Greetings to Everyone

As another academic year rapidly progresses, I send you greetings from the University Faculty Senate (UFS). I want to take this opportunity to update you on some of the happenings at SUNY System Administration but especially about activities that the UFS is undertaking this academic year (although the reports from our committees will give you a more complete picture).

Dr. Alexander Cartwright has joined SUNY System Administration as Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor. Alex comes to System from the University at Buffalo, where he had been Vice President for Research. Alex has been working hard to learn about all of the operations of the SUNY Provost’s office, and he brings to Albany a campus perspective and a clear desire to work with faculty and seek campus input in advance of System decisions and initiatives.

Chancellor Zimpher is focusing much of the effort at System Administration this year on developing a group of performance measures and targets that can be used to seek new State funding for the SUNY System. The goal, ultimately, is to convince political powers that increased investment in SUNY will enable us to provide greater success for New York State, but not to redistribute the current SUNY funds. On the topic of budgeting, as you know (I hope), we are currently in the fourth of the five-year “rational” tuition plan of NY SUNY2020. Accordingly, System Administration is consulting with the Presidents and the Board about whether to request a new round of tuition increases to actually bring us to 2020. Further budget issues are a hard push to convince the governor and the legislature that “maintenance of effort” means covering mandated cost increases. And finally, SUNY is seeking additional bonding authority for selected new construction projects.
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A New Year: Some Things Old, Some Things New

Mobility initiative. Many of you participated last year in the updating of transfer paths that are intended to provide guidance to students about which courses are necessary in the first two years in order to be prepared to complete a particular major in the following two years. While that process was undoubtedly imperfect, nonetheless it offered a unique opportunity for disciplinary faculty from State-operated and Community colleges to come together and (ideally) converge on what are the universal requirements for entry into a
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major. The challenge for us now is to consider how or if to make adjustments to our own programs. And here I’m making a distinction between advice to students and what we accept in transfer on the one hand, and the structure of our curriculum on individual campuses (which does and should vary) on the other.

I’m not sure how all of this will ultimately work out, but I do expect you’ll be experiencing transfer this year.

The first group of “Open SUNY +” programs—existing online programs with enhancements—was approved last academic year, and the second wave of 56 programs from 17 campuses has been announced recently. System Administration has increasingly recognized that most services for online students need to be coordinated among or handled by the contributing campuses rather than established centrally, although SUNY is currently providing a help desk 24/7 for the “enhanced” programs. System Administration is working with interested campuses to evaluate campus readiness for (expanded) online programs, and there is also now a business tool available to help campuses evaluate the short- and long-term costs/benefits of establishing new online programs or expanding existing ones. Finally, SUNY is helping facilitate the identification and development of digital materials and open education resources (Affordable Learning Solutions) for all courses, not just online ones.

START-UP NY is moving forward apace. Some 50 SUNY campuses have approved plans (or soon will). Companies have been announced at a number of campuses. I was particularly impressed by the process that Binghamton has established to get faculty input into approving company proposals: a faculty committee that has veto power over proposals that are deemed not to fit with the campus mission.

I serve on the SUNY Board of Trustees as part of my duties as UFS President. The swirling issues around the Long Island College Hospital sale dominated much of the Board’s attention over the last year. We finally have a contract to sell the site, but now we need to consider what will be the financial impact on the rest of the SUNY campuses. The Board of Trustees will be delving into this question, but I don’t know how soon we will have an answer.

There was a lot of focus on teacher education over the last year, and the Chancellor has emerged as a national champion for the Common Core Standards in K-12 education. As part of this, she and I urge you to familiarize yourself with the standards, as future New York students will have been educated according to that approach. We can expect some changes in the abilities of our future students, and we should be prepared to appreciate and take advantage of the skills they should possess. The Chancellor also has established a TeachNY program in conjunction with the State Education Department, with an advisory committee to offer guidance on how to improve teacher education and K-12 quality and success. Nationally recognized experts as well as SUNY faculty (and union) leadership are working together to advise the Chancellor on next steps for teacher education, particularly how to improve the effectiveness of our teacher education programs and the teachers they produce.

The committees of the UFS already have been extremely busy this year, as you will learn from their reports. Among the major projects: updating guidance to faculty and campuses on best practices for internships and service learning; examining the role of non-tenure-track faculty in shared governance; guidance for the ethical behavior of faculty; reviewing best practices for prevention of bullying and hazing; fostering and supporting undergraduate and graduate research. And that is but a taste of what we’re looking into this year.

The ultimate goal of all we do is engagement: engagement with System Administration to set policies and procedures; engagement with each other as faculty to improve what we do and what we offer our students; and engagement with the wider higher education community. I look forward to working with you on all of these initiatives and projects. And I wish you the best for a continued productive academic year. ■

SUNY Excels: Demonstrating the Power of SUNY 2020

In 2009, when our system came together to create The Power of SUNY strategic plan, we did so with an eye toward guiding the University on a new, five-year path. Then new to SUNY and New York State, I was awed by the system’s potential: 64 diverse institutions and more than 7,500 degree and certificate programs across the widest possible variety of fields. There’s no region of New York not shaped and strengthened by the presence of at least on SUNY school.

But it was clear to me, as I toured the state and all our campuses and came to know New York, that as a system we could do more and better. In The Power of SUNY we introduced for the first time the idea that SUNY would be a key engine of revitalization for New York
State’s economy and do more to enhance the quality of life for the state’s citizens. To that end, we identified six areas of focus that have become part of our system’s lexicon, our “Big Ideas”: SUNY and the Entrepreneurial Century; SUNY and the Seamless Education Pipeline; SUNY and an Energy-Smart New York; SUNY and a Healthier New York; SUNY and the World; SUNY and the Vibrant Community.

It is around these big ideas that we set our goals as an institution, and where we measure our progress. In the last five years, guided by our Power of SUNY goals, we’ve accomplished so much: implementation of rational tuition, creation of comprehensive seamless transfer policy, a commitment to grow online learning and related faculty and student supports under Open SUNY, the establishment of early college high schools, and more.

And one thing we’ve learned as we stretch ourselves to meet these goals is the importance of ingenuity in doing things better. It’s not enough to set goals—to meet them we must be committed to creating a mindset and a culture of continuous improvement.

Now at the end of our initial five years of following The Power of SUNY plan, we are engaging in a series of discussions about the priorities that will guide us over the next five years, bringing us to 2020. After broad consultation within the University community—among presidents, chief academic officers, faculty, students—in a series of what we called “Power of SUNY Refresh” meetings across the state, we have identified five areas of focus that will comprise The Power of SUNY 2020. And we are calling the building blocks of that process SUNY Excells.

In coming to this point we had identified more than two hundred possible measures that we could focus on and track. But to make the most meaningful impact, we knew we’d need to create sharper, more specific targets. Our five areas of focus then are Access, Completion, Success, Research, and Engagement.

**Access.** As laid out in the University’s statutory mission, access is at the core of SUNY’s identity. To that end, we are fine-tuning our efforts to increase and measure enrollment, system and campus capacity, diversity, and affordability.

**Completion.** SUNY is striving to enable all those we serve to achieve their goals. We will continue to improve all efforts toward improving on-time degree completion and non-degree completion and services, and ensuring seamless transfer.

**Success.** We will double down in the next five years on continuing to create a robust system and campus supports for student success through which SUNY students will be prepared for the most successful possible launch into further education, career, and citizenship.

This includes expanding and tracking the success of applied learning opportunities and multi-cultural experiences, tracking and measuring SUNY graduate employment and earning, and creating groundbreaking financial literacy programming.

**Research.** SUNY’s statutory mission stipulates that the university “encourages and facilitates basic and applied research for the purpose of the creation and dissemination of knowledge vital for continued human, scientific, technological and economic advancement.” To better fulfill that mission, SUNY is developing new ways to enhance and measure research productivity, external investment, and philanthropic support, and training SUNY system, campus, and faculty thought leaders in critical areas of advancement.

**Engagement.** SUNY is stepping up its commitment to engagement—our economic, societal, and cultural impact on New York State, and beyond. Through workforce development, community service, cultural contributions, and START-UP NY, we’re engaging and will continue to share the expertise of the State University with the business, agricultural, governmental, labor and nonprofit sectors of the state for the purpose of enhancing the well-being of New Yorkers and the health of local economies and quality of life.

SUNY Excells formulates our shared commitment to excellence as a system, across disciplines and sectors, and in SUNY’s individual institutions. We will excel in our service to students, in the development of our faculty and staff, and in our support of New York State. ■
FROM THE PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR

A

As I write this, I am just beginning the sixth week in my new role as System Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor. And while it is an honor to pen my first article for the University Faculty Senate Bulletin, you will see that—with the understanding of President Pete Kuepfer and Editor Norm Goodman—my focus for this issue is more a general introduction and sharing of early observations.

I am so pleased that I had the opportunity to join the University Faculty Senate (UFS) for its October meeting. It was a terrific opportunity to learn more about its priorities, questions and concerns and also to see the high level of engagement by the UFS in all system-wide initiatives. I think most of you know that I came to this position already a member of the SUNY family. In fact, I am sure I have worked with several members of the UFS over my 19 years at the University at Buffalo as I have had the opportunity to serve on a number of system-wide committees. I most recently served as part of the campus administration at UB as Vice President for Research and Economic Development, but also served as a department chair, a vice provost and continue to serve as a faculty member.

What you may not know, is that with the support of the SUNY Trustees and Chancellor Zimpher, as System Provost, I plan to stay active in my discipline—optical materials and sensors—and continue to conduct research, and mentor students. I realize that in some respects this is a departure from the traditional role of System Provost, but I think it will ensure that I always remember the hard work of being on a campus and will generally give me a broader view of my role here at system.

My first several weeks have been a blur of non-stop meetings and orientations, and believe it or not, a quick trip back to Buffalo for jury duty. I have had a chance to dive right into a number of initiatives already that I know are important to you: 1) SUNY Excels, our proposed new performance management system; 2) progress on the implementation of the SUNY Trustees policy on Seamless Transfer; 3) progress on Open SUNY including the announcement of the next wave of Open SUNY+ programs that include added support for students and faculty; 4) launch of our Network of Excellence on the Science of Teaching and Learning; 5) launch of the TeachNY policy development initiative; 6) chairing of our new Working Group on Sexual Assault Prevention; and, 7) planning for the launch of our Diversity Task Force.

At the same time, I am working to get up-to-speed on the many offices and initiatives that fall under the umbrella of the Office of the Provost (a number of which are pictured below). The list of responsibilities is broad but all linked to SUNY’s statutory mission: from the detailed demands of academic program review to the review of honorary degree candidates; from the extensive reporting and analytical responsibilities of Institutional Research to the growing demands placed on our enrollment marketing office; and from the extensive training provided by the Center for Professional Development to ensuring that all Start-Up NY partners have a link to the academic mission of their proposed campus partner.

I assure you that I am working hard to gain a strong understanding of the full scope of work of the office and, importantly, to understand why we do what we do and where we can improve. I will also be starting a round of campus visits soon and look forward to seeing you on your home campus.

I thought I might close with a few of my bigger picture observations from my first five weeks on the job. It’s all still percolating… but some things are beginning to become clear.

It struck me that in so many of the conversations I have had over the past month, a common theme is an ongoing commitment to excellence. To that end, SUNY’s motto, To Learn, To Search, To Serve, is clearly relevant. We need to reflect on that more, and also on our statutory mission. I have seen too that when faced with a difficult decision, if we put the needs of students first, often our next steps become clearer. I recognize the importance of ensuring that the collective voices of the SUNY family are heard—our governance leaders, our faculty at large, our students, our chief academic officers, presidents, etc. I know the value of shared governance and the importance of being consultative. And I know firsthand the vast experience and expertise that exists across the system.

All of these early observations support my initial thinking that it is imperative for me to have a broader lens through which I view this position. In large part because I know that at the end of the day, after listening to all critically important input and recommendations, there will be difficult, final decisions that will be mine to make.

I take seriously my charge and feel incredibly privileged to have this opportunity. I look forward to working with the University Faculty Senate and calling on its collective expertise as we move forward.
The changing of the leaves marks not only the beginning of Fall and the return of students to campus, but it also marks the start of another State budget cycle. Given this timing, it is a good opportunity to share some details on the budget process of the State and the State University of New York (SUNY) with you.

In addition, as any talk of a SUNY budget will eventually lead us, I would like to touch on the NY-SUNY 2020 program. As we enter into the penultimate year of this program, it is worth highlighting the import of this historic law, while I offer some thoughts as to the future of both it, and the University.

New York State Budget Process

New York State’s budget process follows an Executive Budget model. This means that the Governor develops a comprehensive fiscal plan of expenditures and revenues, which is then submitted to the Legislature for review. The budget must be balanced and cannot have expenditures exceed revenues.

The Legislature can reduce, eliminate, or add to items of appropriation, but cannot alter or modify them. A period of executive and legislative negotiations intended to resolve budget disagreements usually follows the initial legislative reaction. It is expected that the Legislature will enact a balanced budget before the beginning of the State fiscal year on April 1, which will then be signed into law by the Governor. If an agreement cannot be reached, the Constitution grants the Governor line item veto authority, which can be overridden by two-thirds majority votes of both houses of legislature.

State agencies’ budget process typically begins in the Fall of every year, with the Budget Director’s “call letter” to all agency heads. The call letter sets the policy guidelines and parameters on how budget requests should be developed for the new fiscal year. Before the end of the year, the Division of the Budget (DOB), in conjunction with the Governor’s staff, works to finalize the Executive Budget. The Constitution requires that the budget be submitted to the Legislature by the second Tuesday after the first day of the annual meeting of the Legislature. This is followed by Joint Legislative Budget Hearings (in which agency heads defend their budget requests) and the public and interest groups are allowed to comment.

The charts below show State tax dollar spending for major functional areas of the State budget in 2013/2014 and 2014/2015. In these years, four areas: education, health, social welfare, and others (comprising mainly fringe benefits) account for about 80 percent of the State’s tax supported spending. This same spending on Higher Education represents less than 6 percent of the total State tax expenditure, accounting for approximately $3B of the $52B and $55B in total disbursements in 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>PERIOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Budget Preparation</td>
<td>June-December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Budget Release</td>
<td>3rd week in January (February 1 in years following a gubernatorial election)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Review</td>
<td>January-March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate/Assembly Budget Resolutions</td>
<td>Mid-March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-way Negotiations</td>
<td>Mid-Late March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Budget Is Enacted</td>
<td>April 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Execution</td>
<td>April 1-March</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. An exception is provided for gubernatorial election years, in which case the submission due date is February 1.
2. The dollar amounts and percentages represent total (actual or planned) tax dollar disbursements for the State’s two public higher education systems, SUNY and CUNY. The amounts and percentages also include disbursements for community colleges and the Tuition Assistance Program (TAP).
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to present testimonies to the Legislature on the impacts of the Executive Budget. Each house of the Legislature passes a resolution reflecting its priorities, which will then be the basis for a three-way negotiation.

A key part to this negotiation is the agreement among the Executive, Senate, and Assembly on available resources or “Avails” and spending levels and targets. Once there is an agreement, DOB and Legislative staff will meet to fine-tune various pieces of the agreement until a State Budget is produced, passed by both houses, and sent to the Governor for signature prior to midnight on March 31st. The table below depicts the New York State budget cycle.

SUNY Budget Process

The State University is one of over 100 public agencies serving the people of New York. Consequently, the University’s funding and policy direction are closely enmeshed in the New York State budget and legislative processes.

The preparation of the budget request by System Administration relies on campus data, including student enrollment, payroll, University-wide programs, and other-than-personal-service (OTPS) spending. The State University Board of Trustees typically acts on the Budget Request during its November meeting. The request is then transmitted to the State’s Budget Director.

