, among university centers, the salaries were typically +20% of each other. In biology and mechanical Engineering, Buffalo had the highest salaries; in biomedical engineering, electrical engineering, and chemistry Stony Brook had the highest salaries; and Binghamton topped the list for salaries in computer science.

Continued on page 28

Comparison of Average Salaries per Academic Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professions and Applied Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See chart below.
2013 Winter and 2014 Spring Plenary Highlights

Plenary...

Continued from page 27

- Increase the number of SUNY graduate students with (NSF, NIH, DoD, etc.) fellowships:
  Initial input been sought from the total of 19 NSF Fellows across all of SUNY and a set of best practices will be put together with further actions in 2014-2015.

- Conference on Research Ethics Issues in Biology, engineering and Medicine-to widely include SUNY faculty and students: a proposal was prepared for the 8th International Conference on Ethics Issues in Biology, Engineering and Medicine, that would include a workshop on Research Integrity and Responsible Conduct of Research to be held in April 2015 in Brooklyn, NY. The committee’s goal is to invite faculty, graduate students and postdoctoral fellows from SUNY campuses to this conference. The committee is actively seeking contribution and co-sponsorship from the Research Foundation and University Faculty Senate to defray the costs of registration for SUNY faculty and students.

- Showcasing of student research at the state capital:
  The committee is consulting with the Undergraduate Academic Programs and Policy Committee about next year’s showcase of graduate student research in the New York State Legislative Office Building in Albany.

Programs and Awards Committee

Dennis Showers, Chair
SUNY Geneseo

- The Committee approved and forwarded to the University Faculty Senate a resolution requesting participation of Alfred University and Cornell University in the process of recognizing SUNY faculty for distinguished achievement. This resolution was approved by the Senate at its Winter Plenary Meeting.

- The Committee approved a Resolution recognizing the contributions of Kulathur Rajaseethapathy to the organization and operations of the Conversations in the Disciplines program which was to be read into the minutes at the Winter Plenary. The resolution was adopted by the entire body.

- The submission information for 2014-2015 Conversations in the Disciplines proposals was communicated to campuses and 19 proposals were submitted representing 16 campuses. The Committee met in Albany on May 9 with some members participating by conference call. The proposals were reviewed and nine awards were made.

  The first Shared Governance Award was given to SUNY Fredonia at the SUNY Voices Conference on Shared Governance on April 24.

- Forty-three faculty received the Excellence Award for Adjunct teaching in the inaugural year for the award.

  Review and changes to the process for evaluating proposals for the Conversations in the Disciplines awards will be a high priority for next year’s committee. Assessing and evaluating the local campus processes for Excellence Awards and Distinguished Ranks will also be important in the Committee’s agenda.

Student Life Committee

Kelley J. Donahgy, Chair
College of Environmental Science and Forestry

- Veteran’s Survey: The survey is finished and the committee will send the survey to campuses this fall with a return date of mid-November so that we can discuss the results at the Winter Plenary of the University Faculty Senate (UFS) in 2015. The Faculty Council of Community Colleges is also interested in working with us to send the survey to their campuses and the committee is currently focused on doing this. The committee is concerned that on some campuses this will require IRB approval.

- Best Practices in Textbooks:
  The committee continues to be concerned about the rising cost of publications and the student’s ability to have the necessary reference materials for success available to them. The committee submitted a resolution on textbook availability in campus libraries and submitted it to the UFS Executive Committee for approval for forwarding to the UFS 2014 Spring Plenary forward. However, the discussion at the Plenary Meeting led to the resolution being returned to the committee for further consideration of the issues raised in the discussion (e.g., budgetary costs, available library space).

- Bullying and Hazing Whitepaper:
  The current draft of this paper was to be the primary focus of the committee’s March meeting, but it has been postponed until June. The committee will have a paper for the June Planning meeting of the Executive Committee with a planned submission to the UFS Senators before the Fall Plenary.

- Inclusiveness initiative for gender and sexual identity:
  The committee will be creating a document that identifies the campus traditions focused on this topic, such as Lavender Graduation to living arrangements in dormitories. In general the committee believes that there are a lot of “best practices” on these issues that are happening on some of our campuses, and that a review with documentation of these practices would be useful for campuses looking for ways to be more inclusive.

- Future Plans:
  Policies and practices about sexual violence, drugs and alcohol are all on the committee’s agenda for next year. The committee will increase its communication with the SUNY Chief Student Affairs Officers this coming June.