NY-SUNY 2020 and State-operated Campuses Fiscal Year 2014/15 Budget

Enacted in 2011, the NY-SUNY 2020 program offered the University much-needed stability following years of declining State tax dollar support, and large, sporadic jumps in tuition rates. The most significant aspects of the NY-SUNY 2020 law include the State’s Maintenance of Effort provision, which guaranteed that State tax dollar support for SUNY operations could not be less than the amount provided in the prior fiscal year (including fringe benefits), unless the State finds itself in a fiscal emergency. Also significant was the first-ever Rational Tuition provision in the history of SUNY. This provision recognized the authority of the SUNY Board of Trustees (BoT) to set tuition rates at the State-operated campuses by providing for annual tuition by up to $300 for resident undergraduate students enrolled at a SUNY State-operated institution.

Finally, the legislation included the Challenge Grant program, designed to leverage private funding for infrastructure investment on our campuses. Under the Challenge Grant program, over $200M in capital investment has been committed for various projects at SUNY campuses, advancing State’s economic development goals, creating good jobs, and enhancing higher education curriculum and training and research programs.

These initiatives have been complemented and enhanced by wide-ranging system-wide efficiencies, which have enabled the University to move closer to achieving relative financial stability. The pivotal role played by campus leaders and faculty and staff in this endeavor cannot be overemphasized. As a result of the commitment of our strong cadre of faculty, we have maintained academic and teaching excellence, while we continue to prioritize high-quality research. However, much remains to be done if we are to maintain our gains and continue to set national standards in critically important areas of higher education.

Looking Ahead to 2015/16 and Beyond

While the New York State economy has rebounded significantly from the recession that began in 2008, uncertainties still remain. According to the First Quarterly Financial Plan Update recently released by DOB, the State is projected to end the current fiscal year with a $4.2B surplus, mainly attributable to financial settlements reached with banks and insurance companies. However, the uses for this surplus have not been determined, and the Budget Director’s “call letter” specifically required agencies’ budget submissions to show zero growth from the 2014/2015 levels, with the exception of Medicaid, School Aid, and Federal funds. The NY-SUNY 2020 program and our ongoing efficiencies initiatives such as the University’s premier strategic energy sourcing programs.

We will seek State resources to support United University Professions (UUP) and other representative unions’ contractual and inflationary increases, as well as request adequate appropriation authority to utilize all University-generated revenues, including those related to the Rational Tuition plan. System Administration and campus leaders are also contemplating the successor to the NY-SUNY 2020 law, set to expire at the end of the 2015/16 Academic Year.

The University will request funding for a multi-year capital investment to address backlog and renewal needs at our facilities. We will advance capital investment for targeted projects that could further SUNY’s core educational, research and economic development goals. We will also continue to seek appropriate level of State base operating aid for our community colleges. To be successful in all of these goals, the continued support from all of our campuses and the University Faculty Senate will be essential.
Greetings to Everyone

I hope that everyone’s semester is going well and that all of you have been enjoying the beauty of the New York State landscape as we make the transition into fall! This year have been pretty action packed as we, SUNY SA, have been implementing some important changes to make sure that we are reaching out to as many of our SUNY students as possible. I would like to thank our Immediate Past President, Tremayne Price for leaving SUNY SA in a great position and standing within our 64 campuses and SUNY.

We have already accomplished many firsts as an organization during this academic school year.

1) We were one of the first student organizations to be involved with the White House, the National Campus Leadership Council, and student leaders throughout the country since summer regarding the “It’s On Us” campaign. Those conversations have been open and frank regarding sexual assault, the rape culture, and the legal systems handling of these cases. We will be reaching out to each of our 64 campuses to take the “It’s On Us” pledge.

2) As a member on the SUNY Board of Trustees, I was in NYC on October 2, 2014 when Governor Cuomo presented the Sexual Assault Response & Prevention Resolution to the board. I was consulted and offered my thoughts and opinions on several occasions during the development of this resolution.

3) We have been conducting Town Hall Meetings at each of our campuses that have been hosting the SUNY SA monthly Executive Committee meetings and have had some great conversations with students on our campuses. Those conversations have created the possibility for an open dialogue surrounding issues, concerns, problems, and ideas brought forth by our SUNY students.

My goal is to work on increasing the communication throughout the organization and the campuses as we work diligently to advocate for our 463,000 SUNY students and make sure that their voice is heard at all levels of government. We are increasing the number of our advocacy days to three this year, which will include each of our conferences and the SUNY Speaks Up event in Albany in which each student in attendance will have the opportunity to have a conversation with legislators and their staff.

We, the students of SUNY, wish to acknowledge the hard work of our faculty/mentors/advisers, campus and SUNY administrators, Chancellor Zimpher, our state and county legislators, and Governor Cuomo as they work hard behind the scenes to provide us with the best educational experience possible. We are SUNYStrong.

I wanted to touch on our 2014-2015 Legislative Agenda and provide a link to our SUNY SA website so that everyone can look up our resolutions and the supporting documents behind our Legislative Agenda. We will be continuing to work with the University Faculty Senate on the issues of Textbook Affordability, with the Faculty Council of Community Colleges on On-Campus Childcare, advocating for Chargebacks and Rational Aid, and, on the federal level, we will be educating for the reduction of student loan interest rates. As you will see through our resolutions, SUNY SA and our SUNY students are tackling a vast array of issues during this academic school year. Our resolutions cover a vast array of issues and concerns for our SUNY students such as: Sexual Assault/Domestic Violence, Blood Donor Equality, Support of the LGBTQ+ Communities, Community College Safety, Student ID’s as Non-legal Documents, Discrimination and Stereotypes, Diversity Awareness, the Eight Steps to Veterans’ Success, and the use of Local Produce on our campuses. For more information, please visit: www.sunysa.org/initiatives/events/conferences/#14fall.

It has been my privilege to serve to be a liaison for the University Faculty Senate and I am looking forward to working with it on any issues that arise over the course of the year!
It’s about time!

On September 19, 2014, President Obama and Vice President Biden launched a national awareness campaign, entitled “It’s on us,” to deal with the issue of sexual assault on college campuses. The next month, California became the first state in the country to pass a law that altered the generally prevailing standard of consent to sexual activity on college campuses that “no means no” to a more affirmative standard that only “yes means yes.” In the same month, Governor Andrew Cuomo insisted New York change the way it acts with the issue of sexual assault form manner and to make “affirmative consent” the rule. To that end, Chancellor Nancy Zimpher requested and received the approval of the Board of Trustees for her October 2, 2014 Resolution on Sexual Assault Response & Prevention. That resolution requires, among other things, that all SUNY campuses adopt a system-wide uniform Sexual Assault Victims’ Bill of Rights that includes a list of available campus and community resources for victims which is widely publicized, a clear standard of affirmative consent for sexual activity, coordination with the state on a public awareness campaign of this problem, a uniform reporting protocol, and the implementation of a uniform campus climate assessment to gauge the prevalence of sexual assault as well as students’ attitudes and awareness of the issue.

All of these actions are worthy efforts to deal with a problem that has received considerable public attention recently. But, frankly, this is not a new problem. Unfortunately, sexual assault on college campuses has a long history. There has been evidence of this problem dating back at least about a half century ago, evidenced, for example, in a 1957 article in the American Sociological Review, entitled “Male Sex Aggression on a University Campus.” Yet, the steps taken by those in higher education who have responsibility for the safety and security of students has generally been both sporadic and inconsistent. It is for this reason that the action by California and SUNY to require an affirmative standard of consent and greater uniformity in ways to prevent or to deal with sexual assault is especially welcome.

There is another issue, however, that needs to be clearly addressed. In the past, most campaigns to deal with sexual assault on college campuses focused on advising women to be clear in communicating their willingness to engage in sexual activity. In short, the burden of reducing this problem was generally placed upon women—a clear example of “blaming the victim.” For example, in the article referred to above, the authors indicate in their summary that “One possible educational implication of this study is that college girls should be trained in informed self-reliance.” (p. 58) While it is certainly important to stress to college women that they need to be as clear as possible to their partner about whether or not they wish to engage in sex, the major focus of an educational campaign about sexual assault should be directed at college men. Beyond the obvious reason that it is men who are almost exclusively the perpetrators of sexual assaults, a few facts from studies in the literature provided by the S.A.F.E. (Sexual Assault Facts and Education) program that existed at Stony Brook for many years provide additional reasons. The data from the studies reviewed indicated that “55% of college men whose behavior meets the legal definition of sexual assault do not think that what they did was sexual assault.” Of even greater concern is another fact that “1/3 of college men say that they would have sex with an unwilling partner if they thought that they could get away with it.” These data clearly suggest that any major educational effort to reduce the incidence of sexual assault on college campuses will have to be directed primarily at college men.

Recently, one innovative attempt to deal with sexual assault on college campuses uses what Vogue called “an unorthodox framing of the federal law known as Title IX...” (October, 2014, p.156) In that interpretation of Title IX, supported by the U.S. Department of Education, sexual assault is deemed a form of sexual harassment and is thus considered to be covered by this act. However, there has been some opposition to the use of Title IX for this purpose. An October 15, 2014 article in the New York Times reports that “Dozens of Harvard Law School faculty members are asking the university to withdraw its new sexual assault misconduct policy, saying that it violates basic principles of fairness and would do more harm than good.” Their major complaint is that “Harvard has made the Title IX office the charger, the prosecutor, the investigator, the adjudicator and the appeals board, and its sole task is to get this Title IX furor to go away. So at every stage, that office is deeply invested in the rightness of what they did at a prior stage.” Harvard law professors are not the only ones concerned about U.S. Department of Education’s use of Title IX for this purpose. For example, an article by Judith Shulevitz in the October 27, 2014 issue of The New Republic “cited 20 pending lawsuits by student [accused of sexual assault] who said that they had been treated unfairly.”

From another vantage point, a recent article by Jeb Rubenfeld, a Professor of Criminal Law at the Yale Law School, in the New York Times (Sunday Review, page 1) raises several concerns about the current approach to campus sexual assault. He argues that a strict use of “affirmative consent” is impractical in many cases, and the shift from a standard of “incapacitation” due to alcohol use to one that simply involves alcohol use as a basis for a “lack of consent” assumes that the alleged victims are not “responsible for their sexual choices.” Further, that since sexual assault is a criminal act, “[T]he college hearing process [should]be integrated with law enforcement” to provide for adequate, professional investigative experience and skill so that it is more likely than is currently the case that the guilty will be appropriately prosecuted and the innocent clearly exonerated.

Clearly, this is a complex issue that needs to be addressed in a sensitive manner. All the available data indicate that very few instances (5 to 10%) of actual or attempted sexual assault are reported to campus or law enforcement authorities. In part, it has been suggested that this
underreporting is a result of many victims believing that campus policies and enforcement are inadequate, and many of the campus officials involved in adjudicating complaints are inadequately trained. The campus procedures to handling accusations of sexual assault need to involve adequately trained professionals who take into account the legitimate rights of both the accused and the accuser to a fair hearing.

To a large extent, the Board of Trustees’ Resolution on Sexual Assault Response & Prevention addresses these issues by:

1. Clearly indicating that “affirmative consent” and what that actually means though it needs to take account of Professor Rubenfeld’s concerns.

2. Requiring campuses to adopt a uniform amnesty policy for reporting incidents of sexual assault so that minor infractions of the Student Conduct Code should not be a deterrent to reporting such instances.

3. Working with the state to develop training programs to prevent and adjudicate incidences of sexual violence on the campus, especially including law enforcement agencies.

4. Having campuses conduct a uniform campus climate assessment to gauge students’ attitudes and awareness of this issue so as to be able to develop appropriate policies and actions to reduce campus sexual assaults.

However, as usual, the devil is in the details. It is important to see what policies and procedures are actually developed to address this issue, and how these are accepted by the various campus constituencies. One key element in addressing the issue of sexual assault on the campus is the training of faculty and professional staff so that they can be active participant in this enterprise. The American Association of University Women (AAUW) suggests five ways that faculty and professional staff should be engaged in this effort to:

- Encourage educational and prevention programming on their campus.
- Bring in outside experts to continue and support their campus’s educational campaign.
- Participate in faculty and staff training to recognize instances of sexual assault and to know the campus policies and procedures to guide students who come to them for help.
- Ensure that necessary resources are made available to survivors of sexual assault.
- Organize or participate in public awareness initiatives to reduce campus sexual assault.

We, as faculty and professional staff, have a responsibility to ensure the safety and security of our students. We need to be an active part of the process to do so. The SUNY initiative to reduce campus sexual assaults is an important step that provides an opportunity—and a mechanism—to carry out that responsibility.

In the Spotlight

(Addendum: 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 the 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.)

Morrisville State College

Conrad Gerken

Morrisville State College

Like many of our students (about 20%), I came to Morrisville from New York City. I knew little about the school except that it was within 50 miles from my new home in Central New York. What I have discovered over the past eight years is an extremely busy campus full of hardworking, caring faculty and staff, and a diverse student body with expertise in a wide variety of fields. Many of them literally work in those fields, some in mud up to their knees.

Over the last eight years, I have had a series of therapeutic massages from Massage Therapy students, bought plants and lettuce from the Horticulture students, eaten cheese curds from Ag Business students, and even had my “weed-wacker” repaired. These skill-based trades are the living history of Morrisville State College. Our dairy students like to say they are “shoul-der-deep in hands-on learning.”

One hundred and five years ago Morrisville was founded as an Agricultural College with a mission of training men and women in the skills necessary to live and farm upstate NY. “Learning by doing” was a pedagogical model then just as it is today. We see it in our founding principles: The purpose of this institution is three fold:

1. To train young people for a successful life on the farm. This is accomplished by a two year course in Agriculture and Home Economics.
2. To discuss with the farmer and his wife in institutions and conferences and by demonstrations, problems of rural life.
3. To investigate questions concerning the production of farm crops, animal husbandry, dairying, etc., and to furnish free information concerning farm matters.

SUNY now considers us a Technical College, but we still prepare our students for a “successful life on the farm”; we are still concerned with “questions concerning the production of farm crops, animal husbandry [and dairying].” We never stopped milking cows at Morrisville; we just built around them.

The most important construction project that a campus can undertake is building a diverse student body. 32% of our students identify as ethnic minorities. Because we are a small campus, our students must learn to live and work with each other: engaging and collaborating with peers and faculty, broadening their understandings, and increasing their cultural competencies. Our graduates apply these competencies as they move into an increasingly diverse and globalized workforce. In spring 2015, we begin a partnership with Cambridge Educational Group (CEG) with the goal of growing a greater international presence on our campus. This pathway program for international students has the potential to be the largest in the United States, a partnership benefiting both Morrisville and SUNY.

Morrisville’s diversity has been recognized and supported by Dr. Sheila Johnson, a successful entrepreneur and philan-
thorist, whose generous donation created the Sheila Johnson Institute (SJI). The SJI offers numerous opportunities for students to get involved and widen their understandings of leadership and culture through educational and community service initiatives. The SJI is housed in the Morrisville College Foundation. With its $8 million annual budget it supports over 550 students with scholarships and funds hundreds of programs, events, and educational projects.

Faculty and staff have developed a number of educational initiatives built around partnerships. Strong partnerships are the core concept in any Applied Learning practice. Students with experience—practical and academic—work with more experienced members of their field developing a greater understanding of the discipline and the practices necessary to be successful upon graduation. We call these educational partnerships Living Classrooms. They include institutes in Dairy, Equine (Sales, Breeding, Breaking and Training, Racing, and Rehabilitation), Auto, Horticulture, Travel Agency, Diesel Technology, Aquaculture, Wood Technology, Entrepreneurship, Environmental Training, and Renewable Energy. Students from freshman to senior—working with faculty and staff—are deeply involved in the running and ultimately responsible for the success of these enterprises. And, they are successful.

The annual Autumn Review dairy cattle sale set a record with gross sales of $279,640, the highest numbers in the 32-year history of the event. Our dairy’s milk sales were $1.2 million last year. The annual Morrisville College Yearling sale, run by the Equine Institute, grossed almost $1.4 million with Royal Encore selling for $85,000: a win for all involved.

The FORD ASSET program is a popular two-year Automotive Technology degree sponsored by the Ford Motor Company. Students partner in a cooperative educational experience with a participating dealership and work there during winter and summer breaks with a job waiting for them upon graduation. Students run the parts and supply shop and they have built a Mustang Drag Racer.

Another opportunity for applied learning happens through our Morrisville Auxiliary Corporation, a nonprofit company that provides non-academic services to Morrisville State College. The MAC’s budget is derived from meal plans, student transportation, book store revenue, residence hall service charges and other services rendered to the campus. Earnings beyond operating costs go back to the campus, supporting a variety of academic programs, scholarships, and Student Government Organizations. MAC also owns and operates the Copper Turret Restaurant, which serves as the learning laboratory for the new two-year Culinary Arts Program. The culinary program includes a final semester capstone course where students will assist in the operation of the kitchen at the restaurant. The Turret also offers a “$28 NY Strip Filet with garlic cheddar whipped potatoes, sautéed vegetables, and crispy shallots.”

We expect our students to be skilled in their chosen majors before they participate in their internship programs, but we also expect them to be good communicators. Our revamped Career Services Center helps students develop the workplace literacy skills they need. But, students also need to have the ability to find and communicate information. The ability to engage in knowledge-based economies is critical in today’s rapidly evolving markets. Our librarians help students develop the skills to efficiently find, identify, and apply authoritative information in academic and workplace settings. We have a long list of programs and majors where students develop skills in a two-year technical degree program and then combine these with two more years in one of our bachelor programs for an individualized four year program. Some of these include our bachelors in Science, Technology, and Society; Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management; Agricultural Business Development; Horticulture Business Management; Technology Management: Resort and Recreation Services.

Morrisville works to support the communities of Central New York. The Renewable Energy Training Center trains members of the community seeking marketable skills in renewable energy fields, supported with a $2 million grant awarded under the President’s Community-based Job Training Grants. The Copper Turret sources food from farms and businesses in our local area and will be brewing beer with local hops as part of our newly funded Brewing Institute, the result of a $600,000 SUNY 2020 Challenge Grant. Another MAC supported enterprise, Nelson Farms, provides entrepreneurial agri-business opportunities for specialty food processors, farmers, growers, and producers. Educational opportunities include: developing and processing/co-packing products, distributing, marketing and sales, a dairy incubator, and a country store where the developed products are sold. Check out the latest products at the online store.

Nelson Farms also carries Morrisville Fresh LLC, a line of products developed and managed by Agriculture Business students. A significant part of their mission is to stimulate the Central New York economy through the growth and development of the local food systems. Many of these products, including Road Kill Slather Sauce, are now available at LaGuardia airport and other Taste NY stores around the state.

There’s barely time to eat, though, with so much going on around campus. We have a variety of programs to support our diverse student body. The CSTEP program has about 80 students enrolled and a long waiting list. Three of our students took home the first place trophy in 2013 at the CSTEP Statewide Conference. Our Educational Opportunity Program provides financial assistance, counseling support, and academic support to prospective students who have the potential to succeed but need additional academic or financial resources to be successful in college.

We have 17 sports teams and recently added women’s hockey. Our men’s basketball team went to the Elite 8 in the Division Three Championships last year. Our football is currently 5-1 and beat Cortland for the first time in 10 meetings. Our athletes work hard and over 40% of them received academic honors. This past September Morrisville students placed first as the high team overall at the International Post-Secondary Dairy Cattle Judging Contest at the World Dairy Expo in Madison, Wisconsin. We also have more than 40 clubs and organizations active at Morrisville. Each school year there is a play and a musical production. We offer a wide variety of intramural activities including “free-skates” at our IcePlex,
The Graduate Academic Programs and Research Committee

The Graduate and Research Committee is comprised of seventeen members from twelve campuses including four comprehensive campuses, one technical campus, four university centers and three doctoral degree institutions. The committee is made up of both academic faculty and professional employees which gives us a broad perspective of issues related to graduate degree programs and campus wide research agendas. Our membership also includes Kathleen Caggiano-Siino from the Research Foundation, and Tanya Owens from system administration. The diversity of our committee helps us to better meet our charge:

The Committee serves as a source of professional advice and guidance to the Senate on matters relating to the quality, operation, and encouragement of graduate programs and research. To these ends, the Committee may be concerned with the procedures, criteria, and support of existing and new graduate programs within the University. The Committee may review and recommend policies and procedures relating to moral and ethical concerns of research and graduate studies and other matters involving the furtherance of research and graduate studies within the University.

As such, we were able to implement two successful studies last year. The first looked at why our graduate students chose their degree program. Part of the success of this study came from the strong support of the Research Foundation. A grant was awarded to an Empire State graduate student, Joshua Horn, to implement the survey and analyze the data. We received over 4000 responses from 19 campuses. The data indicated that what appears to be important for both university centers and comprehensive colleges are the reputation of the program and the SUNY college or university, followed by tuition costs (not necessarily assistantships, though these were more important to non-professional PhD and professional doctoral degree programs). On the other hand, flexibility of the program and time to complete the degree was important for master level students rather than faculty reputation, which was important for non-professional PhD and professional doctoral degrees. The other important criteria for both university centers and comprehensive colleges are the sources of information for graduate students. All students felt that the website was one of the top ways in which they gained information about the college and degree programs.

This might indicate that we need to invest in better websites and other ways to promote the image of our programs and institutions. For professional doctoral degree programs, it is also important to use word of mouth promotion from other students, faculty, and staff. Very few of the respondents found recruitment fairs important for finding out about our programs. Thus the promotion budget might be better allocated toward program reputation and website development, in order to attract the best graduate students. This is consistent with the work begun in 2007, when System Administration had completed a listing of all graduate programs throughout SUNY on its website as requested by a resolution of the University Faculty Senate.

Our second study looked at whether graduate student employees achieve similar pay for work in similar fields, working similar hours across the different SUNY campuses. The results of this study indicated that there was a disparity across degree programs (see exhibit 1 below), with the highest salaries for students in the natural sciences. Furthermore, disparity was also found for the same degree program across campuses. What was significant was that each university center had a higher than average salary in a specific field. Higher than average salaries were found in biology and electrical engineering at the University of Buffalo; biomedical engineering, electrical engineering, and chemistry at Stony Brook; and computer science at Binghamton.

A. Exhibit 1

Comparison of Average Salaries per Academic Discipline

Since our first study indicated that fellowships were important for attracting the best PhD. students, it would appear that for the biology and electrical engineering fields of study, the University of Buffalo would have an advantage; for biomedical engineering, electrical engineering, and chemistry fields of study, Stony Brook would have an advantage; and for computer science study, Binghamton would have an advantage.

Since salary, especially in the natural sciences, appears to help attract the best PhD. students to SUNY, we recommend that we work to increase the number of fellowships for SUNY graduate students through NSF, NIH, DoD, etc. We began to explore ways to increase student knowledge of and applications for fellowships and scholarships in 2012. Currently, we are looking at ways to make students more aware of grant opportunities. We are now

Continued on page 12
trying to improve the number of awards given to SUNY students. To support an increase in fellowships, the committee is working on developing a student guidebook for grant writing. Once the guidebook is completed it will be made available through an online platform. Furthermore, the committee will be presenting a resolution at the fall plenary to support the formation of a Research Foundation Fellowship for select students who have not been funded elsewhere.

One additional task that the committee undertakes every other year is to showcase the research work of our graduate research in the Legislative Office building. We began making our graduate research more visible in 2011. That year we had 75 presentations from 25 graduate institutions in SUNY including 16 projects from CUNY. In 2013 we had two to three submissions from many of our SUNY and CUNY campuses. These presentations of graduate student research demonstrate quite graphically just how state funding has helped to increase the quality of the academic efforts of our graduate students. Furthermore, it brings visibility to our SUNY campuses and helps to build the reputation of our graduate degree programs. We will be exploring ways to improve the effectiveness of the poster session and to increase awareness of the quality research going on at each campus as part of this year’s agenda. This, too, is consistent with our findings that program reputation helps to attract the best students to SUNY.

As a committee, we are not only concerned about how to attract the best students to SUNY, but also how to retain our graduates in New York State. A study was begun in the summer of 2014 and will continue this fall in order to identify best practices in this area. We are looking at both STEM and non-STEM graduates in order to identify their success in finding jobs in their field of study one year after graduation. We are also in the process of identifying the most successful initiatives at each campus that help students find jobs within their field in New York State. Preliminary results indicate that when internships are offered they help considerably in this effort. On the other hand, it appears that our graduate students in most disciplines, except for the masters in accounting, found employment in their field within one year of graduating. However, until we finalize our study, we do not have adequate statistical support for these findings.

In spite of the success of the many studies undertaken by the Graduate Academic Programs and Research Committee, there have been some challenges. The committee has found that one of the difficulties in gathering data across campuses is the lack of a centralized Institutional Review Board (IRB). We will be working with the SUNY Networks of Excellence and the Corporate Compliance Committee to develop a process for the establishing a centralized IRB. This is one of the ways in which we collaborate with other University Faculty Senate initiatives. We are also working closely with the Undergraduate Academic Programs and Policy Committee to help support undergraduate student research and with the Operations Committee to help support post-doctoral student research. Similarly, we collaborated in 2012 to sponsor a system wide Sustainability Project/Workshop that was held in May 2012, followed by two Webinars on the topic in September and November of 2012. The workshop brought together faculty across campuses to identify best practices in pedagogy, to increase the awareness of sustainability in the curriculum, and to support collaborative faculty research in this area.

One other area that we have been looking at since 2008 is how we prepare our graduate students to become college faculty. This year we will be developing a best practice white paper on what campuses are doing to prepare our graduate students to teach at the university level.

---

**Speak Out!**

_Editor’s note: This section provides a mechanism for communication among faculty, professional staff, and administrators about issues that are relevant to SUNY or to the field of higher education. The views and comments expressed here are not necessarily those of the editors, the Executive Committee, or the University Faculty Senate. Submissions or comments about articles in this section should be sent to the editor and should not generally exceed 2,000 words._

---

**Affording the American University**

_Peter D. Salins_  
Stony Brook University

_In the Fall/Winter 2013-2014 issue of the Bulletin, former SUNY chancellor, Bruce Johnstone laid out the serious financial dilemma facing American public research universities (like my home base, Stony Brook University) and, more broadly, all public higher education institutions, posed by inexorably rising costs and falling state tax levy revenues. Among many negative outcomes, these trends have led to tuition hikes that exceed the rate of inflation – paid for through increasingly burdensome levels of student debt, and replacement of full-time faculty with a growing number of “adjunct” instructors – members of a poorly paid, marginally affiliated “academic proletariat.”

The colleges’ rising costs can be attributed to many factors, but those that Johnstone focuses on are collegiate “mission creep” as former liberal arts and teachers colleges recast themselves as research universities – which results in higher faculty pay accompanied by lighter teaching loads, and the accelerating growth in administrative personnel, justified (in a bit of circular logic) by the need to cope with the financial challenge through more efficient management and aggressive fund-raising. As remedies, Johnstone ponders three kinds of institutional adjustments aimed at increasing higher education efficiency: increased teaching loads of full-time faculty (at research universities), cutting administrative costs, and turning over more teaching to the internet. After offering them for consideration, Johnstone shoots each one down, primarily for their political infeasibility. Whatever the merits of such measures, focusing on small-bore ways of saving money distracts us from engaging the deeper national dialectic regarding not just the cost of college and university education, but its rationale.

When politicians and pundits charge that American higher education as it is constituted today is financially unsustainable, they are not just arguing for greater efficiency (the kinds of reforms reviewed by Johnstone), they are explicitly or implicitly pushing for a kind of higher education rationing. They may not have the courage to say it outright, but what they are really envisioning is a two-tier higher education system for the United States. They unapologetically expect their own children and those of their broad social tier (affluent, college-educated and upper middle class) to go to college or university in traditional campuses, preferably academically selective ones, laden with student support and amenities. However, because the cost of traditional higher education is now financially “unsustainable,” other American youngsters – middle class and poorer – should rethink their post-high school options: enrolling in technical training or apprenticeship programs in lieu of a conventional collegiate experience, and, to the extent they still want or need to go to college, do so more economically, preferably online. This line of thinking generally rests on evidence of disproportionately rising college costs, growing student loan debt burdens, and poor post-collegiate career outcomes (or the claim that even employed graduates are doing work that doesn’t really require a college education). Ergo, implementing the long-
standing national goal of ever-rising levels of college attainment represents a waste of societal and personal resources. And, as such, this appears to justify lower levels of state financial support and, if the critics had their way, lower levels of federal financial aid.

I propose to challenge the key elements of this currently fashionable syllogism. First, and most critically, it is proven that a college education remains the best possible preparation for a life of economic and social security – which is why virtually all members of the upper middle class make sure their own children attain it. Second, considering its true cost, a traditional, high quality, campus-based college education is eminently affordable – by society, if not necessarily by all potential students. Third, while we can achieve some operating efficiencies in managing our colleges and universities, great savings will not materialize without sacrificing academic quality. That also goes for the currently popular belief that the cost of college can be sharply lowered through online instruction. While it has spawned a host of (mainly for-profit) online “universities,” and is now firmly embedded in most traditional colleges and universities, I believe online instruction can complement, but will not replace, the traditional campus-based experience. Finally, I suggest that if we are serious about financially sustaining our – quite non-collegiate peers. The BLS publishes forecasts of the U.S. labor market which show the growing proportion of jobs requiring a college degree and the higher pay associated with them. Further, the benefits of a college education are social as well as economic. The college-educated are healthier, live longer and have more stable family lives. Perhaps the best evidence of college’s value lies in the enormous lengths to which America’s most affluent families go to make sure that their children have one.

Regarding affordability: Perhaps the best way to analyze the problem is to understand what an undergraduate education typically costs an institution, not what it charges undergraduates in tuition or what it receives in state or federal aid. Fortunately, SUNY’s highly regarded Office of Institutional Research recently compiled a comprehensive database of college and university expenditures, including most U.S. colleges and universities, that can tell us just that. The data are for the 2009-10 academic year, but are highly indicative even if one accounts for the modest level of inflation since then.

I will confine myself to the numbers for SUNY. At its comprehensive colleges (e.g. Brockport, Cortland, New Paltz etc.), the average total expenditures per FTE (full-time equivalent student) that can be attributed to undergraduate instruction came to $10,777. Even at SUNY’s four research universities (Albany, Binghamton, Buffalo, Stony Brook), the average per FTE outlay for undergraduate instruction was $12,641. Total inflation since 2010 is officially estimated at 8.7 percent, bringing the number for SUNY’s colleges to $11,715 and that for its research campuses to $13,741. To arrive at the full institutional cost, we need to add approximately $5,000 per FTE to cover all institutional overhead expenses including fringe benefits.

What these data show is that, while not inexpensive, the true cost of undergraduate education in a typical U.S. institution – public or private – is not inordinately high, nor has it grown disproportionately relative to the general level of inflation or the cost of other components of the service sector. Granted, college is too expensive for most Americans to afford without public subsidies or student loans but that is true of all levels of education in all places. That is why higher education – like K-12 schooling – should be considered a “public good” whose benefits to society transcend those accruing only to the educated individuals, justifying some level of direct or indirect taxpayer support.