Undergraduate Academic Programs and Policies Committee

Barbara Babetz, Chair
SUNY Cobleskill

- Innovative Exploration Forum:
  The committee conducted its biannual forum highlighting the work of SUNY and CUNY undergraduates, each of whom were selected by their campus for a poster presentation of their creative endeavors and research projects in the Legislative Office Building in Albany. Over 150 students and their mentors participated (see photo). The posters were viewed by legislators, their staff, Board of Trustees Chairman H. Carl McCall and Chancellor Nancy Zimpher, who also discussed them with the students. A video montage of this highly successful program will be available in the next few months.

- Review of changes to Teacher Education:
  The committee reviewed changes to the admissions standards as introduced by the Board of Trustees, and it supported the Executive Committee’s Resolution on edTPA that is provided below. The committee was brieved and discussed the
The results were reported to System Administration, the SUNY Board of Trustees (BoT), and to the University Faculty Senate (UFS) at its Winter Plenary.

A research project was conducted by a subcommittee composed of library directors and officials regarding the impact of budget cuts on library operations and access. The project is completed and ready for presentation to the executive committee and then to the UFS during the 2014-2015 governance year. The report also considers the implications of Open SUNY for campus libraries.

The committee received regular, detailed reports on the university budget and on the Downstate medical/Long Island College Hospital (LICH) financial crisis. Wendy Gilman, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Financial Services (AVC), pre-

Continued on page 30
Chancellor Nancy Zimpher discusses posters with participants from SUNY Canton at the Innovative Exploration Forum.

**RESOLUTIONS**

**Resolution on edTPA**

- Whereas, the (Teacher Preparation Assessment) edTPA is more appropriate for professional certification after teachers have had full-time teaching experience because of its emphasis on classroom performance; and
- Whereas, New York State requirements for student teaching (NY State Education Department Commissioner’s Regulation 52.21), coupled with the need to present new material for evaluation if a teacher certification candidate fails the edTPA, limit the candidate’s ability to be fairly tested by emphasizing the results of a candidate’s initial student-teaching experience; and
- Whereas, there were multiple fundamental flaws in the implementation of the edTPA in New York, compared with the current recommendations by the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity (SCALE), the developer of the test; and
- Whereas the teacher preparation programs have not been given sufficient time to evaluate whether programmatic changes should be made to prepare students for the edTPA or to implement such changes; and
- Whereas, there is a near-consensus of opinion among teacher education faculties and leaders that there was not a sufficient period of low stakes participation for proper implementation of edTPA; and
- Whereas the teacher preparation programs were not provided final guidance material for edTPA preparation until fall 2013 in many cases; and
- Whereas national validity and reliability studies are not applicable to New York’s specific implementation, and predictive validity for actual teacher quality has not been established; and
- Whereas, the increasing burden of test fees and other fees impacts the ability of low-income students to pursue teacher certification; and
- Whereas, this burden may further limit the ability of under-represented and under-prepared students to become teachers, restricting the diversity of future classroom teachers at a time when K-12 students themselves are increasingly from multicultural backgrounds; and
- Whereas, the State Assembly of New York has introduced legislation (A09207 and S07001) to delay use of the edTPA in initial teacher certification until July 1, 2015;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Executive Committee of the State University of New York Faculty Senate emphatically urges the Board of Regents and the State Education Department:

1. To remove the use of the edTPA as a requirement for initial certification in New York beginning May 2014 and thereafter; and
2. To establish a task force involving college faculty and administrators to review the role of externally evaluated performance-based assessment in teacher education programs, and whether or how edTPA (or other measures) might be used in those programs; and
3. To postpone the use of edTPA data in the profiles of teacher education programs until the 2015-16 academic year at the earliest.

167-01-1 passed without dissent, April 3, 2014 by the Executive Committee

**Resolution on Presidential and Chief Executive Searches**

Whereas a set of guidelines for presidential searches was created by the Board of Trustees in 2012 after active engagement with and endorsement by the University Faculty Senate, and

Whereas the recent Board action that may lead to the appointment of a chief executive officer to a college with authority and responsibilities equal to a campus president at a state-operated campus is an area not covered by current policy,

Therefore be it resolved that the University Faculty Senate emphatically and unequivocally reaffirms its support for the process for selection of campus presidents outlined in the 2012 State University of New York Guide to Presidential Searches at State-Operated Institutions and as published in the Board of Trustees Policies, and recommends to the Chancellor and the SUNY Board of Trustees that the applicability of that policy extend to positions equal in authority and responsibility to a president regardless of title, other than interim or acting.

167-02-1 passed without dissent, May 3, 2014

**ACTION REPORT OF THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE**

[Editor’s note: As indicated above in the report of the Governance Committee, this report was requested by Chancellor Zimpher and, when submitted to the Executive Committee and the University Faculty Senate, it was approved for transmittal to her.]

**Evaluation of Presidential Commitment to the Principles of Shared Governance**

Shared governance is recognized as an essential element in American higher education. This is exemplified in the following statements:
The widely accepted and respected 1966 Joint Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges establishes:

The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process.