The reason that college and university attendance today appears to be unaffordable is the massive intra-institutional cross-subsidization going on, which inflates the “sticker price” of undergraduate education; for students and their parents in tuition, for taxpayers through state subsidies and federal financial aid. In the public – state operated – sector, this cross-subsidization primarily involves support for academic scholarship and research, and graduate and professional education. Johnstone decriles the light teaching loads of the professoriate at our research campuses, but that is merely one of the most prevalent manifestations of this cross-subsidization. The obvious – and only appropriate – way to end this practice is to make faculty research and graduate education discrete budget categories, with their own revenue streams. To get states to provide that revenue stream, a strong empirical case can be made that their economic vitality is heavily dependent on the research productivity and advanced education generated by their universities. If these items were supported by dedicated revenue streams, it is also likely that the mission creep issue raised by Johnstone goes away; states will only want to offer such support to campuses with a solid record in these areas.

Let me be clear, however, that I am in no way opposed to the emphasis on scholarship and research or graduate education at our great public research universities. Indeed, in my years as SUNY provost, I strongly encouraged our research universities to become even more productive in securing research grants, and for our colleges to promote greater faculty scholarship. The real issue, however, is who should pay for this, and how the financial support for research should be structured. As provost, and one of the architects of the SUNY’s budget allocation model (the BAP), I fought for – and partially succeeded in getting – research support and graduate programs explicitly accounted for as discrete components of the SUNY budget. Research support was to be awarded to university center campuses in proportion to their success in gaining external (mainly, federal) research funding. Unfortunately, over time – and several state fiscal crises – explicit support for research was severely curtailed. In response, the SUNY research campuses reverted to paying for it in the time-honored way, by short-changing their undergraduates, especially freshmen and sophomores: putting more of them in large classes taught by PhD student and adjuncts.

What about cutting back on administration, another perennial issue? The fact is that in most public universities it won’t generate much in the way of savings. According to SUNY IR’s analysis of various expense categories at SUNY campuses, administrative overhead at the leanest SUNY comprehensive colleges runs between 35 and 40 percent of total outlays, which seems to be about as frugal as one can get. The SUNY research campuses spend more, relatively, but much of that can be accounted for by their broader missions – and is offset by revenues associated with them. If severe cuts in administration were attempted, campuses might lose more than they gain if the resulting cutbacks eroded student services (and thus student academic success), or impaired effectiveness in securing research grants or alumni and philanthropic gifts. On the larger campuses (like Stony Brook and Buffalo), the most expensive nonacademic operation is the intercollegiate athletic program, but curtailing that risks loss of public – includ-
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What about saving money through online instruction? Where it has proven itself as academically robust is in the – by now very well-developed – format followed in SUNY’s Empire State College and the SUNY Learning Network. These courses are characterized by small classes (smaller in many cases than on-campus classes), intense email interaction between faculty and students and among students, detailed and rigorously adhered to curricula, and rapid online feedback for tests and papers. This is all to the good and increasingly – and appropriately – serves as a model for the best of traditional courses. As such, supplement the traditional campus life: many variables associated with instruction, but also those that deal with what are referred to as “enriching experiences,” interaction with faculty, advisors and other students, and other aspects of campus life. The NSSE survey results show that, with respect to instructional quality, distance learning (i.e. online courses) fares surprisingly well, but students for whom this is their only college experience miss out on some other aspects of campus life that can have an enormous impact on their future careers and lifetime well-being: leadership training, collaborative work with faculty, teamwork and socialization with other students, networking opportunities with classmates and alumni, community service, and – not to be taken lightly – age-appropriate social life and recreation.

That said, there are serious problems our traditional campuses must deal with if they hope to retain public support and reverse the trend of financial disinvestment. The most serious (and, I believe, interrelated) concerns are low graduation rates and – as Johnstone noted with respect to excessive reliance on adjunct faculty – poor quality lower division level (i.e. freshman/sophomore) instruction. Since most undergraduates drop out after their first or second years, this points to campus failures in advisement and other forms of support, and the consequences of their economizing on lower division courses. What was striking to me in reviewing the NSSE results was how most undergraduates gave instruction in online courses higher grades than those taught in conventional classrooms. The NSSE data doesn’t disaggregate the reasons, but I conjecture that it is related to the fact that most current online courses (MOOCs are unlikely to have been experienced by NSSE surveyees) are small, with a great deal of individual attention and feedback, while most lower division courses are large and taught by adjuncts or graduate students.

In conclusion, I agree with Johnstone that there is no quick fix on the horizon to alleviate the financial bind in which public higher education finds itself. I also strongly believe that implementing the currently most widely promoted reforms (especially reliance on online instruction) would take the country backward to an even more socially stratified allocation of opportunity. But there are steps to be taken that can clarify the nature of the higher education financing problem and, hopefully, lead to durable longer term remedies. I suggest we begin with an entirely costless reform: greater budgetary transparency – that will reveal both the level of cross-subsidization going on and, to the extent that transparency allows us to compare expenses at similar institutions, where reasonable efficiencies can be realized.

Beyond that, I believe that both college students and institutions can benefit from a serious overhaul of the federal financial aid system. The overall size of the federal financial aid program – student loans and grants – is large enough to make it possible for all American high school graduates that want to go to college to do so. But certain features of the system could be reformed to broaden access, reduce post-collegiate debt burdens and motivate colleges and universities to rationalize their budgets and raise graduation rates. I have written more extensively on this topic, but the abbreviated essence of my proposal is a) to make student loans cheaper and easier to get (thus broadening access); b) to have the loans be limited to – but also cover the full cost of – an undergraduate education, as opposed to being pegged to the tuition charged (thus facilitating full-time study and discouraging cross-subsidization); and c) to forgive a large portion of the student loan debt of college graduates (thus motivating both colleges and students to take graduation more seriously). Obviously, such a major restructuring is a long way off. In the meantime, I will be happy with greater budgetary transparency.

Let me turn now to a defense of the traditional college campus, challenging the new conventional wisdom that such places are becoming obsolete, manifested most recently in a debate at Columbia University titled: “More Clicks, Fewer Bricks: The Lecture Hall is Obsolete.” In addition to arguing that the true cost of a campus education is not inordinately expensive, and that effective online education is not necessarily cheaper, I contend that the benefits of attending college transcend what happens in the classroom. This is admittedly a subjective proposition, but we can get some idea of these benefits by looking at the most comprehensive survey available today of how U.S. college students are faring: the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). NSSE surveys students at a broad cross-section of higher education institutions as well as those that have taken all their courses via “distance learning” (presumably online). The surveys probe every aspect of campus life: many variables associated with instruction, but also those that deal with what are referred to as “enriching experiences,” interaction with faculty, advisors and other students, and other aspects of campus life. The NSSE survey results show that, with respect to instructional quality, distance learning (i.e. online courses) fares surprisingly well, but students for whom this is their only college experience miss out on some other aspects of campus life that can have an enormous impact on their future careers and lifetime well-being: leadership training, collaborative work with faculty, teamwork and socialization with other students, networking opportunities with classmates and alumni, community service, and – not to be taken lightly – age-appropriate social life and recreation.

That said, there are serious problems our traditional campuses must deal with if they hope to retain public support and reverse the trend of financial disinvestment. The most serious (and, I believe, interrelated) concerns are low graduation rates and – as Johnstone noted with respect to excessive reliance on adjunct faculty – poor quality lower division level (i.e. freshman/sophomore) instruction. Since most undergraduates drop out after their first or second years, this points to campus failures in advisement and other forms of support, and the consequences of their economizing on lower division courses. What was striking to me in reviewing the NSSE results was how most undergraduates gave instruction in online courses higher grades than those taught in conventional classrooms. The NSSE data doesn’t disaggregate the reasons, but I conjecture that it is related to the fact that most current online courses (MOOCs are unlikely to have been experienced by NSSE surveyees) are small, with a great deal of individual attention and feedback, while most lower division courses are large and taught by adjuncts or graduate students.

In conclusion, I agree with Johnstone that there is no quick fix on the horizon to alleviate the financial bind in which public higher education finds itself. I also strongly believe that implementing the currently most widely promoted reforms (especially reliance on online instruction) would take the country backward to an even more socially stratified allocation of opportunity. But there are steps to be taken that can clarify the nature of the higher education financing problem and, hopefully, lead to durable longer term remedies. I suggest we begin with an entirely costless reform: greater budgetary transparency – that will reveal both the level of cross-subsidization going on and, to the extent that transparency allows us to compare expenses at similar institutions, where reasonable efficiencies can be realized.

Beyond that, I believe that both college students and institutions can benefit from a serious overhaul of the federal financial aid system. The overall size of the federal financial aid program – student loans and grants – is large enough to make it possible for all American high school graduates that want to go to college to do so. But certain features of the system could be reformed to broaden access, reduce post-collegiate debt burdens and motivate colleges and universities to rationalize their budgets and raise graduation rates. I have written more extensively on this topic, but the abbreviated essence of my proposal is a) to make student loans cheaper and easier to get (thus broadening access); b) to have the loans be limited to – but also cover the full cost of – an undergraduate education, as opposed to being pegged to the tuition charged (thus facilitating full-time study and discouraging cross-subsidization); and c) to forgive a large portion of the student loan debt of college graduates (thus motivating both colleges and students to take graduation more seriously). Obviously, such a major restructuring is a long way off. In the meantime, I will be happy with greater budgetary transparency.

Let me turn now to a defense of the traditional college campus, challenging the new conventional wisdom that such places are becoming obsolete, manifested most recently in a debate at Columbia University titled: “More Clicks, Fewer Bricks: The Lecture Hall is Obsolete.” In addition to arguing that the true cost of a campus education is not inordinately expensive, and that effective online education is not necessarily cheaper, I contend that the benefits of attending college transcend what happens in the classroom. This is admittedly a subjective proposition, but we can get some idea of these benefits by looking at the most comprehensive survey available today of how U.S. college students are faring: the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). NSSE surveys students at a broad cross-section of higher education institutions as well as those that have taken all their courses via “distance learning” (presumably online). The surveys probe every aspect of campus life: many variables associated with instruction, but also those that deal with what are referred to as “enriching experiences,” interaction with faculty, advisors and other students, and other aspects of campus life. The NSSE survey results show that, with respect to instructional quality, distance learning (i.e. online courses) fares surprisingly well, but students for whom this is their only college experience miss out on some other aspects of campus life that can have an enormous impact on their future careers and lifetime well-being: leadership training, collaborative work with faculty, teamwork and socialization with other students, networking opportunities with classmates and alumni, community service, and – not to be taken lightly – age-appropriate social life and recreation.

That said, there are serious problems our traditional campuses must deal with if they hope to retain public support and reverse the trend of financial disinvestment. The most serious (and, I believe, interrelated) concerns are low graduation rates and – as Johnstone noted with respect to excessive reliance on adjunct faculty – poor quality lower division level (i.e. freshman/sophomore) instruction. Since most undergraduates drop out after their first or second years, this points to campus failures in advisement and other forms of support, and the consequences of their economizing on lower division courses. What was striking to me in reviewing the NSSE results was how most undergraduates gave instruction in online courses higher grades than those taught in conventional classrooms. The NSSE data doesn’t disaggregate the reasons, but I conjecture that it is related to the fact that most current online courses (MOOCs are unlikely to have been experienced by NSSE surveyees) are small, with a great deal of individual attention and feedback, while most lower division courses are large and taught by adjuncts or graduate students.

In conclusion, I agree with Johnstone that there is no quick fix on the horizon to alleviate the financial bind in which public higher education finds itself. I also strongly believe that implementing the currently most widely promoted reforms (especially reliance on online instruction) would take the country backward to an even more socially stratified allocation of opportunity. But there are steps to be taken that can clarify the nature of the higher education financing problem and, hopefully, lead to durable longer term remedies. I suggest we begin with an entirely costless reform: greater budgetary transparency – that will reveal both the level of cross-subsidization going on and, to the extent that transparency allows us to compare expenses at similar institutions, where reasonable efficiencies can be realized.

Beyond that, I believe that both college students and institutions can benefit from a serious overhaul of the federal financial aid system. The overall size of the federal financial aid program – student loans and grants – is large enough to make it possible for all American high school graduates that want to go to college to do so. But certain features of the system could be reformed to broaden access, reduce post-collegiate debt burdens and motivate colleges and universities to rationalize their budgets and raise graduation rates. I have written more extensively on this topic, but the abbreviated essence of my proposal is a) to make student loans cheaper and easier to get (thus broadening access); b) to have the loans be limited to – but also cover the full cost of – an undergraduate education, as opposed to being pegged to the tuition charged (thus facilitating full-time study and discouraging cross-subsidization); and c) to forgive a large portion of the student loan debt of college graduates (thus motivating both colleges and students to take graduation more seriously). Obviously, such a major restructuring is a long way off. In the meantime, I will be happy with greater budgetary transparency.
graduate and graduate students, over 260 full-time faculty and librarians, over 180 part-time faculty, over 200 professional staff, and 27 management-confidential administrators. Our University Senate currently has 55 representative positions, including reps from each of our 23 departments and interdisciplinary studies as well as college-wide and university-wide-at-large positions, professional staff from each of our divisions, undergraduate and graduate student reps from our Student Association and graduate student group, and a relatively new position representing adjunct and contingent faculty (we’re currently in the process of adding a second position later this year). We also have almost 20 ex officio members including our president, her cabinet, all of the deans, and many of the important directors of major offices across campus. Our CGL is elected yearly but can repeat up to four years in a row, and our Executive Committee and Standing Committee chairs are compensated by either stipends or by course releases.

Bruce and I decided to divide this essay up into two parts, so I’ll describe the collaborative efforts that we’ve put into place over the past three years and Bruce will touch on the strength of our current governing body and explore how they have vastly improved the sense of shared governance and consultation on your campus and make the point that it’s important to avoid the concept of collaboration, whether it’s collaborating with musicians, filmmakers, choreographers, poets, or theatrical directors. To that end it seemed natural to initially approach the position of Senate Chairperson with a collaborative spirit and see where things took us. Obviously there can only be collaboration when all of the parties at the table are interested in working together, and from my perspective we’ve been very lucky to not only have faculty who have been open to such things but also administrators who have been very willing to work together to get governance on a great number of initiatives.

Before any cooperative endeavor can be successful, there must be a strong level of personal trust on all sides. Our current president, Virginia Horvath, was inaugurated two years ago – the same year I started my term as CGL – and we hired a new provost, Teresa Brown, last year. The timing of when we began our tenures was an advantage because we were all able to begin our working relationships without any pre-conceived ideas or baggage, but all three of us continue to strengthen the trust that exists between senate and administration. This isn’t always easy, of course, and there are many reasons why concerns arise: the perceived need for quick decisions, a breakdown in communication or hierarchical structures, and sheer amount of issues at hand are just a few. Nonetheless, governance and administration make a point to discuss matters in a timely fashion and strive to address any failings and move forward. My colleagues on the Executive Committee and I have also worked hard to gain the trust of the faculty and professionals across campus. It has been suggested that the concept of having trusting relationships with both administration and faculty is an impossible challenge (since many faculty assume that it is governance’s job to act as a foil to the administration), but my experience has shown that the two grow and ultimately improve together.

Two of the most important ways that collaboration and trust can be nurtured is through the use of technology in the voting process and the establishment of clear and open lines of communication. Several years ago we instituted the use of clickers in our Senate meetings to replace the inimitable "raising of hands" when votes needed to take place. Not surprisingly, there was an immediate and visceral shift in the tenor of the senate, since now every senator could vote her or his conscience without worrying about who was keeping a tally of their decision. In addition, campus-wide elections and bylaws ratification votes are no longer sent via snail mail but are done electronically as well. This strengthened sense of anonymity has vastly improved the sense of trust and respect on all sides for the decisions that the Senate creates.

It is incredible that, in this day and age, we hear so many stories of miscommunication or lack of communication between administration and governance as well as between governance and the faculty and professionals that they serve. After every Senate meeting, an “Update from the Chair of University Senate” is sent to the entire campus with brief explanations of what went on in the meeting and many take the opportunity to respond to these missives with questions or comments. Communication lines with administrators have been strengthened with standing meetings with the President, Provost, and both of our Associate Provosts as well as the inclusion of the CGL on our Provost’s Council and at our Academic Leadership meetings. The fact that there are more than a few meetings to attend every month is balanced by the depth of knowledge gained and the ability to affect decisions early on in the process, ultimately allowing governance to work toward the best outcome for each situation.

[ Bruce] Every set of bylaws, no matter how seemingly dry, arcane, or limited to procedural matters, articulates a vision and enacts a theory of shared governance and consultation. At Fredonia, many faculty and administrators have spent a good portion of the last five years trying to work out just what that “vision thing” is and should be. Our current Bylaws (available at http://tinyurl.com/qzwobm) are the product of multiple revisions (in advance of approval by University Senate, ratification by the Voting Faculty for each set of substantive revisions, and sign-off by the President for each set that affects consultation). By no means are they perfect, but at least we are trying to make them consistent, both internally and with respect to a theory of shared governance we’ve been stumbling towards.

Here are some strategies that you can use to strengthen your own bylaws and processes:

• Your bylaws are a useful tool for engaging in serious discussions across roles, positions, and lines of responsibility about the meaning of shared governance and consultation on your campus and the principles and values underlying the policies, procedures, practices, and systems that enable institutional communication and decision-making.

• Revising your bylaws can provide opportunities to revisit, review, and rejuvenate agreements and ground rules for interactions between the President and the Faculty.

• Going through the bylaws review, revision, approval, and ratification process can therefore increase awareness, build trust, and limit the odds and scope of conflicts over proper procedures, allowing everyone involved to focus on what’s best for the institution and what best helps it achieve its mission.

• It may be a pain and painstaking process to figure out how to come to agreement on what kind of shared governance activity is warranted for which kind of institutional decision (and who participates in it at what stage), but it saves time and headaches down the road.

• Always look to adapt rather than adopt models from other institutions or principles articulated by national organizations. It’s more important that faculty and administrators at your institution go through the process and come to agreement on a framework for approaching procedural matters than it is to hold out for every last detail of your ideal external model. Don’t let the perfect be the enemy of the good—or at least the better.

• If your President is ever resistant to good-faith efforts to improve the bylaws on your campus, look for windows of opportunity, such as when planning for a major university-wide accreditation agency site visit is in the works, when a President is close to retiring and interested in leaving a legacy, or when a President is
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new on the job and looking to establish good working relations with multiple campus constituencies.

That said, bylaws are always a work in process. They depend for their validity on the confidence campus constituencies have in them. When legitimate objections are raised, and thoughtful revisions are proposed, they need to be carefully ratified. That's what we've been doing at Fredonia for most of the last decade. Here are the major bylaws revisions we've been working on in recent years (for a few more details on each, see http://citizense.blogspot.com/2014/04/first-principles-of-shared-governance_1347.html):

• defining consultation, shared governance, Faculty, and voting faculty
• updating administrative review policies and procedures
• officers’ roles and terms
• executive, standing, and affiliate committees’ functions
• defining task forces’ functions
• defining academic departments’ functions
• establishing electronic quorum and voting rules
• updating Senate/Standing Committee membership rules and term limits

Of course, the biggest test for any bylaws is how well they facilitate substantive decision-making. If the system of shared governance instantiated by bylaws is a car that needs to be tuned up or overhauled periodically so that the driver can use it to get somewhere safely and quickly, then our process of revising the Fredonia Bylaws between 2008 and 2013, and particularly during the 2012-2013 academic year, should enable faculty and administrators to better trust the vehicle and trust each other to play our appropriate roles as we've been taking it for a spin during this period.

[Rob] To put all of this into context, a few of the important initiatives that our campus has addressed over the past two years include:
• Strategic Plan Implementation
• Baccalaureate Goals Implementation
• General Education Revision
• Mission Statement Revision
• Campus Rebranding
• Student Evaluations
• Comprehensive Internationalization

It's not surprising that the concepts of shared governance and consultation are so elusive at many of our institutions; they take an immense amount of hard work and understanding on the parts of many interested groups that are rarely in sync with each other. That being said, we hope that the example we at Fredonia are setting is indeed a positive one and that, through our efforts, others may find opportunities for improvement at their institutions.

Comment on the article, "Shared Governance at Fredonia"
Virginia Schaefer Horvath
President
State University of New York at Fredonia

Sharing decision-making is hard work, as appointing and gathering committees/task forces and waiting for their recommendations is much more difficult than making decisions alone, and most people rise to leadership positions in part because they are good at getting things done. But faculty, staff, and administrators should always be reminding one another—from the search process through the routing work that we do once in our roles—that most decisions are considerably better when achieved through broad input and multiple perspectives on issues.

Two-way communication is key, built on trust that Professors Deemer and Simon both identify as critical for success. That trust can happen when people meet, express views freely, can maintain confidentiality when necessary, and can point out to one another when we get it wrong. It’s been a commitment of mine my entire career in higher education, and I’m proud to be working with a Senate, UUP and CSEA leadership, student government, and a College Council that are committed to the same approach and goals.

Mini-symposium on “changing the way knowledge is conveyed and students learn”
(Editor’s note: In the 2013 Fall/Winter issue of this Bulletin, included an article by D. Bruce Johnstone, former SUNY Chancellor and specialist on financing higher education, entitled "US Public Universities in an Era of Continuing Austerity: More of the Same or Profound Change. In it, he highlights three possible changes in higher education that could conceivably serve to reduce its costs: increasing teaching loads for 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 address the first of these suggestions and in the subsequent issue of this Bulletin, the second suggestion is addressed by a panel of faculty. In this section of the Bulletin, the third suggestion is addressed by two papers.)

INTRODUCING Student Centered Marketing Education Through Open Learning Resources and Web 2.0 Tools
Roslyn J. Rufer
SUNY Empire State College

ABSTRACT
This paper will look at the use of innovation and open resource technology to provide quality education (as measured by student learning outcomes) through pedagogy that is student centered and flexible in a web-based marketing management course. The paper summarized here is adopted from the full study by Rufer & Adams (2012).
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Student Centered Marketing Education Through Open Learning Resources and Web 2.0 Tools
Roslyn J. Rufer
SUNY Empire State College

ABSTRACT
This paper will look at the use of innovation and open resource technology to provide quality education (as measured by student learning outcomes) through pedagogy that is student centered and flexible in a web-based marketing management course. The paper summarized here is adopted from the full study by Rufer & Adams (2012).
MBA studied in this paper, they still had trouble grasping the concept from reading and hearing a lecture. To improve student outcomes in the traditional classroom, small group exercise was incorporated into the lecture to increase the learning through socialization. To mimic the traditional classroom and to increase learning through socialization, web2.0 tools have been successfully incorporated into the on-line learning platform.

**Student Learning Styles and Pedagogy**

Early work of Boyatzis and Kolb (1995) suggests that skills are an integrated transaction between the person and the environment. However, learning occurs when there is an interaction between the structures of knowledge and a cognitive process. Consistent with these findings, the Felder and Silverman (1988) studies find that the cognitive process of learning is related to the learning style of the individual (Graf, Viola, Leo, & Kinshuk, 2007; Felder & Brent, 2005; Litzinger, Lee, Wise, & Felder, 2007; Ruttun, 2009). Thus, if we look at the structures of knowledge and the cognitive process, we can evaluate the impact of the mode of learning on student outcomes. The pedagogy under evaluation in this paper is part of an MBA program developed for adult learners through a web instructional management system (Belasen & Rufer 2007). This program was chosen because the learners are self-directed, come from diverse backgrounds, and in many ways benefit from a flexible pedagogy because of time and space constraints.

Models such as the Felder-Silverman Model (first developed in 1988) suggest a mismatch between learners and pedagogy, indicating that the mode through which information is presented must match student learning styles especially for complex theories. As such, the design of the on-line pedagogy must take into account the diversity in learning styles as well as the structure of the learning program, including the amount of collaboration and the mode of information present. As noted earlier, not only is the structure important for the millennial student but so is the amount of collaboration.

**An Experiment in the Use of Different Pedagogical Methods**

The initial curricular design that was used to deliver segmentation theory included reading a mini-lecture and material from the textbook. Due to high failure rates (less than a B average), a narrated Power Point presentation on market segmentation was incorporated to move student learning from a deep approach to one of strategic application of the market orientation theory in a case study analysis. The use of the narrated Power Point presentation was used to re-enforce the readings and engage the students through auditory learning as well as visual. This provided an opportunity for the learners to reflect on their first exposure to the theoretical constructs of how to segment the market and the associated buying behaviors of potential customers. Consistent with the Felder’s work, the use of the power point provided re-enforcement that appeared to help reach the “sensors” and the “intuitors”. According to Felder (1988), sensors respond better to verbal re-enforcement. Whereas, students who demonstrate characteristics of “intuitors” like the symbols of words and thus can grasp the concepts through reading. To reach the sensors the instructional design technology incorporated a narrated power point, similar to that used in the traditional classroom, during the Fall 2006 term. However, as indicated by the learning outcomes, and similar to what has been found in the traditional lecture style classroom, only fifty percent achieved success (with a grade of B or better), with an average assessment of approximately 69% as indicated in Figure 1, which will be found at the end of the paper. Not surprisingly, these outcomes were consistent with Felder’s (1988) findings when studying traditional students, who retained fifty percent of what they saw and heard. Furthermore, neither the self-directed reading nor the narrated power point provided for an increase in socialization as recommended for the non-traditional millennial student.

In an attempt to be more student-centered, additional emerging technologies were integrated into the instructional design. As noted by Graf et al. (2009), technologies can provide an “adaptive learning environments” through a combination of cognitive learning and elements that address the visual, auditory, and kinetic learner. The next technology employed in the MBA marketing course was the use of a webinar. During the webinar, the Power Point presentation was repeated and students were asked if they had any questions. This enhanced the reflective learning through additional discussion and, as a result, increased the collaborative nature of the learning process. Following the discussion, a white board was shown with clip art of individual cartoon characters of men arranged randomly. One student was asked to arrange the clip art into groups based on some characteristic that would be a common way to segment the market, and based on salient attributes for buyers of automobiles. This student suggested lifestyle (some characters were very professional, some very athletic). A second student suggested occupation and then proceeded to divide the characters into blue and white collar workers. Similar to the traditional classroom interactive projects that the webinar provided led to an increase in reflection through collaboration.

The webinar discussion reflected how each of these different ways to segment the market could be related to buying behaviors. Thus, the use of the webinar provided some opportunity for active engagement for those students who required visual, auditory and verbal learning, while at the same time provided sensory and intuitive learning for the others. With this change in pedagogy, approximately sixty-five percent of the students now succeeded in segmenting their market in their case study analysis; an increase of fifteen percent. Using a t-test, our hypothesis that the use of the webinar, and thus increased socialization and active learning, improves student learning outcomes for non-traditional and millennial students was supported. We wanted to be sure that the data could be replicated and thus repeated the pedagogy in the Spring of 2010, and we received similar results, as seen in table 1 below.

**Conclusion**

**Table 1**

**Visual, Auditory, and Web 2.0 Comparative Result**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visual &amp; P.P.</th>
<th>Visual +webinar</th>
<th>Visual +webinar10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 06</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Fall 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>34,333</td>
<td>42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StdDev.</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td>6.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>F 06 vs F09</td>
<td>.0540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visual, Auditory, and Web 2.0 Comparative Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visual &amp; P.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StdDev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1: Student Learning Outcomes for complex theories**
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Celebrating New York State and New Yorkers
Lincoln and the New York City Cooper Union Speech

Daniel S. Marrone
Farmingdale State College
September 10, 2014

By the late 1850’s, Abraham Lincoln was a seasoned Illinois politician who was a veteran in political campaigns. Surprisingly, Lincoln lost more elections, often only by narrow margins, during his political career than he won. Up to the 1860 presidential election, his greatest political success was to win a two-year term as a U. S. Congressman. In 1858, Lincoln focused on the race for the Illinois U.S. Senate seat. Opposing Lincoln was veteran Democratic politician Stephen Douglas. The Republican and Democratic candidates for Senate agreed to a series of seven debates throughout Illinois. Although they were from rival political parties and espoused widely differing views regarding slavery and popular sovereignty, the two were on relatively friendly terms. In fact, once Lincoln became president, Douglas offered his full support. Unfortunately, due to alcoholism and other illnesses, Douglas died on June 3, 1861, which was just 91 days after Lincoln’s March 4, 1861, inauguration.

Following the Lincoln-Douglas debates, Douglas was victorious in the Illinois U.S. Senate election. Nevertheless, Lincoln and his well-articulated opinions on slavery drew the nation’s attention. Subsequent to the debates, Lincoln was inundated with speaking invitations. From among these invitations, it was the one from New York City that Lincoln most prized due to its potential importance in the forthcoming 1860 presidential race. According to preeminent Lincoln scholar, Harold Holzer (2004), The Cooper Union address was “The Speech that made Abraham Lincoln President.” On October 15, 1859, Lincoln received a telegram from Republican activist James A. Briggs. The message was an invitation to speak, for a modest $200 fee to cover travel expenses, at Reverend Henry Ward Beecher’s Plymouth Church in the then separate City of Brooklyn. Lincoln accepted the invitation and made plans for this February 1860 NYC event.

By the time Lincoln completed his exhausting trip from his Springfield, Illinois home to NYC, the site had to be moved due to the limited size of Beecher’s church. The new location was the recently erected Cooper Union building in lower Manhattan. This educational institution was named after its financial sponsor— inventor, industrialist, and philanthropist Peter Cooper (1791-1883). This Manhattan institution is currently still in operation and has retained its enormous auditorium where Lincoln delivered his epic speech. He would later remark that his victory in the 1860 presidential election was the result of two factors—The Cooper Union speech and the re-touched photograph of him taken by Matthew Brady. Arriving on February 27, 1860, Lincoln’s first NYC stop was at Brady’s portrait studio.
located at 643 Broadway on the corner with Bleeker Street in a district referred to as Greenwich Village. Although Brady’s photos highlighted Lincoln’s exceptionally statuesque 76-inch height, they also revealed too many flaws in his rather wear-worn face. The 51-year old future president then asked Brady to somehow alter one of the photos. Lincoln, always politically savvy, knew that this photograph would be an important element in his quest for the presidency. Brady complied and “re-touched” one of the photos by “softening the deep [facial] lines, erasing the dark circles above and beneath Lincoln’s eyes, and correcting the roving left eyeball that disconcertingly roamed heavenward whenever he stared” (Holzer, 2004, p. 94). After the touch-ups were incorporated in the photo, the ambitious presidential hopeful was satisfied and extremely prescient for this re-touched image would subsequently accompany the text of his Cooper Union speech in thousands of newspapers across the nation. This re-touched photo and the carefully chosen words of his speech provided the Kentucky-born, Indiana-raised, and Illinois-practicing lawyer a national platform greatly beneficial to his ambition to be president.

the Grand Hall of The Cooper Union Institute, Lincoln addressed a sold-out crowd of more than 900 attendees. Holzer describes the NYC audience as “sophisticated and demanding” (2004, p. 1). Lincoln’s more than 7,000-word seminal speech may be described in three parts. He began his discourse by recalling the 1877 Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia. Lincoln incisively reminded the audience that a majority of the Founding Father delegates, including those from the southern states, approved a ban on slavery in the Federal territories. Although Lincoln astutely conceded that the southern states delegates would have never agreed to a total abolition of slavery, they did approve a ban on slavery in the Federal territories. Lincoln noted, in his homespun manner, that he was only adhering to the U.S. Constitution by calling for a prohibition of slavery in the Federal territories. Lincoln emphasized, “The sum of the whole is, that of our thirty-nine fathers who framed the Constitution, twenty-one—a clear majority of the whole [were in favor of] the Federal Government controlling slavery in the federal territories.” In simpler wording, this meant that the Federal government was founded on the precept that forbade slavery in the Federal territories. This is significant because these Federal territories were enormous in size comprising virtually the entire landmass in the west between the Canadian and Mexican borders. Throughout his speech, Lincoln continually referenced “Our fathers” as a means of concuring with the nation’s founding individuals and principles. “Our fathers” also has a religious connotation that Lincoln knew would be appealing to many in the audience. However, Lincoln’s greatest emphasis during his speech was that of “moderation,” yes, moderation on slavery. In his temperate way of describing slavery, Lincoln emphasized, “Where slavery exists, it would remain.” Lincoln envisioned that he could win the Republican nomination and subsequent election for president if he appealed to mainstream voters. The sentiments of these voters were somewhere between anti- and pro-slavery extremes. Although he was adamantly against slavery, for the time being Lincoln placed the lofty principle of the complete abolition of slavery “on hold.”