A draft form of the proposed standard of The Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) also addresses the importance of shared governance during the accreditation process:

An accredited institution possesses and demonstrates... a clearly articulated and transparent governance structure that clearly outlines roles, responsibilities, and accountability for decision making for each constituency, including governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and students.

The SUNY Shared Governance Transformation Team (2011) also recognizes the importance of shared governance by defining it as follows:

Shared governance in higher education refers to the structures and processes through which faculty, professional staff, administration, governing boards and, sometimes, students and staff participate in the development of policies and in decision making that affect the institution.

An assessment of a campus president must include an evaluation of his or her commitment to the essential principles and practices of shared governance. It is imperative that the president acknowledges the importance of shared governance and the roles of various stakeholders (e.g., faculty, administration, students, professional staff, governing boards) in decision-making processes. Based on a review of a variety of materials the University Faculty Senate believes that the following descriptors, with supporting evidence, should be used to evaluate SUNY presidents’ commitment to the principles and practice of shared governance:

- The institution fosters shared governance by supporting development of governance skills of campus constituents and recognizing and rewarding participation in governance work.
- Faculty, through its representative governance organizations, has primary responsibility in determining educational policy, curriculum design, curriculum review, and standards and procedures for evaluating teaching and scholarly production.
- Faculty, through its representative governance organizations, has primary responsibility for establishing and using those standards and criteria for determining retention, promotion, and tenure for faculty.
- Faculty, through its representative governance organizations, has primary responsibility for determining policies and decisions concerning those aspects of student life that relate to the educational process.
- The faculty, through its representative governance organizations, sets agendas, chooses representatives and leadership, and establishes procedures for committees that oversee those areas in which the faculty has primary responsibility.
- The president uses established campus governance mechanisms to ensure a faculty voice in matters of shared concern.
- The president provides adequate funds and resources for the campus governance bodies to carry out their responsibilities.
- In those cases, which should be rare, when the president overturns faculty judgments in those areas in which the faculty has primacy (i.e., curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, and faculty status), a written explanation for this action is provided to the campus governance body.

In order to demonstrate a commitment to these descriptors of shared governance, a campus president may choose to present various documents such as the faculty handbook, bylaws and constitutions of governance organizations, relevant policies and procedures, and written records of various committees. These documents should demonstrate appropriate participation by campus governance bodies across diverse activities and responsibilities. All should be consistent with SUNY’s strategic plan as well as that of the individual campus. The campus governance organization should also provide an assessment to document the degree to which the president practices shared governance.

It has been noted by Trakman that “Good university governance ... does not simply happen. It is usually the product of painstaking effort to arrive at suitable governance structures, protocols and processes.” Within their evidence of a commitment to shared governance, presidents should be expected to demonstrate an appreciation of the evolution of shared governance. Protocols and processes of shared governance must be reviewed, amended, and updated if they are expected to stay relevant. Therefore, presidential review should include evidence of periodic assessment of the effectiveness of institutional leadership and shared governance.

### Award

**Rochelle (Shelly) Mozlin-Chugh/Senate Award for Commitment to Faculty Governance**

The Chugh/Senate Award for Commitment to Faculty Governance is to a person who has “achieved a reputation for outstanding service in the area of faculty governance at the System and Campus levels...for a minimum of five (5) years.”

Shelly Mozlin’s contribution to faculty governance at her campus and to System through her work in the University Faculty Senate amply justifies her receiving this award. Besides being deeply involved in various committees at the College of Optometry, she has been a Senator from her college for many years, served as the representative of the Health Sciences sector to the Executive Committee, and, most especially on the Senate’s Governance Committee as a member and recently as its chair. In that latter role, her commitment to faculty governance has been outstanding. She has significantly updated the Faculty Governance Handbook and the University Faculty Senate’s By-Laws and Procedures. She has developed, and redeveloped, an Orientation Program for campus governance leaders and, this year, for student governance leaders as well, and an important statement for the Senate on Academic Freedom. She spearheaded the development of a document to respond to Chancellor Zimpher’s request for advice from the Senate on how to evaluate the commitment of campus presidents to the principle of shared governance. Finally, she provided a framework and position for the Senate on the complicated situation at the New York State College of Ceramics at Alfred University that, ultimately, was submitted to Chancellor Zimpher and the SUNY Board of Trustees.