In the second part of his Cooper Union speech, Lincoln cannily and in a partisan way redirected the blame for rising national tensions on southern Democrats. He argued that the Republican Party, although new to many Americans, was not a sectionalist party but was instead the nation’s “conservative and nationalistic” political entity. Lincoln’s use of the term “conservative” refers to his “moderate” policy platform that would leave slavery intact where it already existed but would block slavery in the new territories. Not everyone agreed with Lincoln that “moderation” towards slavery was either ethical or politically tenable. Staunch Abolitionists such as Thaddeus Stevens (1792-1868) and Charles Sumner (1811–1874) would continually view Lincoln as being “much too slow” on the slavery issue. Lincoln, however, sensed that a direct attack on slavery, at that critical juncture, would lead again to the defeat of the Republican candidate in the forthcoming presidential election. His priority in his speech was to appeal to as many voters as possible to elect Republicans—especially him. Lincoln also argued that Republicans represented the “nationalist” party because it represented all Americans from the North, South, East, and West. Lincoln further rebuked charges from southern Democrats that the Republicans were “instigators of slavery unrest.” He responded stating that the Republicans were neither behind nor in favor of slave rebellions. Further, he declared, “John Brown [the Abolitionist zealot] was no Republican.” Lincoln contended that the southern Democrats were wrong about the Republican Party and wrong for trying to “destroy the Government and the Constitution.” Of course, the southern Democrats viewed the situation quite differently. They viewed the federal government, especially with Republicans in control, as the enemy of states’ rights including and most especially the right to own slaves. Interestingly, since the Civil War, Democrats and Republicans would change positions on many issues including the still-contentious issue of states’ rights. In an ironic reversal, in today’s political landscape, it is the Republicans, and not the Democrats, who are far more the “champions” of states’ rights. Lincoln’s third Cooper Union talking point was directed at his own Republican Party. He urged party members to appeal to the majority of American voters who were somewhere politically in the middle of anti- and pro-slavery extremes. Lincoln encouraged Republicans to “cease calling slavery wrong.” Rather, he exhorted party members to acknowledge slavery as being “right” where it already existed. Using current vernacular, Lincoln was clearly “pandering” to slavery supporters as well as to many “fence sitters” on this contentious issue. Although ethically questionable, pandering to slavery supporters in NYC was a wise, political move, for the city had many financial ties to the south’s “Cotton Kings.”

In the Illinois debates, Lincoln expressed soaring ideals. However, in his NYC speech, Lincoln emphasized political strategy. Yet, the importance of the NYC speech at Cooper Union cannot be dismissed or overestimated. Holzer (2004) characterizes Lincoln’s Cooper Union speech as representing “an altogether unique rhetorical watershed, the transforming moment separating the prairie stump speaker and the presidential orator” (p. 3). Lincoln acknowledged often that he had but only a few weeks of formal education. Yet, his use of the English language throughout
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his speeches, including the one at Cooper Union, was unique and remarkable. He concluded his NYC speech with a spiritually binding phrase: “Let us have faith that right makes might and that in faith, let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it.” These words, among the many others he used throughout his political career, is why Ronald C. White (2005), labels Lincoln as our most “eloquent president.”

The 1860 Presidential Election
Each presidential election has its own importance in U.S. history. However, the contest that occurred on November 6, 1860, was unique—and exceptionally pivotal. It included four main candidates for president with widely differing political visions for the future of the nation. Lincoln had the support of the Republicans whose stronghold was in the North and to some extent the northern Midwest. As there was virtually no support for Republicans in the south, Lincoln’s name, according to Harold Holzer, did not even appear on the voting ballots of ten “Deep South” states. Although the 1860’s Democratic Party as a whole was far less opposed to slavery than the Republicans, there was nevertheless an inevitable split between Democrats in the northern and southern states. In fact, the Southern Democrats stormed out of the Democratic Party Convention that was held in Baltimore in June 1860. Shortly thereafter, the Southern Democrats held their own convention and nominated their own candidate.

Consequently, there were two competing Democrats running in the 1860 election. The Northern Democratic nominee was Stephen A. Douglas and the Southern Democratic nominee was John Cabell Breckinridge (1821-1875). There was also a fourth candidate, John Bell (1796-1869) from Tennessee who was the Constitutional Union Party nominee. This political party was so-called “neutral” on the slavery issue. Paradoxically, Bell was a slaveholder who was against the expansion of this “peculiar” institution in the Federal territories. However, once war broke out, Bell sided with the Confederates.

The November 6, 1860, election had a turnout of 81.2 percent of the nation’s eligible voters and resulted in Lincoln winning 180 electoral votes—an amount that far exceeded the total of the other three main candidates: Breckinridge, 72; Bell, 39; and Douglas, 12. Lincoln’s popular vote majority was far narrower. Lincoln garnered 1,866,452 popular votes that equated to only 39.7 percent of the nation’s votes. The other three main candidates had the following popular vote percentages: Douglas, 29.5; Breckinridge, 18.2; and Bell, 12.6.

According to Harold Holzer, without The Cooper Union speech in NYC, Lincoln may have lost the voting majority in New York State thereby losing its electoral votes and possibly even the 1860 Presidential Election. Had Lincoln lost to any of his election opponents, Bell, Breckinridge or Douglas, the future of America would have been substantially different. How different, no one knows. However, what is certain is that Bell and Breckinridge were slaveholders. Douglas was an advocate of “popular sovereignty” that would allow slavery to exist by plebiscite. It is highly probable that any one of them would have acquiesced on the contentious expansion of slavery in the Federal territories. On the other hand, it is highly improbable that any of them would have issued the equivalent of Lincoln’s monumental Emancipation Proclamation. It is also quite doubtful that they would have advocated for the 13th Amendment, the legal force abolishing slavery. Fortunately, we had Abraham Lincoln as our President.
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HIGHLIGHTS OF THE FALL 2014 PLENARY MEETING

Presentations
[Editor’s note: There were four presentations at this Plenary meeting. Robert Haelin, Interim Vice Chancellor for Finance and Chief Financial Officer and Josh Sager, Associate Vice Chancellor for Finance and Business reported on the budget. Timothy Killeen, Vice Chancellor for Research and President of the Research Foundation offered a presentation on the “Networks of Excellence. Alexander Cartwright, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor detailed the various programs of his office. Chancellor Nancy Zimpher, Tim Killeen, Alexander Cartwright, and Associate Provost Elizabeth Bringsjord provided a presentation on the “SUNY Excels Performance Management System. These presentations are available on the University Faculty Senate website.”]

Committee Reports

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

Committee Goals for 2014-15:
• The committee (CDCC) aims for a successful proposal of the System-wide LGBT Athlete Ally resolution with follow up and implementation of supportive Athlete Ally behaviors, programs, and commitments across the SUNY system. The committee would like to see the Suny system to be the first academic system in the country to have every campus actively hosting an athlete ally commitment program. The Athlete Ally resolution calls for campuses to intentionally look at the climate, retrofitment, support and retention of LGBT athletes, coaches, faculty and staff. The committee’s resolution emanated from the work available at www.athleteally.org
• The committee is happy to facilitate the system wide diversity survey in January 2015 with a report to the University Faculty Senate (UFS) at its Fall 2015 plenary. The survey will be sent to Chief Diversity Officer, Affirmative Action Officer, and the Chief Academic Officer on each campus in an attempt to get a system-wide landscape of diversity offices, curriculum, and personal across the 64 campuses.
• The committee is excited to see the system-wide diversity conference come to fruition on November 12-13, 2014 at the “Making Diversity County: Ensuring Equity, Inclusion, Access and Impact” conference. Registration is still open but space is becoming more limited as the date nears. https://www.cvent.com/events/2014-suny-diversity-conference-registration-04c2be59910946b087647f3d5c468972.aspx
• The committee is planning training for its members on issues of diversity, equity, inclusion, and access in the Spring 2015 semester and will recommend that similar training be made available to the UFS and is Executive Committee during the Spring or Summer 2015.
• The committee will be working to establish an articulation of the scope of system-wide and local needs for marginalized populations that would benefit from the consideration and resources of the CDCC including but not limited to veterans, international students, non-majority faith and non-faith identities. These populations will be integrated into the ongoing conversations and initiatives of the committee.
• The committee will be following up with the UFS senators and campus governance leaders on the status of the “Making Diversity Count” recommendations on their campuses.
This academic year, the Ethics Committee has identified these goals:

- Development of a "guiding principles document" which expresses SUNY’s commitment to an ethical framework that is relevant and applicable to all constituents across all the University’s activities. The guiding principles document begins with a statement of SUNY’s mission and points to core values in the strategic plan: student centeredness, integrity, diversity, collaboration, and community engagement.
- Survey of activities and academic programs focusing on ethics on the campuses. The campuses can be a great resource for the development of activities and programs aimed at enhancing ethics education system-wide. The first step is to identify programs and activities that already exist!
- Development of a white paper on bullying and hazing. The Student Life Committee is developing this and the Ethics Committee will be collaborating with them.
- Development of a document to educate faculty about academic freedom. The Governance Committee has been working on this and, again, the Ethics Committee will collaborate to move this document along.
- The Ethics Committee hopes to work with the Student Assembly on a joint project based on the needs and desires of the Student Assembly; nothing definitive yet but conversations will continue.
- Policy on electronic privacy. Work is just beginning on this initiative. The Committee hopes to work with System Administration, including the University Counsel’s, office to develop an appropriate policy.

The Governance Committee continues to work on two objectives from last year, and has added two more to the agenda.

- The committee has finalized a procedural change to the UFS Bylaws and Procedures concerning the timely presentation of resolutions to submit to the Executive Committee for evaluation and inclusion on the University Faculty Senate’s agenda for its Fall Plenary Meeting. The Executive Committee approved these changes.
- We continue to examine the basic tenants of academic freedom with the goal of expanding the scope of the document drafted last year, examining what is/is not academic freedom, the freedom to speak one’s mind on governance issues, and separation of roles – that of private citizen versus that of University employee.
- The committee will also address the role of contingent faculty in shared governance. Extensive discussion highlighted the complexities of this topic and the importance of learning more about how the voice of contingent faculty is heard in governance across the system. Our goal is to provide guidance to campuses on constitution of fair service (e.g., whether and how contingent faculty should be afforded the option to give their time participating in governance) and level of involvement in campus governance (e.g., within programs or departments or at the institutional level, how votes should be counted), among other issues.
- The committee will respond to concerns raised on several campuses about the role of faculty consultation in administrative searches (excluding Presidents): Provosts/Deans were appointed during the summer months with no evidence of consultation. The committee plans to survey campuses about search policies and practices with the goal of formulating resolutions that will address any identified problems.

The committee plans a major review of the Conversations in the Disciplines (CID) program for possible reforms for 2016-2017 award criteria:

- Review the 40+ year record to consider whether its original purpose is still relevant.
- As the program was designed to bring former teachers college faculty up to speed in their discipline on as many campuses as possible.
- Examine the existing policy of identical $5000 awards. Fewer awards of larger amounts might provide more "bang for the buck". Electronic communication provides possible ways to increase participation and impact.
- The original ban on pedagogical topics will be reconsidered with the possibility that topics integrating disciplinary knowledge and pedagogy be made eligible.

A sub-committee will examine the administration of Chancellor’s Awards (CA) across SUNY
- Concerns have been raised as to excessive administrative and inadequate faculty involvement on some campuses. The first step is information gathering through Campus Governance Leaders.
- Once there is campus feedback, we will consider whether any policy or procedural changes are necessary.

Oversee administration of the Conversations in the Disciplines (CID) program
- The Committee will review the current procedures with an eye to clarifying language to correct problems observed last year.
- Raise the CID profile, especially with a goal of a more timely rollout this year and finding ways to communicate directly to faculty rather than through administration.

Review the policies and procedures for Chancellor’s Awards (CA) and Distinguished Profesorships
- For the 2015-2016 cycle, review DPs. No problems are apparent, but there are areas in which language could be clarified.
- For the 2015-2016 cycle, review the first administration of the CA for Adjunct Teaching. As a new program, lessons need to be learned. In particular, there is confusion about defining ‘adjunct,’ including an apparent error that bars full-time non-tenure track faculty and leaves them as the only group ineligible for any CA.
- For the 2015-2016 cycle, review the first administration of the Senate’s new CA for Shared Governance. As another new program, and one totally under Senate purview, it needs to be reviewed carefully.
Continued from page 21

• For the 2016-2017 cycle, review the CAs for Scholarship & Creative Activities, Teaching, Faculty Service, Professional Service, and Librarianship. Once the subcommittee on faculty participation in CAs reports, the Committee will consider possible policy recommendations or procedural changes.

Student Life Committee
Kelley Donaghy, Chair
College of Environmental Science and Forestry

The Student Life Committee has an extensive list of interests this year and will be fostering relationships between the appropriate SUNY offices, Board of Trustees and Campus Student Affairs Offices to gather, assimilate and prepare meaningful information and policies on a variety of topics such as the following:

Textbook Affordability
• The committee will continue to advocate for affordable solutions to the high prices of print textbooks.

Drugs and Alcohol
At the fall meeting the committee met with a Department of Health representative to learn more about the rise of Heroin usage. The committee plans to disseminate helpful information throughout the year to faculty on how they can help combat student heroin usage.

Sexual Assault
• The committee plans to work with SUNY to in the development and implementation of effective and fair policies and procedures to meet the goals of the October 2, 2014, Board of Trustees resolution.

Plenary Meeting Highlights

Hazing and Bullying
• A “white paper” is expected in time for the January Plenary, this is being jointly written with the Ethics Committee Workshop on the Role of Faculty in Student Affairs
• Upon meeting with the Chief Student Affairs Officers in June, the committee realized that there is a great deal of variability with respect to the faculty involvement in student affairs. To better understand the role of faculty in student affairs, a workshop involving faculty, student affairs professionals and students will be organized for spring of 2014

Veteran’s Affairs Survey
• Recognizing the larger number of veterans that will be returning to SUNY campuses, the committee expects to deploy a survey intended to focus on student support services designed for them in November 2014.

Undergraduate Academic Programs and Policies Committee
Daniel D. White, Chair
SUNY Polytechnic Institute

• Review and revision of the Internship guide: The Undergraduate Committee has been charged by the UFS President and Executive Board to review and revise, where appropriate, the Guide to Undergraduate Internships completed in 2007. All of the information in this guide is still accurate but a number of changes have occurred within SUNY and higher education that have prompted our leadership to revisit this important opportunity for students. The Chancellor has set a goal to involve all SUNY students in an applied learning experience before they graduate. Internships and cooperative education fall under the umbrella of applied learning and both will be explored in the updated Guide. Janet Nepkie from SUNY Oneonta is leading a sub-committee of the Undergraduate Committee to develop a survey and revise the guide.

• Undergraduate Research: Involving undergraduate students in real, meaningful research is a powerful pedagogical tool that leads to enhanced learning outcomes and student persistence. The undergraduate research subcommittee is working on a resolution for the UFS to consider at the fall plenary encouraging our colleagues and administrations to support more undergraduate research and to develop creative ways to infuse more research into our established curricula. We are also collecting information from campuses to establish a baseline understanding of what we do and our best practices within the system. Dan White (SUNY Poly) is leading this subcommittee.