In light of these activities, it is clear that Shelly Mozlin is more than amply qualified to be the 2014 recipient of this prestigious award.
### 2013-2014 Campus Governance Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Administration</th>
<th>Buffalo State College</th>
<th>Purchase College</th>
<th>Morrisville State College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Campbell</td>
<td>Joseph Marren</td>
<td>Keith Landa</td>
<td>Timothy Gerken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Hildebrand</td>
<td>Scott Goodman</td>
<td>Peggy DeCooke</td>
<td>Tom Hogle (Alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University at Albany</td>
<td>Jason Grinnell</td>
<td>(Alternate)</td>
<td>College of Environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Leonard</td>
<td>(Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Science and Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Philippe Abraham</td>
<td>Edward Warzala</td>
<td></td>
<td>Klaus Doelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Schmidt</td>
<td>Justin Giordano</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lisa Campagna (Alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Dewar (Alternate)</td>
<td>SUNY Cortland</td>
<td></td>
<td>SUNY Maritime College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Wagner (Alternate)</td>
<td>Tim Phillips (Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maryellen Keefe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binghamton University</td>
<td>SUNY Fredonia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Carl Delo (Alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Mess</td>
<td>Reneta Barneva</td>
<td></td>
<td>SUNYIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall McGuire</td>
<td>Andrea Zevenbergen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ron Sarner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Sinclair</td>
<td>(Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doug Eich (Alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosmarie Morewedge</td>
<td>SUNY Geneseo</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (Alternate)</td>
<td>Dennis Showers</td>
<td></td>
<td>of Ceramics at Alfred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Rea (Alternate)</td>
<td>Maria Lima (Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Scheer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Brook University</td>
<td>SUNY Old Westbury</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Carlson (Alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arty Shertzer</td>
<td>Minna Barrett</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georges Furon</td>
<td>Caroline Sawyer</td>
<td></td>
<td>of Agriculture and Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Kane Gillespie</td>
<td>(Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sciences at Cornell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Feldman</td>
<td>SUNY Oneonta</td>
<td></td>
<td>University Anthony Hay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Stellacci</td>
<td>Renee Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brian Chabot (Alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Alternate)</td>
<td>Robert Compton(Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Wolfskill</td>
<td>SUNY Oswego</td>
<td></td>
<td>of Human Ecology at Cornell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Alternate)</td>
<td>Gwen Kay</td>
<td></td>
<td>University Sharon Sassi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Brockport</td>
<td>Laura Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Gibson Ralph</td>
<td>SUNY Plattsburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td>of Industrial &amp; Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan Rath</td>
<td>Karen Volkmann</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relations at Cornell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ray Guydosh</td>
<td></td>
<td>University John Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Hurd (Alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUNY Potsdam</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walter Conley</td>
<td></td>
<td>of Veterinary Medicine at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Susan Haller (Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cornell University Linda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robin Gleed (Alternate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2013-2014 Senators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUNY Cortland</th>
<th>SUNY Plattsburgh</th>
<th>SUNY Morrisville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Walkuski</td>
<td>Sandra Rezac</td>
<td>Paul Buckingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire State College</td>
<td>SUNY Potsdam</td>
<td>College of Environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom McElroy</td>
<td>Jan Trybula</td>
<td>Science and Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Fredonia</td>
<td>Peggy DeCooke</td>
<td>Kelley Donaghy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Deemer</td>
<td>(Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Geneseo</td>
<td>SUNY Canton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James McLean</td>
<td>Brian Harte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY New Paltz</td>
<td>SUNY Cobleskill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Zuckerman</td>
<td>Barbara Brabetz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Old Westbury</td>
<td>Chuck Moran</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan Quarless</td>
<td>(Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Oneonta</td>
<td>SUNY Delhi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Bischoff</td>
<td>Nana-Yaw Andoh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Oswego</td>
<td>Terry Hamblin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Carroll</td>
<td>(Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louis Scala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amit Bandyopadhyay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### campus administration

- Jim Campbell
- Fred Hildebrand

### University at Albany

- Danielle Leonard
- J. Philippe Abraham
- John Schmidt
- Diane Dewar (Alternate)
- David Wagner (Alternate)

### SUNY Brockport

- P. Gibson Ralph
- Logan Rath

### Buffalo State College

- Joseph Marren
- Scott Goodman
- Jason Grinnell (Alternate)

### SUNY Cortland

- Joy Hendrick
- Tim Phillips (Alternate)

### Empire State College

- Edward Warzala
- Justin Giordano (Alternate)

### SUNY Fredonia

- Reneta Barneva
- Andrea Zevenbergen (Alternate)

### SUNY Geneseo

- Dennis Showers
- Maria Lima (Alternate)

### SUNY Old Westbury

- Minna Barrett
- Caroline Sawyer (Alternate)

### SUNY Oneonta

- Renee Walker
- Robert Compton (Alternate)

### SUNY Oswego

- Gwen Kay
- Laura Brown (Alternate)

### SUNY Plattsburgh

- Karen Volkmann
- Ray Guydosh (Alternate)

### SUNY Potsdam

- Walter Conley
- Susan Haller (Alternate)