• Service learning: Service learning is another form of applied learning that many of our programs and campuses offer to students. We are developing a baseline understanding of programs and best practices within the system. We plan to interview appropriate faculty and staff from around the system to get a broad perspective of service learning within the system. Our service learning subcommittee is being led by Andrea Zevenbergen (SUNY Fredonia).

• Competency-based assessment: Competency-based assessment is a growing trend in higher education. In response to interest from the state and federal government, the State Education Department has developed a task force on competency-based learning which includes Sue Deer (Provost Rockland CC). The task force will be providing a report this fall. SUNY Empire State has also received funding to explore competency-based assessment. The competency-based assessment subcommittee is exploring ways to educate the broader faculty about the potential benefits and challenges of a system that removes seat-time from the credit equation. This subcommittee is being led by Margaret Souza (SUNY Empire State).

University Operations Committee
Thomas Sinclair, Chair
Binghamton University

The Operations Committee has already launched its ambitious work plan for the 2014-15 academic year. Among its planned activities are:

• Revision of Operations Committee Charge. The evolution of SUNY operations in recent years prompted a re-examination of the Committee’s charge. A revised charge that adds educational technology and forms of instructional delivery and strategic planning to its established role in generating reports and recommendations on budgets, operations, libraries and personnel policies including diversity, equity and affirmative action will be presented to the University Faculty Senate for adoption at the Fall, 2014 plenary session.

• A white paper on budget transparency. Despite the size and complexity of SUNY’s budget and those of its campuses, the practices related to publishing budgeting and finance information vary widely across the system. The Operations Committee will examine current practices within SUNY and compare them with established best practices used by other public universities.
Addenda will evaluate the financial stresses on the system’s libraries and discuss financial transparency issues related to university foundations.

• Study on the composition of SUNY faculty. Periodically, the Operations Committee has conducted a study of the composition of faculty on SUNY campuses and we will undertake a similar activity this year. As methods of instructional delivery and types of programs change, the mix of full- and part-time faculty and their respective roles may also change. Impacts on the gender and diversity of campus faculty will also be reviewed.

• SUNY-Excel, a performance measurement system proposed for all campuses. The Committee will closely monitor the proposed adoption and implementation of a performance measurement system by SUNY system and its campuses. Of particular interest will be the role of faculty governance organizations in the process.

• Continuing discussions on other topics. Developments with respect to Start-Up NY, SUNY’s budget and OpenSUNY will be matters of continuing discussion by committee members in the coming year.

SECTOR REPORTS

The reports from the five sectors of SUNY (Colleges of Technology, Health Sciences Centers, Specialized Colleges, Statutory Colleges, University Centers, University Colleges) can be accessed from the University Faculty Senate website.

Resolutions

Resolution on Sexual Assault Prevention

Whereas, sexual assault is a continuing concern for institutions of higher education; and

Whereas New York State and SUNY are committed to taking great care in protecting the safety and well-being of all of its students, employees and personnel and to creating and maintaining a safe educational and learning environment free from all sexually related harms, whether occurring on or off campus; and

Whereas, the problem of sexual assault within college communities has gained increasing national awareness, including at the Federal Congressional level; and

Whereas, this increased awareness has led more colleges and universities to reassess the effectiveness of policies and enforcement regarding all Title IX violations and identify new approaches to prevention; and

Whereas, California enacted SB967 on Student Safety: Sexual Assault, commonly known as the “Yes Means Yes” law, in September 2014; and

Whereas, the State University of New York Board of Trustees passed a resolution, Sexual Assault Response and Prevention, on October 2, 2014, at the urging of Governor Cuomo, that will establish uniform policies and procedures across all SUNY campuses regarding sexual assault response and training; and

Whereas, the SUNY Board of Trustees, in consultation with Governor Cuomo, appointed Linda Fairstein to serve as a special adviser for the implementation of the sexual assault response and prevention policy; therefore

Be it Resolved that the University Faculty Senate endorses and supports the SUNY initiative on sexual assault response and prevention; and

Be it Further Resolved that the University Faculty Senate recommends to the Chancellor that SUNY System Administration and Special Adviser Linda Fairstein work in collaboration with the University Faculty Senate in the development and implementation of effective and fair policies and procedures to meet the goals of the Board of Trustees resolution.

168-01-1 Resolution on Sexual Assault Prevention Passed without dissent

Resolution Requesting All State University of New York Campuses Offering Athletics Create Programs to Support Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender Athletes, Coaches, and Staff and to Prevent Anti-LGBT Bias and Discrimination in Athletics

Whereas, SUNY is one of the country’s largest and most diverse state university systems and understands that diversity is “an integral component of academic excellence”; and

Whereas, 55 of SUNY’s campuses have athletics programs which offer over 800 sports teams and participation by approximately 14,000 student athletes; and

Whereas, athletics, intramurals, and club sports play a significant role in the overall education of our students; and

Whereas, athletic programs are used to promote the SUNY system, to recruit students, to retain students, to build campus identity and school spirit, and to grow and solicit alumni and foundation donations; and

Whereas, college athletic programs have historically served as spaces for cultural, ethnic, and racial integration, helped grow more diverse campus communities, and allowed for introduction of valuable cultural competencies; and

Whereas, employers value the transferable skills—communication, leadership, time management, reflection, ability to take criticism, and how to effectively work with others toward a common goal—learned by student-athletes; and

Whereas, team membership connects student-athletes to internship and career opportunities through networks of alumni and former athletes; and

Whereas, SUNY graduates serve as teachers, coaches, and administrators in our public schools and serve as role models for the students they interact with; and

Whereas, there is a history of explicit and implicit bias and intimidation against Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender athletes, coaches, and staff; and

Whereas, college athletic programs should be safe spaces for all students who wish to participate, including Out and Gender non-conforming athletes, coaches, and staff; therefore

Be it resolved that the University Faculty Senate requests that SUNY System Administration, through individual campus Presidents and their designees, work with Directors of Athletics and Student Government organizations to develop systematic programs that support LGBT athletes, coaches and staff and prevent any anti-LGBT bias and discrimination in all sports on each of its campuses, and

Be it further resolved this program be instituted by the 2015-2016 school year.

Resources

About the LGBT Sports Coalition

The coalition is an association of organizations and individuals committed to ending anti-LGBT bias in sports by 2016. It was formalized at the LGBT Sports Summit in Portland, Ore., in June 2013. Member organizations include GLAAD, National Center for Transgender Equality, the Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network, and the National Women’s Law Center. The coalition is led by National Women’s Law Center Senior Legal Advisor Mariss Herod, and represents more than 250 organizations and individuals, including the National Center for Transgender Equality, the Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network, and the National Women’s Law Center.
### Sector Reports . . .

Continued from page 23


http://www.campuspride.org/

http://www.standupfoundation.com/

http://www.outsports.com/

http://youcanplayproject.org/

http://www.athleteally.org/about/

168-02-1

Resolution Requesting All State University of New York Campuses Offering Athletics Create Programs to Support Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender Athletes, Coaches, and Staff and to Prevent Anti-LGBT Bias and Discrimination in Athletics.

Passed

Resolution on SUNY Excels Performance Measurement System

Whereas the State University of New York system recognizes that its strength lies in a “geographically distributed comprehensive system of diverse campuses which shall have differentiated and designated missions...” and,

Whereas the principle of shared governance has a long-standing role in the development of college and university strategic planning with the 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities declaring that

“The framing and execution of long-range plans... should be a central and continuing concern of the academic community,” involving input from all participants in campus governance; and

Whereas performance measurement systems are designed to measure the results of services or programs and the selection of specific measures often directs organizational activities and resources; and,

Whereas the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools’ accreditation requires its members to demonstrate institutional effectiveness with outcome measures; and,

Whereas the success of performance measurement systems depends upon the active participation and support of all stakeholder groups responsible for implementing them including faculty; and,

Whereas the State University of New York system has been engaged in the development of SUNY Excel, a performance measurement system for both the system and its campuses since 2013; and,

Whereas the four leadership meetings held across the state of New York in December, 2013 offered limited participation by faculty representatives in attendance; and,

Whereas the process for developing campus level outcomes and indicators does not include steps to consult with faculty to discuss the potential impact of indicators on the missions of campuses, programs or departments; and,

Whereas the implementation of performance measurement systems are more successful when they are reviewed and revised as all stakeholders gain knowledge about the processes and their outcomes; now, therefore

Be it resolved that support of the SUNY Excels program by the University Faculty Senate is contingent upon satisfactorily addressing the following:

- Both individual campuses and the SUNY system engage all participants in governance including faculty, staff and students in the development and implementation of campus specific performance measures that are integrally linked to their unique institutional missions;
- Each campus, through the existing shared governance process(es), and SUNY carefully assess the impacts of pursuing conflicting performance measures simultaneously;
- SUNY and its respective campuses, through the existing shared governance process(es), select and use measures which directly support the core academic missions of the institutions;
- SUNY and its institutions, through the existing shared governance process(es), systematically review the validity and reliability of their performance measures on an annual basis; and,
- SUNY adopt procedures for amending performance measures and their systems as part of a process of continuous improvement for the System and its campuses.

168-03-1

Resolution on SUNY Excels Performance Measurement System Passed

Resolution on Affordability of Textbooks and Other Instructional Materials

Whereas the mission of the State University of New York (SUNY) is to provide the people of New York State with educational services of the highest quality and with the broadest possible access; and

Whereas the cost of higher education borne by students including those attending SUNY has risen in recent years; and

Whereas the cost of education can be prohibitive, affect access and affordability, and contribute to indebtedness for students and their families; and

Whereas the increased cost of textbooks and other instructional materials contributes to the overall increase in the cost of higher education; and

Whereas ensuring that students have access to textbooks and related materials is consistent with SUNY’s mission and integral to student success; and

Whereas textbooks are continuously updated and it is not general policy or within the scope of the budgets of libraries to purchase textbooks as part of their academic holdings; and

Whereas faculty instructional copies may not be copyright compliant for use in library reserves; and

Whereas the Chancellor on October 23, 2014, announced the SUNY Affordable Learning Solutions initiative as part of International Open Access Week; and

Whereas on November 9, 2013, the General Assembly of the Student Assembly of the State University of New York passed the Textbook Affordability Solutions Resolution #1314-40; therefore

Be it resolved that the University Faculty Senate (UFS) asks the Chancellor to work with campus Presidents to implement the Student Assembly of the State University of New York’s Resolution #1314-40; and

Be it further resolved that the UFS asks the Chief Academic Officer on each campus to work with the Campus Governance Leader to consider faculty to adopt textbooks from all phases of Open SUNY Textbooks and other open textbook sources and be encouraged to author such resources; and
Be it further resolved that the UFS asks the Chief Academic Officer on each campus to work with the Campus Governance Leader to increase faculty knowledge of low or no cost textbook alternatives.

168-04-1 Resolution on Affordability of Textbooks and Other Instructional Materials Passed without dissent.

Resolution on Reduction on the Maximum Working Hours for Student Assistants

Whereas the mission of the State University of New York (SUNY) is to provide the people of New York State with educational services of the highest quality and with the broadest possible access; and

Whereas the cost of higher education borne by students including those attending SUNY has risen in recent years; and

Whereas the cost of education can be prohibitive, affect access and affordability, and contribute to indebtedness for students and their families; and

Whereas a student’s inability to earn sufficient wages could result in lack of persistence toward graduation, and/or delayed graduation; and

Whereas previous recommendations from the Provost’s Office and the Student Affairs Office state that students who are in good academic standing may be allowed to work more than 20 hours per week and students who are struggling academically should continue to be limited to 20 hours per week when classes are in session; and

Whereas the SUNY Human Resources document 8300 policy of September 1, 2014, has limited student assistant working hours to twenty-nine (29) per week may present a significant financial hardship;

Therefore Be it resolved that the University Faculty Senate requests that SUNY System Administration work with the State of New York to remove the limitation on student assistant working hours; and

Be it further resolved that the University Faculty Senate urges the Chancellor to support any and all other efforts to provide students with insurance options so that student working hours not be limited.

168-05-1 Resolution on Reduction on the Maximum Working Hours for Student Assistants Passed

Resolution in support of expanding SUNY undergraduate research and creative endeavors

Whereas undergraduate education, basic research, and applied research are fundamental components of SUNY’s mission statement; and

Whereas undergraduate research is understood in the broadest sense to mean hands-on, applied learning and creative endeavor in laboratories, studios, performance venues, and field sites; and

Whereas the Chancellor, in her 2014 State of the University address stated, “Our goal is that every SUNY student has an applied learning experience by graduation;” and

Whereas applied learning experiences such as undergraduate research opportunities increase student persistence toward degree completion, particularly in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics; and

Whereas the Research Foundation for SUNY has dedicated funding for summer undergraduate research opportunities as well as education and outreach funding for the Networks of Excellence; therefore

Be it resolved that the University Faculty Senate supports the goal of expanding research opportunities for undergraduate students; and

Be it resolved that the University Faculty Senate supports our colleagues in their efforts to strengthen curricula that prepare students for undergraduate research; and

Be it resolved that the University Faculty Senate supports our colleagues in their efforts to further develop creative ways to infuse undergraduate research into existing curricula, and where appropriate, to provide extracurricular research opportunities; and

Be it resolved that the University Faculty Senate encourages SUNY and campus administration to provide greater resources (funding, time, space, credit), to our colleagues who regularly inspire, educate, and mentor undergraduate researchers.

168-06-1 Resolution in support of expanding SUNY undergraduate research and creative endeavors. Passed without dissent

Resolution on Naloxone Availability

WHEREAS, heroin is widely available, and heroin overdoses are increasing in frequency,

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that University Faculty Senate requests that SUNY Administration ensure that all SUNY campus police units and campus First Responders have access to and are stocked with naloxone and are trained in its use for emergent administration; and

BE IT THEREFORE FURTHER RESOLVED that campuses work to prevent substance abuse in our campus communities.

168-07-1 Resolution on Naloxone Availability Passed without dissent.
ANNOUNCEMENTS AND CONFERENCES

Appointment of Dr. Alexander N. Cartwright as Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

Dr. Cartwright was appointed Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor starting in September, 2014. He was Vice President for Research and Economic Development, Professor of Electrical Engineering, and Adjunct Professor of Physics at the University of Buffalo (UB). As such, he was responsible for the overall management of UB’s research enterprise, including funding, administration and compliance, communications, support, university/industry relations, and economic development. He also worked with the leadership teams of UB 2020 strategic strengths to help build the necessary research infrastructure and facilities, and collaborative efforts through the creating of new cross-disciplinary initiatives.

Following a brief postdoctoral appointment at the University of Iowa, Dr. Cartwright was appointed Assistant Professor of Electrical Engineering at UB’s School of Engineering and Applied Sciences in 1995. He was promoted to Associate Professor in 2000 and to Professor in 2005. He served as Deputy Director (1999-2002) and Director (2002-2010) of the Institute for Lasers, Photonics and Biophotonics; Director for UB 2020 Integrated Nanosctructured Systems Initiative (2006-2007); Vice Provost for Strategic Initiatives at UB (2007-2009); and Chair of the Department Electrical Engineering and the Inaugural Chair for the Department of Biomedical Engineering (2009-2010).

Dr. Cartwright was awarded a National Science Foundation CAREER Award in 1998 and an Office of Naval Research Young Investigator Award in 2000. During his time at UB, he has attracted more than $40 million in grant support. He currently serves, or has served, as Principal or Co-Principal Investigator on research grants from the Air Force Office of Scientific Research; National Institutes of Health; National Science Foundation; Department of Defense; Office of Naval Research; John R. Oishei Foundation; New York State Office of Science, Technology, and Academic Research; and various industrial sponsors. As an active cross-disciplinary research collaborator, Dr. Cartwright’s research emphasizes translating new knowledge to commercial applications. He has six patents to date, and his technologies have been licensed by three start-up companies. His demonstration of a rainbow-colored polymer, a one-step, low-cost holographic lithography method to fabricate a polymer with extraordinary properties, was included in the Society of Manufacturing Engineers’ list of 2013 Innovations that Could Change the Way You Manufacture—one of five awardees internationally. He has published more than 160 journal papers and conference proceedings.

Dr. Cartwright’s interest in combining research and education is demonstrated by his serving as the Principal Investigator on the NSF IGERT (Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship) program in Biophotonics, as Co-Principal Investigator on two undergraduate education grants, and, more recently, as a Co-Principal Investigator on a prestigious NSF Math and Science Partnership Award at BU and Buffalo Public Schools. He is also the recipient of the Chancellor’s Award for Excellence in Teaching, and has taught and mentored students at all levels.

Finally, Dr. Cartwright received his B.S. and Ph.D. at the University of Iowa in Electrical and Computer Engineering. He is a Fellow of the SPIE—The International Society for Optical Engineering; a senior member of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE); and a member of the American Society for Engineering Education (ASEE);Eta Kappa Nu; the Materials Research Society (MRS); and the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS). He has served the academic community as a referee to federal funding agencies as well as over a dozen scholarly journals.

SUNY GHI Goals:

• Develop inter-campus mechanisms for global health education that increase access and participation by SUNY students, faculty and staff.

• Conduct innovative global health research that promotes collaboration among faculty initiatives across SUNY campuses.

• Utilize an integrated approach for educational programs and research cores to increase competitiveness for funding from state, federal, and international funding agencies and philanthropic organizations.

• Develop an educational services and consultative mechanism for resource-limited countries to access SUNY faculty and staff with expertise in clinical education and research program development.

Background: SUNY faculty have numerous ongoing global health initiatives that are located at the SUNY Academic Health Centers. Each of these programs functions individually with regard to seeking competitive funding, administrative and operations staff, recruitment, and scientific dissemination. This concept proposal provides the framework for a SUNY Global Health Institute that will create a “value-added” organizational unit to the SUNY system-wide effort and emerge as a key component of the Power of SUNY theme that will establish a regional and international link for SUNY faculty, staff and student. The SUNY Global Health Institute is being established to create a virtual linkage among programs within SUNY that will integrate the array of educational and research programs that currently exist and transition to a seamless system-wide institute that is well positioned to compete for global health grants and projects. Most global health
initiatives now appreciate that successful outcomes are more likely to be achieved if applied sciences including engineering, environmental sciences, biotechnology and informatics are included in the research and education teams to be assembled to address key issues in resource limited countries. To achieve this goal, we plan to establish a formalized mechanism for linking the SUNY Global Health Institute with the 4E Network of Excellence in Energy, Environment, Education and Economics. The vision of the 4E Network of Excellence in Energy, Environment, Education and Economics (SUNY 4E) is to identify and bring together faculty and facilities across SUNY in partnership with key academic institutions, the private sector and national labs, in unparalleled transdisciplinary teams that lead the nation and the world in key transformative research areas that have a broad, positive and lasting impact on society. The 4E Network of Excellence will focus on research areas related to energy and the environment with associated economic considerations and the enhancement of educational opportunities across the SUNY system and beyond. This approach, bringing together the SUNY GHI and the SUNY 4E will create a forum for discussion that will develop a strategy for integration and establish programs and a business plan that will mobilize and synergize faculty programs into highly competitive applications and foster the development of novel research and education teams across the SUNY system. The SUNY GHI conference with the 4E Network of Excellence is scheduled for October 27-28 at the SUNY Global Center in Manhattan.

Goals of Conference: Identify areas for SUNY GHI collaboration in infectious diseases: The world has been buffeted by a range of microbial threats in the past 40 years. Newly emerging infectious diseases continue to challenge both the global and domestic health system. SUNY faculty have played a major role in capacity development as it relates to infectious diseases research globally. SUNY GHI faculty can be extended to continue to provide advanced training in both epidemiology and laboratory sciences related to infectious disease control.

Establish an Innovation in Global Nanotechnology and Bioengineering Program that can be pursued with SUNY GHI partner countries: Existing SUNY GHI programs in nanotechnology offer great opportunity to develop global applications in infectious diseases, cardiology, neurology, and other medical specialties. These applications range from nanoparticles that can target cells and organs with site-specific drug delivery systems to carbon nanotubes for diagnostic aspects of medical imaging. SUNY GHI faculty can be extended to include implementation research and education programs that will lead to international collaboration, new product development and technology transfer. Diagnostics products created and used in the developed world often cannot be used in resource-limited settings (RLS) due to insufficient electricity, transportation, and lack of trained healthcare technicians and technologists. To achieve the WHO goals to scale-up patient access to needed diagnostics a new initiative is needed that will allow conventional technologies to be implemented at the point-of-care (POC). Design and manufacturing of these products for the global health market will need to consider the specific needs of individual and regional RLS. Some examples of recent advances that resulted from collaboration between engineering, environmental scientists and global health investigators include HIV RNA Testing, Rapid Tuberculosis Testing and Noninvasive Liver Testing for Advanced Hepatic Disease.

Develop New Inter-Campus Models in Bioinformatics, Information and Communication Systems (ICS) that can bridge SUNY GHI with Developing Countries: A major emphasis within the global health community is the focus on improving dissemination of public health information and facilitation of important community-based education and discussion regarding major public health topics. The World Health Organization envisions ICS as a key to enabling collaboration and cooperation among health workers, support more effective health research and the dissemination and access to research findings, improve the efficiency of health administration, improve the ability to monitor outbreaks and have effective management plans, and facilitate research and education training in culturally diverse areas.

Identify areas of mutual interest with other SUNY Networks of Excellence in Health: The SUNY Global Health Institute will establish collaborations with the other SUNY Networks of Excellence including Health, Materials Informatics and Neuroscience to develop integrated programs. These programs will lead to innovative approaches to establish partnerships with companies that have an interest in Energy, Environment, Education and Economics that intersect with biomedical research and global health. By including economists and entrepreneurs, SUNY GHI will integrate strong SUNY programs into initiatives that include economic forecasting models that will promote reduced expenditures and new businesses to start-up/relocate to NYS. The SUNY Global Health Institute will also collaborate with the NYS Regional Economic Development Committees to identify aspects of their planning and programs that overlap with the GHI.

SUNY GHI Organization: The SUNY Global Health Institute will be a seamless, integrated organization that maximizes current resources while adding new staff and information technology utilities that will facilitate growth, efficiency, collaboration and a balanced business plan. The Institute will function through an Advisory Board, an Executive Steering Committee, and multiple units including: 1) Undergraduate and Graduate Health Professions Education Committee, 2) Faculty Global Health Core in Education and Research Committee, 3) Clinical, Laboratory and Informatics Research Centers and Cores Committee, 4) Global Health Educational Services and Consultancy Committee and 5) Regional and International Economic Development.

8th International Conference on Ethics in Biology, Engineering & Medicine

This conference will be held St. Francis College, 180 Remsen
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Street, Brooklyn, NY 11201, from April 24 to April 26, 2015. Previously, this conference was called the “International Conference on Ethics in Biomedical Engineering” and was held every other year for the last 15 years. It is sponsored by SUNY Downstate Medical Center and co-sponsored by the SUNY Research Foundation, St. Francis College, the American Institute of Medical and Biological Engineering (AIMBE), Sigma Xi, The Scientific Research Society, IEEE Society on Social Implications of Technology (technical co-sponsor), and several other universities and scientific societies. The abstracts of papers presented at the conference will be published in *Ethics in Biology, Engineering & Medicine—An International Journal*.

There will also be a whole day workshop on “Research Integrity and Responsible Conduct of Research” on Sunday, April 26, 2015, as part of this Ethics Conference. The Conference chair, Dr. Subrata Saha of SUNY Downstate Medical Center, has already invited an eminent group of speakers for this workshop and they have agreed to talk on specific topics that are relevant to this workshop. There are also plans to invite faculty, postdoctoral fellows and students from all 64 SUNY campuses as well as representatives for other medical centers, universities and companies to attend this important conference and workshop.

Below is the link for the call for abstracts for the conference and some further information about the conference.


---

**ANNOUNCING SUNY’S SECOND ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON SHARED GOVERNANCE**

**MARCH 20-21, 2015**

**SYRACUSE, NEW YORK**

**CALL FOR PROPOSALS**

**DEADLINE: FEBRUARY 18, 2015**

http://www.suny.edu/about/shared-governance/sunyvoices/
ANNOUNCEMENTS AND CONFERENCES

8th INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON ETHICS IN BIOLOGY, ENGINEERING & MEDICINE

Call for Abstracts

The program committee is seeking abstracts submission of paper relevant to this conference, which will be evaluated for inclusion in the final agenda as Oral presentations. The Deadline for abstract submission is November 26, 2014. Notification of abstract acceptance December 15, 2014. Selected papers will be published in the Ethics in Biology, Engineering and Medicine: An International Journal. Email word doc to EBM@downstate.edu

SUGGESTED TOPICS FOR PRESENTATIONS

ETHICS IN BIOENGINEERING
ETHICAL ISSUES IN BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH
ETHICS OF NANOBIOENGINEERING
ETHICS OF GENETIC ENGINEERING & CLONING
ETHICS OF STEM CELL RESEARCH
RESPONSIBLE CONDUCT OF RESEARCH
ETHICS OF SYNTHETIC BIOLOGY

MEDICAL ETHICS & HEALTH POLICY
ETHICS IN MEDICAL RESEARCH
ETHICAL ISSUES IN TISSUE ENGINEERING
NEUROETHICS
PRIVACY AND BIOINFORMATICS
ETHICS OF BIOBANKS
ETHICS IN GLOBAL HEALTH
ETHICS IN DENTISTRY

Mini Symposium: Ethical Issues in Dentistry

One-Day: WorkShop

Sunday, April 26. Research Integrity and Responsible Conduct of Research

Rebecca S. Twersky, MD, MPH
SUNY Downstate Medical Center

Adil E. Shamoo, Ph.D., CIP
Univ. of Maryland School of Medicine

Beth A. Fischer, Ph.D.
Univ. of Pittsburgh

Sarah McGraw, Ph.D.
The Hastings Center

Josephine Johnston, LLB, MBHL
The Hastings Center

Michael J. Zigmond, Ph.D.
Univ. of Pittsburgh

Barbara Redman, PhD, MBE, FAAN
New York University

Conference Chair
Subrata Saha, PhD
SUNY Downstate Medical Center
EBM@downstate.edu
Office – (718)-613-8652
Fax – (718)-270-3983

Keynote Speakers:
Arthur L. Caplan, PhD
New York University

Mildred Z. Solomon, Ed.D
The Hastings Center

Invited Speakers:
George Khushf, PhD
University of South Carolina

Kenneth R. Foster, PhD
University of Pennsylvania

Wade Robison, PhD
Rochester Institute of Technology

Registration
Before March 1st, 2015
Registration Fee*: $200
One-Day Registration
does not include banquet:$150
Student Registration*: $70
Guest Banquet Ticket:$50

After March 1st, 2015
Registration Fee*: $250
One-Day Registration
does not include banquet: $200
Student Registration*: $90
Guest Banquet Ticket: $50

Conference Site
St. Francis College
180 Remsen Street
Brooklyn, NY 11201
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Administration</th>
<th>SUNY Cortland</th>
<th>SUNY Potsdam</th>
<th>SUNY Maritime College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Campbell</td>
<td>Noelle Chaddock Paley</td>
<td>Tim Phillips (Alternate)</td>
<td>Timothy Gerken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Hildebrand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Hogle (Alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University at Albany</td>
<td>Empire State College</td>
<td></td>
<td>College of Environmental Science and Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Leonard</td>
<td>Edward Warzala</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kelley Donaghy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Philippe Abraham</td>
<td>Justin Giordano (Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>SUNY Maritime College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Schmidt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walk Nadolny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Dewar (Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUNY Optometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Wagner (Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patricia Modica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binghamton University</td>
<td>SUNY Fredonia</td>
<td></td>
<td>SUNY Polytechnic Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Wozniak</td>
<td>Reneta Barneva</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maarten Heyboer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall McGuire</td>
<td>Bruce Simon (Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>James Castracane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Sinclair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New York State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosmarie Morewedge (Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramics at Alfred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florenz Plassman (Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Wieter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Colon (Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant (Alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University at Buffalo</td>
<td>SUNY Geneseo</td>
<td></td>
<td>SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Kieler</td>
<td>Dennis Showers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Wieter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Van Wicklin</td>
<td>Maria Lima (Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant (Alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heny Durand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Wieter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant (Alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohamed S. Awayda (Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Brook University</td>
<td>SUNY New Paltz</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Wieter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arty Shertzr</td>
<td>Corinne Nyquist</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant (Alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georges Fouron</td>
<td>Kevin Caskey (Corinne is also the alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores Bilges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Wieter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Walter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant (Alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Stellacci (Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Wolfskill (Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Wieter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Brockport</td>
<td>SUNY Old Westbury</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant (Alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Gibson Ralph</td>
<td>Minna Barrett</td>
<td></td>
<td>SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Leslie</td>
<td>Caroline Sawyer (Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Wieter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Jones (Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant (Alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo State College</td>
<td>SUNY Oneonta</td>
<td></td>
<td>SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Marren</td>
<td>Renee Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Wieter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Goodman</td>
<td>Michael Koch (Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant (Alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Grinnell (Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Wieter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant (Alternate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2014-2015 Campus Governance Leaders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Governance Leader Convenuer</th>
<th>SUNY Cortland</th>
<th>SUNY Potsdam</th>
<th>SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan Trybula, SUNY Potsdam</td>
<td>Kathleen Lawrence</td>
<td>Jan Trybula</td>
<td>Timothy Gerken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University at Albany</td>
<td>Empire State College</td>
<td>Purchase College</td>
<td>Tom Hogle (Alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joette Stefi-Mabry</td>
<td>Tom McElroy</td>
<td>Peggy De Cooke</td>
<td>SUNY Maritime College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binghamton University</td>
<td>SUNY Fredonia</td>
<td>Alfred State College</td>
<td>Walk Nadolny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Sinclair</td>
<td>Robert Deemer</td>
<td>James Grillo</td>
<td>SUNY Optometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alistair Lees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patricia Modica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall Edouard</td>
<td>SUNY Geneseo</td>
<td>SUNY Canton</td>
<td>SUNY Polytechnic Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University at Buffalo</td>
<td>James McLean</td>
<td>Elizabeth Erickson</td>
<td>Maarten Heyboer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra Zubrow</td>
<td>SUNY New Paltz</td>
<td>SUNY Cobleskill</td>
<td>James Castracane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Marie Landel</td>
<td>Janice Anderson</td>
<td>Angelika Hoehler</td>
<td>New York State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Brook University</td>
<td>SUNY Old Westbury</td>
<td>SUNY Delhi</td>
<td>Ceramics at Alfred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Feldman</td>
<td>Kathleen Velsor</td>
<td>Jared Yando</td>
<td>S. K. Sundaram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Brockport</td>
<td>SUNY Oneonta</td>
<td>Farmingdale State College</td>
<td>Downstate Medical Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Parker</td>
<td>Todd Ellis</td>
<td>Llyod Makarowitz</td>
<td>Stephan Rinnert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo State College</td>
<td>SUNY Oswego</td>
<td>Karen Gelles</td>
<td>Upstate Medical University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Carson</td>
<td>Joan Carroll</td>
<td>SUNY Morrisville</td>
<td>Dale Avers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUNY Plattsburgh</td>
<td>Paul Buckingham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandra Rezac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>